THE AGES DIGITAL LIBRARY
REFERENCE

CYCLOPEDIA of BIBLICAL, THEOLOGICAL and ECCLESIASTICAL LITERATURE

Modestus, St.- Monks, Eastern

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

Modestus (1), St.

an apostle of the Church in Carinthia, flourished in the 8th century. He was one of six whom bishop Vigilius of Salzburg sent to Carinthia to preach the glad tidings. Modestus lived but a short time after his arrival in Carinthia, but the success of his mission is manifest in the conversion of the princes of the country, who are said to have espoused the cause of Christianity at this time. *SEE CARINTHIA*. Modestus is commemorated in the Latin Church as a saint.

(2.) Another Modestus flourished in the 7th century (616-626) as patriarch of the Church of Jerusalem. He is reputed as the restorer of the holy church at Jerusalem. which was destroyed by the Persians under Chosroes II in 614.

Modesty

(Lat. *modestia,* from *maodus,* a measure) is sometimes used to denote humility, and sometimes to express chastity. The Greek word *kosmios* signifies neat, or well arranged. It suggests the idea of simple elegance. Modesty, therefore, consists in purity of sentiment and manners, inclining us to abhor the least appearance of vice and indecency, and to fear doing anything which will justly incur censure. All excess of modesty is called bashfulness or diffidence, and the want of it impertinence or impudence. There is also a false or vicious modesty, which influences a man to do anything that is ill or indiscreet; such as, through fear of offending his companions, he runs into their follies or excesses; or it is a false modesty Which restrains a man from doing what is good or laudable, such as being ashamed to speak of religion, and to be seen in the exercises of piety and devotion.

Modi Or Mode

(*i.e. courageous,* from a root cognate with the Danish *mod,* and the German *muth* “courage”) is in northern mythology the name of a son of Thor, who, the legend goes, is to survive the destruction of the world at Ragnarock, and in the renovated world will share with Mogni the possession of their father’s hammer, and engage in the extermination of all strife. See Thorpe, *Northern Mythology,* volume 1; Keyes, *Religion of the Northmen.*

Modigliana, Francisco

a Bolognese painter; flourished about the beginning of the 17th century. Lamnzi says he “was not remarkably powerful, nor always consistent with himself, but very graceful and beautiful, and deserving a place in our lexica.” His works at Urbino, where he is known under the name of Francisco da Forli, are a picture of *Christ taken down from the Cross,* in oil, at St. Croce, and some *Angels,* in fresco, at St. Lucia. His finest works, however, are in the churches at Forli and Rimini, among which are *A dam driven from Eden,* the *Deluge,* and the *Tower of Babel.* He died suddenly, leaving his work imperfect,’ but it was afterwards continued by Arrigoni, who painted the *Death of Abel* in the same place. See Lanzi’s *Hist. of Painting,* transl. by Roscoe (Lond. 1847, 3 volume, 8vo), 3:57.

Mo’din

*(*Μωδεΐν v.r. Μωδεείμ, Μωδιείμ, Μωδαείμ, and in chapter 2 Μωδεείν*;* Josephus, Μωδιείμ, and once Μωδεείν*;* Vulg. *Modin:* the Jewish form is, in the Mishna, µy[ydwmh in Joseph ben-Gorion, chapter 20 ty[dwmh; the Syriac version of Maccabees agrees with the Mishna, except in the absence of the article, and is the usual substitution of *r* for *d, Mora’im),* a place not mentioned in either the Old or New Testament, though rendered immortal by its connection with the history of the Jews in the interval between the two. It was the native city of the Maccabnean family (1 Macc. 13:25), and as a necessary consequence contained their ancestral sepulchre (τάφος) (2:70; 9:19). Hither Mattathias removed from Jerusalem, where up to that time he seems to have been residing, at the commencement of the Antiochian persecution (2:1). It was here that he struck the first blow of resistance, by slaying on the heathen altar which had been erected in the place both the commissioner of Antiochus and a recreant Jew whom he had induced to sacrifice, and then demolishing the altar. Mattathias himself, and subsequently his sons Judas and Jonathan, were buried in the family tomb, and over them Simon erected a structure which is minutely described in the book of Maccabees (13:25-30), and, with less detail, by Josephus *(Ant.* 13:6, 6), but the restoration of which has hitherto proved as difficult a puzzle as that of the mausoleum of Artemisia.

At Modin the Maccabsean armies encamped on the eves of two of their most memorable victories — that of Judas over Antiochus Eupator (2 Macc. 13:14), and that of Simon over Cendebaus (1 Macc. 14:4) — the last battle of the venerable chief before his assassination. The only indication of the position of the place to be gathered from the above notices is contained in the last, from which we may infer that it was near “the plain” (τὸ πεδίον*),* i.e., the great maritime lowland of Philistia (verse 5). By Eusebius and *Jerome.(Onomast,* Μηδεείμ, Modim) it is specified as near Diospolis, i.e., Lydda; while the notice in the Mishna *(Pesachim,* 9:2), and the comments of Bartenora and Maimonides, state that it was fifteen (Roman) miles from Jerusalem. At the same time the description of the monument seems to imply (though for this see below) that the spot was so lofty as to be visible from the sea, and so near that even the details of the sculpture were discernible therefrom. All these conditions, except the last, are tolerably fulfilled in either of the two sites called *Latrin* and *Kubbab.* The former of these is, by the shortest road — that through Wady All-exactly fifteen Roman miles from Jerusalem; it is about eight English miles from Lydd, fifteen from the Mediterranean, and nine or ten from the River Rubin, on which it is probable that Cedron — the position of Cendebbeus in Simon’s battle-stood. Kubab is a couple of miles farther from Jerusalem, and therefore nearer to Lydd and to the sea, on the most westerly spur of the hills of Benjamin. Both are lofty, and both apparently — Latrun certainly — command a view of the Mediterranean. In favor of Latrun are the extensive ancient remains with which the top of the hill is said to be covered (Robinson, *Bib. Res.* 3:151; Tobler, *Dritte Wand.* page 186), though of their date and particulars we have at present no accurate information. The foundations of the fortress appear to be of the Roman age, or perhaps earlier, though the upper parts exhibit pointed arches and light architecture of a much later date. The view from the summit is commanding, and embraces the whole plain to Joppa and the Mediterranean beyond. The name Latron appears to have arisen in the 16th century, from the legend which made this the birthplace of the penitent thief —“Castrum boni *Latronis”* (Quaresmius, 2:12; Porter, *Hand-book,* page 285; Reland, page 901; Thomson, *Land and Book,* 2:308). Kubab appears to possess no ruins, but, on the other hand, its name may retain a trace of the monument. Ewald *(Gesch.* 4:350, note) suggests that the name Modin may be still surviving in *Deir Ma’in.* But this is questionable on philological grounds; and the position of Deir Ma’in is less in accordance with the facts than that of the two named in the text. The mediaeval and modern tradition (see Robinson, 2:7) places Modin at *Soba,* and eminence south of Kuriet el-Enab; but this being not more than seven miles from Jerusalem, while it is as much as twenty-five from Lydda and thirty from the sea, and also far removed from the plain of Philistia, is at variance with every one of the conditions implied in the records. It has found advocates in our own day in M. de Saulcy *(L'Art Judaique,* etc., page 377 sq.) and M. Salzmann *(Jerusalem, Etude, etc.,* pages 37, 38; where the lively account would be more satisfactory if it were less encumbered with mistakes), the latter of whom explored chambers there which may have been tombs, though he admits that there was nothing to prove it. A suggestive fact, which Dr. Robinson first pointed out, is the want of unanimity in the accounts of the mediaeval travellers, some of whom, as William of Tyre (8:1), place Modin in a position near Emmaus — Nicopolis, Nob, and Lydda. M. Mislin also usually so vehement in favor of the traditional sites has recommended further investigation. If it should turn out that the expression of the book of Maccabees as to the monument being visible from the sea has been misinterpreted, then one impediment to the reception of Soba will be removed; but it is difficult to account for the origin of the tradition in the teeth of those which remain.

The descriptions of the tomb by the author of the book of Maccabees and Josephus, who had both apparently seen it, will be most conveniently compared by being printed together:

1 Macc. 23:27-30.	Josephus, *Ant.* 13:6, 6.
"And Simon made a building over the sepulchre of his father and his brethren, and raised it aloft to view with polished stone behind and before. And he set up upon it seven pyramids, one against another, for his father and his mother and his four breththren. And on these he made engines of war, and set great to pillars round about, and the pillars he made suits of armor for a perpetual memory; and by the suits of armor ships carved, so that they might be seen by all that sail on the sea.	"And Simon built a very large monument to his father and his brethren of white and polished stone. And he raised it up to a great and conspicuous height, and threw cloisters around, and set up pillars of a single stone, a work wonderful to behold: and near to these he built seven pyramids on his parents and his brothers, one for each, terrible to behold both for size and beauty.

This sepulchre he made at Modin, and it stands unto this day.”

And these things are preserved even to this day.”

The monuments are said by Eusebius *(ut sup.)* to have been still shown when he wrote — A.D. cir. 320. Any restoration of the structure from so imperfect an account as the above can never be anything more than conjecture. Something has been already attempted under *SEE MACCABEES* (q.v.). But in its absence one or two questions present themselves.

(1.) The “ships” *(πλοῖα, naves).* The sea and its pursuits were so alien to the ancient Jews, and the life of the Maccabaean heroes who preceded Simon was — if we except their casual relations with Joppa and Jamnia and the battle-field of the maritime plain — so unconnected therewith, that it is difficult not to suppose that the word is corrupted from what it originally was. This was the view of J.D. Michaelis, but he does not propose any satisfactory word in substitution for πλοῖα (see his suggestion in Grimm, ad loc.). True, Simon appears to, have been to a certain extent alive to the importance of commerce to his country, and he is especially commemorated for having acquired the harbor of Joppa, and thus opened an inlet for the isles of the sea (1 Macc. 14:5). But it is difficult to see the connection between this and the placing of ships on a monument to his father and brothers, whose memorable deeds had been of a different description. It is perhaps more feasible to suppose that the sculptures were intended to be symbolical of the departed heroes. In this case it seems not. improbable that during Simon’s intercourse with the Romans he had seen and been struck with their war-galleys, no inapt symbols of the fierce and rapid career of Judas. How far such symbolical representation was likely to occur: to. a Jew of that period is another question..

(2.) The distance at which the “ships” were to be seen.. Here again, when the necessary distance of Modin from the sea — Latr’in, fifteen miles; Kubab, thirteen; Lydda itself, ten — and the limited size of the sculptures are considered, the doubt inevitably arises whether the Greek text of the book of Maccabees accurately represents the original. De Saulcy *(L’Art Judaique,* page 377) ingeniously suggests that the true meaning is, not that the sculptures could be discerned from the vessels in the Mediterranean. but that they were worthy to be inspected by those who were sailors by profession. Hitzig *(Gesch. des Volkes. Israels,* page 449) insists upon it (1869) that Modin is recognised in the modern little village *el-Burjh* (comp. Robinson, 3:272), but the exact location is by recent excavations determined to be *in el-Mediyeh,* two and a quarter hours. east of Lydda *(Quar. Statement* of "Palestine Exploration Fund," 1870, page 245 sq.; 1874, page 58 sq.).

Modius

SEE BUSHEL.

Modius

(from Greek μόδιος, *a measure)* designates, in the language of archaeological sculpture, a kind of basket frequently found in representations of heathen divinities. It was placed on their heads in imitation of the practice prevailing among the ancients, among whom the women carried in baskets on their heads sacrifices for the gods.

Modoin, Or Mautwin

a noted early French ecclesiastic, was born towards the latter part of the 8th century. In his early manhood he was a priest connected with St. George's church at Lyons. Later he was bishop of Autun. The first mention of his name in the Church records of Autun occurs in 815. Soon afterwards he was recognised as one of the leading prelates in the empire. Louis "le Debonnaire," in his disgrace and adversity, had no adherent more faithful than Modoin, whose credit at the court of Charles the Bald was equally high. When Pepin was driven out of Aquitaine, Charles the Bald divided that kingdom into three governments, the designated capitals of which were, respectively, Limoges, Clermont, and Angouleme. The ecclesiastical district of Clermont was then assigned to bishop Modoin. Later, after the deposition of Agobard, archbishop of Lyons, Modoin took an active part in the administration of the archiepiscopal see. Florus reproaches him with undue firmness in his treatment of the Lyonnese clergy. The reverend Rouvier mentions Modoin as being numbered among the abbes of Moutier-Saint-Jean, in the diocese of Langres. In the 9th century it was not uncommon to meet bishops engaged in the same pursuits with abbes. When Theodulfe, bishop of Orleans, was in prison at Angers, he sent a poetical composition to Modoin, begging him to interfere in his favor. Modoin, in reply, indited a short poem, his only literary work extant. He died about

842. See *Gallia Christ.* volume 4, col. 359; *Hist. Litter. de la France,* 4:547.

Modus

in ecclesiastical law, signifies an exemption from the payment of tithes, and is of two kinds: first, a partial exemption, when it is called a *modus decimandi;* secondly, a total exemption, when it is called a *modus de non decimando.* There is a third species of exemption, called a *real composition,* where an agreement is made between the owner of lands and the parson or vicar, with the consent of the patron and ordinary, that the lands specified shall be exempt from tithes on such considerations as are contained in the stipulation, such as land or other real recompense given in lieu and satisfaction of the tithes to be relinquished. The *modus decimandi* is that which is generally meant when the term *modus* is used. It is defined to be a custom of tithing in a particular manner, different from that which the general law prescribes; and the custom must have existed from time immemorial. The modes of tithing established by these customs are exceedingly various: sometimes it is a compensation in work and labor, as that the incumbent shall have only the twelfth cock of hay, and not the tenth, in consideration of the landowner making it for him; sometimes it is a less quantity of tithe in a more perfect, in lieu of a larger quantity in a crude and imperfect state, as a couple of fowls in lieu of tithe eggs; sometimes, and more frequently, it consists in a pecuniary compensation, as twopence an acre for the tithe of land.

The *modus de non decimando* is an absolute exemption from tithes. It exists in four cases:

1. The ruler may prescribe that he and his progenitors have never paid tithes for ancient crown lands, and this prescription will be good.

2. One Church officer does not pay tithes to another officer his superior, nor the superior to the inferior, according to the rule that *ecclesia ecclesiae decimos solvere non debet.*

3. An ecclesiastical person, as a bishop, may prescribe to be exempt from paying tithes on the ground that the lands belong to the bishopric, and that neither he nor his predecessors have ever paid them.

4. The abbeys and monasteries at the time of their dissolution were possessed of large estates of land, a great part of which was held tithe-free, either by prescription or by unity of possession, which was, in fact, no more than prescription, or by the pope's bull of exemption, or by a real composition. Thus in 'England, for example, the statute of 31 Henry VIII, c. 13, which dissolved the larger abbeys, enacted that all persons who should come to the possession of the lands of an abbey then dissolved should hold them tithe-free, in as ample a manner as the abbeys themselves had formerly hell them. The lands which belonged to the Order of the Knights of St. John of Jerusalem and to the Order of the Cistercians are within the protection of this statute; and those of them, consequently, which were tithe-free before they came into the hands of the king still continue tithe-free, in whosesoever hands they may now be. Some lands have been made tithe free by special legislative acts. See Blackstone, *Comnmentaries,* 2:28; Selden, *History of Tithes,* chapter 13; Burton, *Conmpendium of the Law of Real Property,* page 367 sq.

Moebius (Or Mobius), Georg

a Lutheran divine, was born at Laucha, Thuringia, December 18, 1616; studied at Jena and Leipsic; became rector of the gymnasium at Mercersburg in 1647; professor and doctor of theology at Leipsic in 1668; and died November 28, 1697. He edited and enlarged Cruusius's *Grammatica Graeca,* and was the author of numerous essays in Latin on Biblical and theological topics, which were afterwards published in a collective edition (Leips. 1699, 4to). See Jocher, *Gelehrten Lexikon.* s.v.

Moed

SEE TALMUD.

Moedsognir

in Norse mythology, is the name of the highest class of pigmies who dwell in stones.

Moehler

SEE MUHLER.

Moelart, Jacob

a Dutch painter, was born at Dort in the year 1649. He was a pupil of Nicholas Maas, and gained an enviable reputation as a historical painter, though he is better known by. his portraits. Spooner mentions two religious works by this artist — *Pharaoh and his Host drowned in the Red Sea,* and *Moses striking the Rock.* He died in 1727.

Moeller

SEE MOLLER.

Moeso Gothic Version

SEE GOTHIC VERSION.

Mo’eth

(Μωὲθ, Vulg. *Medics),* a Levite, “son of Sabban,” who aided Ezra in conveying the bullion from Babylon (1 Esdras 8:63); evidently the NOADIAH *SEE NOADIAH* (q.v.) “son of Binnui” of the Heb. text (<150833>Ezra 8:33).

Moffatt, Josiah

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

Mogila(s), Peter

a distinguished Russian prelate, was born in Moldavia very near the close of the 16th century (about 1597). He studied at the University of Paris and other high schools, afterwards entered the Polish army, and greatly distinguished himself. Becoming sober-minded, he decided to devote himself to the service of the Church, was made a monk at Kief in 1625, and rapidly rose in favor. In 1629 he was elected archimandrite of his monastery, and in 1633 was elevated to the rank of metropolitan of Kief, Galicia, and Little Russia. Mogila was the first to introduce in the study of theology at Kief the developments which it had acquired in the European universities. Indeed, Mogila is today honored annually by a panegyrical oration at the Academy of Kief, in recognition of his services to that institution of learning. He arranged and improved the courses of study in every particular; established, among. other advantages, three classes in philosophy and theology in the Latin and Polish languages; obtained from the Polish government permission to erect a printing-press, invited many learned men to the academy, and settled upon them sources of revenue which had formerly gone to the metropolitan; and, besides affording all these advantages, gave them his own library, which was considered a very rare and valuable collection of books. He died December 31, 1646. To confirm the views and feelings of the Oriental Church in opposition to the encroachments of Roman and Protestant elements, Mogila wrote a *Confession of Faith (*Ὀρθόδοξος ὁμολογία τῆς καθολικῆς καὶ ἀποστολικῆς ἐκκλησίας τῆς ἀνατολικῆς*)*, which occupies an important place in the history of the Russian Church. In this the doctrines of the Church are presented in the simple manner and style of the ancient Church, but in accordance also with the latest developments they had gradually attained; and as the exception of the work was ranked among the three cardinal theological virtues it has become prominent in the practical system of the Church (Hase, *Ch. Hist.* page 481). “The Eastern churches,” says M. Boulgakof, bishop of Vinitzi, “had heretofore no symbolic books of their own in which they could find,’ on matters of faith, sufficient authoritative information and direction; no systematic exposition and apology of their dogmas; they had to be satisfied with short definitions, given by oecumenical and local councils, and with the rules of the fathers named in the council *in Trullo.* For anything further they had to refer to the other writings of the fathers, which did not possess the same authority. The *Confession of Faith* of Peter Mogila, examined and approved by two councils — that of Kief in 1640, and that of Jassy in 1643 — and further endorsed by the four oecumenical patriarchs, and by the Russian patriarchs Joachim and Adrian, became the first symbolic book of the Eastern Church.” This work, which remains to this day the text-book of the Russo Greek Church in dogmatic theology, went through numerous editions in Russian, was translated into Greek (Amst. 1662), Latin (Leips. 1695), and

German (Berlin, 1727, and Breslau, 1751), and has furnished the basis for several catechisms in different Greek churches. *SEE CONFESSIONS OF FAITH*. Mogila published also a *Catechism* (Kief, 1645), and some pamphlets. A work containing biographical sketches of the saints, in the Slavonic language, he undertook, but did not bring to completion. But Mogila gained some distinction also as a poet, and made dramas, which were acted by the pupils of his academy; one of them, on the *Nativity of Christ,* was for a long time very popular. See *Hist. de la Hierarchie Russe,* 3:735; *Dictionnaire des Auteurs Ecclesiastiques Russes,* s.v.; Otto, *Hist. of Russian Literature* (Oxf. 1839, 8vo), p. 321 sq.;' Brihl, *Russische Studiem zur Theologie u. Gesch.* (Minst. 1857-58); Gerebtz of, *Essai sur l'Histoire de la Civilisation en Russie;* Haag, *Hist. des Dogmes Chretiens,* 1:458; Kimmel, *Libri symbolici ecclesiae Orientalis* (Jena, 1843, 8vo), page 56. *SEE GREEK CHURCH*; *SEE RUSSIA*. (J.W.)

Mogtasilah

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

Mogul, Great

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

Mohammed or Mahomet

(written also *Mahonsmed* or *Mahommet,* and *Mtuhamed* or *Muhamet,* an Arabic word meaning *the predicted Messiah;* applied to him in allusion to <370207>Haggai 2:7; but formerly called, according to a tradition quoted by Halabi, *Kothanm)* was a great Arabian legislator, who not only completely changed the face of the world in his own age, but still continues to exercise a powerful influence in the civilization of the Eastern world, being best known as the founder of a religious system which has spread extensively among men, and is denominated *Islam,* or, more properly, after its founder, *Mohammedanism* (q.v.).

Sources for his Life. — Arabian literature is very rich in sources for a biography of Mohammed. Besides the Koran, which records the most important events of his’ life, there exist numerous collections of traditions in which the expressed views of the Arabian prophet on. various incidents and relations of life are introduced; then there are biographies proper, some of which extend as far back as the first century of the Mohammedan era. They are, it is true, written with a religious prejudice, and more or less spiced with legends, but in most cases the historical part worthy of credit is easily discerned. It must not be believed that these biographies were allowed too free a rein to fancy, or were permitted to distort facts or pass them over in perfect silence; for they had to fear being convicted of mendacity and negligence by no less an authority than the Koran itself, already collected by the contemporaries of the prophet. Still another circumstance helps the historian in determining truth, namely that. the Mohammedans rarely try to conceal the frailties of their founder, for their judgment is guided by a standard different from that of non-Mohammedans — they praise some of his deeds and words as virtuous which we brand as infamous. They even proceed generally on the principle that Mohammed, as a privileged individual, was exempt from the common laws.’ Hence, notwithstanding the abundance of historical accounts on the rise of *Islam* (the proper name for the religion established by Mohammed, while its professors are called *Moslems),* and the continued lively intercourse between Mohammedans and Christians in Syria and Palestine, as well as in Egypt and Spain, the most perverted opinions on Mohammedanism and its author came to prevail among the non Mohammedans, even in the Occident. He was represented either as a sorcerer or as an idol; some believed him the Antichrist, others a renegade cardinal. And in proportion as the later Mohammedans — especially the Persians, greedy of miracles and mysteries — rendered the historical Mohammed of the ancient Arabians scarcely recognisable by over-much adoration and proximity to the supernatural, and the more Mohammedanism spread in the Occident and threatened to become dangerous to Christianity, hatred and fear exerted themselves to disfigure Mohammed and his creed by ridiculous and absurd calumnies. Even in modern times, after several translations of

Arabian biographies of Mohammed had been published, his true character was little understood. As late as 1829 a work appeared in London demonstrating, or rather aiming to demonstrate, that Mohammed was. foreshadowed by the little horn which issued from the fourth monster described by the prophet Daniel. In ‘a still later publication, the author endeavors, at a great’ expense of learning, to prove that Mohammed was an; instrument of the devil’s device and handling. But, as observed in Weil’s work, *Mohammed der Prophet,* the advance of knowledge in these days requires the historical characters handed down to us from remote periods to be re-examined by the light of new and of better classified authorities, and to be recast upon a surer and more truthful basis. See *Meth. Review,* January 1889.

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

State of Arabia previous to the Introduction of Islam. — From time immemorial the aboriginal inhabitants of the peninsula had been divided into a great number of free and wandering clans, limited communities, and petty states, whose peculiarities of character, mode of life, and political institutions, as they were mostly dependent upon local circumstances, were for centuries stamped with the same unalterable features, and had been preserved almost unchanged even from the time of the patriarchs 'of the. book of Genesis. The mountainous table-land of central Arabia, abounding in rich pasturage and fertile valleys, but at the same time intersected and- .skirted with dreary wastes and sandy plains, was occupied by those roving tribes who, in opposition to the settled inhabitants, are proud of the name of Bedouin, or people of the plains. Most of them were addicted to a wandering pastoral life, but from being strongly. disposed to war and chivalrous adventures, their peaceable occupations were interrupted, either by conducting a caravan of merchants, or still oftener by assailing and robbing their fellow-tribes. Every tribe was governed by the most aged or worthy sheik of that family which had been exalted above its brethren by fortune and heroic deeds, or even by eloquence and poetry. For as the heroic bards were at once the historians and moralists by whom the vices and virtues of their countrymen were impartially censured or praised, a noble enthusiasm for poetry animated those Arabs, and at an annual fair at

Okhad thirty days were consecrated to poetical emulation, after which the successful poem was written in-letters of gold and suspended in the .temple of Mecca. These meetings, however, formed but a very. feeble bond of union among the independent and hostile tribes, who only occasionally, and in times of danger and warfare, submitted to a supreme chief, or emir of emirs, and had never yet been united into one body. And the tie was still less binding on those inhabitants who, being collected in flourishing towns and cities on the coasts of the peninsula, and mostly employed in trade and agriculture, were regarded with supreme contempt by the free Bedouin as a weak and degenerate race of slaves.

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

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

Arabian idolatry centered in Mecca, whither annual pilgrimages were made by all Arabians. *SEE MECCA*. Its temple, which tradition claimed to have been founded by Abraham and Ishmael, was, so to speak, the hotel (khan), where the most diverse idols of the various Arabian tribes were lodged. It was the object of high veneration for the whole Arabian peninsula. Every tribe had its particular deity represented here, as well as its own chief. *SEE KAABA*. But there were also many Arabs who acknowledged a supreme being, and regarded all idols as subordinate to this principal being. Some were even converts to Judaism or to Christianity, especially those who had much intercourse with Jews and Christians. As a rule, however, religious life occupied but little the minds of the Bedouin, so much engrossed with their material wants and affairs, and to this day religious fanaticism is rarely found among the children of the desert. The particular wishes of the votaries were brought before the idols and their priests. and their advice was desired; but if expectation were disappointed, the idols were broken to pieces and their priests insulted and maltreated. Besides the idolaters, in a literal sense of the word, there lived in Arabia single tribes, who worshipped the sun, moon, and other celestial bodies, or inclined to the religion of the Magi and vestiges of hero-worship, and worship of trees and stones are also traceable.

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

Early Life. — Since Mohammed was by birth anything but a prince, nothing certain is known about its time, and even the oldest sources do not agree as to the date. According to the most probable reckoning, he was born in April, A.D. 571, at Mecca. This city was at that time a considerable commercial centre, where caravans from Southern Arabia, Abyssinia, Persia, and India crossed those from Egypt, Syria, and Mesopotamia, and exchanged their agricultural and industrial products. This happened particularly at the time of the pilgrimage. By descent Mohammed belonged to the aristocracy of Mecca, but the branch of which he was an offspring was very much impoverished. His mother, Aminah, possessed, it is said, a peculiarly nervous temperament, and used to fancy, while between sleeping and waking, that she was visited by spirits. It is probable that Mohammed inherited from her his constitutional tendency to epilepsy, as well as his most remarkable mental peculiarities. Mohammedan authors have labored to endow the birth of their prophet with miraculous events, and in consequence many marvellous stories are told. It is related, among other things, that his mother experienced none of the pangs of travail. As soon as her child was born, he raised his eyes to heaven, exclaiming, “There is no God but God, and I am his prophet!” That same night, it is related, also with the same inclination to extravagance, that the fire of Zoroaster, which, guarded by the Magi, had burned uninterruptedly for more than a thousand years, was suddenly extinguished, and all the idols in the world fell down.

When only two months old, Mohammed’s father died (according to some accounts, he died two months before the birth of Mohammed). Aminah for a short time nursed the infant herself; but sorrow soon dried the fountains of her breast, and the young child, after much exertion to meet this extra expenditure, was committed to the care of a nurse, with whom he remained about five years. It is related by Mohammedans that when the nurse, who was a shepherd’s wife, showed the child to a celebrated soothsayer, who was an idolater, the latter exclaimed, “Kill this child!” Halimah snatched away her precious charge and fled. Afterwards the soothsayer explained to the excited multitude: “I swear by all the gods that this child will kill those who belong to your faith; he will destroy your gods, and he will be victorious over you.” When Mohammed was six years old he lost his mother, and the poor orphaned child fell to the care of relatives. He was taken charge of by his grandfather, Abdul Mutalib, who was then the chief priest of the Kaaba. Upon his decease the care of the child fell to his uncle, Abu-Talib; but he was so indigent that he could not long afford to keep his nephew, and Mohammed was obliged to earn his livelihood as a shepherd — an occupation to which only the lower class of the population resorted, while the more opulent engaged in trade. Later (in his twenty-fifth year) he entered the service of a rich widow (Kadijah), attended to her affairs in Southern Arabia, according to some accounts also in Syria, where he is said to have become conversant with monks, who gave him information regarding Christianity. Mohammed soon gained Kadijah’s confidence to such a degree that she offered him her hand in matrimony, which he accepted, though she was much his senior — she was forty years old.

Preparation for his Mission. — Placed in affluent circumstances by marriage, Mohammed gradually abandoned commercial enterprises and. gave himself up to religious contemplation, to which he may have been induced by a cousin of his consort, who, like many Arabs of his time, had relinquished idolatry, and had been converted first to Judaism, then to Christianity, but had failed to find satisfaction in either. Mohammed was no scholar — it is even doubtful whether he acquired reading and writing in later years — his education had certainly been neglected in his earlier years by reason of circumstances. Chirography had only been introduced into Arabia a short time previously, though poetry was highly cultivated — for this, however, in spite of his oratorical talent, he had little aptitude. On the whole, his visionary character and piety formed a great contrast to the sober and robust Arabs of his time, who indulged in wine, gambling, and sensuality as the main objects of life; while he, though not insensible to terrestrial enjoyments, was more disposed to religious reflection. Retired in solitude, he made God, the future life, and revelation the themes of his thoughts, and reviewed the various systems of religion known to him by oral tradition, in order to form from them a new religion adapted to Arabia. There were at this time Ebionitish Christians in the country the *Rakuisi* and the *Hanifs.* To the first belonged, according to Sprenger's conjecture *(Leben u. Lehre des Mohammed,* 1:43 sq.), Koss, who preached at Mecca the unity of God and the resurrection of the dead, and for this purpose also visited the fair at Okhad, where Mohammed had heard him. The Hanifs were (as Sprenger will have it) Essenes, who had lost nearly all knowledge of the Bible, and had submitted to various foreign influences, but professed a rigid monotheism. Their religious book was called the "Roll of Abraham." In the time of Mohammed several members of this sect were living at Mecca and Medina, and Mohammed himself, who originally had worshipped the gods of his people, became a Hanif. The doctrine of the Hanifs was "Islam" — i.e., submission to the one God; they were themselves "Moslem" — i.e., men characterized by such submission. Besides his knowledge from such connections, Mohammed enjoyed the instruction' of Jewish scholars, among whom are particularly mentioned a celebrated rabbi, Abdallah Iba-Salaam, and Waraka, the nephew of his wife. (Comp. Abrah. Geiger, *Was hat Mohammed aus dem Judenthumne aufgenommen,* Bonn, 1833.) The Arabs, Mohammed knew, were ready for a new faith, and he desired the establishment of a religious system which should embody the essentials of all that his countrymen were acquainted with. Idolatry was already on the wane. The idols were considered by the poets and other intelligent Arabs as powerless beings, at most as mediators between the supreme God (Allah) and mankind; and there were some who even accepted the belief in a future life, as entertained among the Jews and Christians of Arabia. The greatest opposition he had reason to fear was from religious indifference, scepticism, and selfishness. According to the Koran, from which alone we can correctly gather Mohammed's religious views, he laid down the following fundamental doctrines: The existence of a monotheistic divinity, a being superior to all; a revelation, but only by special inspiration (by which alone the. prophets were distinguished, while in all other respects on an equality with the rest of mankind); and, finally, a life hereafter, in which the virtuous were to be rewarded and the vicious punished. In his opinion, this was the religion of Abraham, who, as the Koran says, was neither Jew nor Christian, but a pious, God-fearing man.

Moses and Christ were prophets; but their revelation had been distorted by Jews and Christians. He there, fore,, determined that some of the laws and ordinances of the Old Testament, not suitable for Arabia, should be set aside; and of the New, many dogmas, which were looked upon by him and his contemporaries as bordering on idolatry, should be revoked, in order to successfully convert his people to monotheism.

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

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

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

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

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

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

His earliest attention after his arrival at Medina was given towards the consolidation of the new worship and the minor arrangements in the congregation of his flock. At this time Mohammed endeavored, by various concessions, to gain the Jews over to his faith. He selected Jerusalem as the point of direction in prayer, appointed the tenth day of the first month as a day of fasting, and allowed the new converts to celebrate their

Sabbath. But when the Jews, notwithstanding these advances, would not acknowledge him as prophet, ridiculed his pretension to be the Messiah, and enraged him by their constant taunts, he soon abrogated his concessions, became their bitterest enemy, sought closer alliance with the heathenish Arabs, and substituted practices likely to please them. In prayer the worshipper was now directed to turn towards Mecca, the month Ramadan was henceforth fixed upon as a fasting-time, and Friday as the day of rest.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Personal Characteristics. — In appearance, Mohammed was of middling size, had broad shoulders, a wide chest, and large bones; and he was fleshy, but not stout. The immoderate size of his head was party disguised by long locks of hair, which in slight curls came nearly down to the lobes of his ears. His oval face, though tawny, was rather fair for an Arab, but neither pale nor high-colored. The forehead was broad, and his fine and long but narrow eyebrows were separated by a vein, which you could see throbbing if he was angry. Under long eyelashes sparkled bloodshot black eyes through wide slit eyelids. His nose was large, prominent, and slightly hooked, and the tip of it seemed to be turned up, but was not so in reality. The mouth was wide; he had a good set of teeth, and the fore-teeth were asunder. His beard rose from the cheek-bones, and came down to the collarbone; he clipped his mustaches, but did not shave them. He stooped, and was slightly hump-backed. His gait was careless, and he walked fast but heavily, as if he were ascending a hill; and if he looke dback, he turned round his whole body. The mildness of his countenance gained him the confidence of every one; but he could not look straight into a man’s face: he turned his eyes usually outwards. On his back he had a round fleshy tumor of the size of a pigeon’s egg; its furrowed surface was covered with hair, and its base was surrounded by black moles. This was considered as the seal of his prophetic mission, at least during the latter part of his career, by his followers, who were so devout that they found a cure for their ailings in drinking the waters in which he had bathed; and it must have been very refreshing, for he perspired profusely, and his skin exhaled a strong smell. He bestowed considerable care on his person, and more particularly on his teeth, which he rubbed so frequently with a piece of wood that a Shiah author was induced to consider it as one of the signs of his prophetic mission. He bathed frequently, washed several times a day, and oiled his head profusely after washing it. At times he dyed his hair and beard red with henna, in imitation of his grandfather, who imported this habit from Yemen. Though he did not comb himself regularly, he did it now and then. At first he wore his hair like the Jews and Christians; for he said, “In all instance in which God has not given me an order to the contrary, I like to follow their example;” but subsequently he divided it, like most of his countrymen. Every evening he applied antimony to his eyes; and though he had not many gray hairs even when he died, he concealed them by dyeing or oiling them, in order to please his wives, many of whom were young and inclined to be giddy, and whose numbers he increased in proportion as he became more decrepit. The prophet was usually dressed in a white cotton shirt, or blouse, with pockets, and sleeves which reached to his wrists. He had a skull-cap and a turban on his head, the extremities hanging down the back; and sandals, with two leather straps over the instep, on his feet. In the house he wore merely a piece of cloth tied around his temles, leaving the crown of his head uncovered. Sometime he wore, instead of the shirt, a “suit of clothes,” which consisted of an apron — that is to say, a piece of cloth tied round the waist and hanging in folds down to the legs, like a woman’s petticoat — and a sheet, or square shawl, which was thrown over the left shoulder and wrapped round the body under the right arm. Sometimes he wrapped himself in a blanket. In temperament, Mohammed was melancholic, and in the highest degree nervous. He was generally low-spirited, thinking, and restless; and he spoke little, and never without necessity. His eyes were mostly cast to the ground, and he seldom raised them towards heaven. The excitement under which he composed the more poetical Surahs of the Koran was so great that he said that they had caused him gray hair; his lips were quivering and his hands shaking while he received the inspiration. Any offensive smell made him so uncomfortable that he forbade persons who had eaten garlic or onions to come into his place of worship. In a man of semi-barbarous habits this is remarkable. He had a wollen garment, and was obliged to throw it away when it began to smell from persipiration, “on account of his delicate consitution.” When he was taken ill, he sobbed like a woman in hysterics; or, as Ayesha says, he roared like a camel; and his friends reproached him for his unmanly bearing. During the battle of Badr his nervous excitement seems to have bordered on frenzy. The faculties of his mind were extremely unequally developed; he was unfit for the common duties of life, and even after his mission he was led in all practical questions by his friends. But he had a vivid imagination, the greatest elevation of mind, refined sentiments, and a taste for the sublime.

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

Mohammed Abd-el-Wahab

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

Mohammed Aben-Kerram

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

Mohammed al-Darazi

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

Mohammed Hakim Ispahani

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

Mohammedanism

called by its professors *Islam*, meaning *"resignation"* or *"entire* submission" (i.e. to the will of God), in accordance with the Koran, which, as we have already seen in the article under that heading, is the Bible of the Mohammedan, and in the days of the Prophet was the only sacred book in use, the sole exponent of duty and privilege to the *Moslem,* as the Mohammedan calls himself. The Koran, however, being a miscellaneous collection of hymns,, prayers, dogmas, sermons, occasional speeches, narratives, legends, laws, orders for the time in which they were given, without any chronological arrangement, and full of repetitions anti contradictions, owing to the manner of its collection, which took place subsequent to Mohammed's death, soon proved too disconnected to be continued, even by the most ardent disciple of Islam, as the sole guide of authority. Neither dogmas nor laws are here reduced to a system; they had been inserted by piecemeal just as they had been written down, or even afterwards discovered in the reminiscences of Mohammed's companions. But, aside from these imperfections of contradictions, repetitions, and the want of system, it was manifest also that the Koran was lacking in instruction on many important theological questions, in which light the Mohammedan is accustomed to regard all ritual, dogmatic, and juridical matters. The Moslem therefore resorted, in the first place, to oral *tradition*, and by the aid of reported expressions of the Prophet, and examples in his public and private life *(Hadith* and *Sunnah),* supplemented the deficiencies and elucidated the obscure passages of the Koran (q.v.). When this resource failed to meet all wants, the decrees of the imams, i.e. of the caliphs as spiritual heads, were raised to the authority of divine laws and doctrines. Thus a religious structure, extended by analogy and Induction, supported by the Koran, by tradition, and by decrees of the imams, comprising juridical, ritualistic, and dogmatic doctrines, was gradually completed into a systematic whole, sufficient for all purposes as a guide to the Moslem. But we need hardly add that into such a peculiar construction contradictions in theory and practice have found their way, according to the different traditions and decisions of the imams or expounders of the law, besides the various interpretations put upon the Koran itself within the pale of the different Mohammedan sects that have arisen since the days of the Prophet. *SEE MOHAMMEDAN SECTS*. For the historical and ethical circumstances that conduced to the Origin and progress of Mohammedanism, *SEE MOHAMMED*.

Moslemism consists of a dogmatical or theoretical part, called "Iman" (i.e. fa*ith),* and a practical part, called "Din" (i.e. *religion.)* (See Vambery, *Der Islam im neunzehnten Jahrhundert* [Leips. 1875]).

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

(1) the doctrine of one Deity,
(2) of the revelation or prophetic vision of Mohammed, and
(3) the immortality of the soul,

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

Deity induced the Separatists to maintain that the Koran was created, since otherwise two (things) beings must have existed from eternity; the orthodox, on the contrary, regard the Koran as something uncreated, lest, God being immutable, it be viewed as not belonging to his being, and thereby the whole doctrine of revelation become undermined. The latter dogma was fiercely disputed under the caliph Mamun, who instituted a formal inquisition, .and persecuted to the utmost the adherents of the doctrine of the eternity of the Koran.

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

The history of the prophets also occupies a very large space in the Koran. Besides the Old Testament, several other prophets are named, who are said to have been sent to the extinct tribes of Arabia. The history of all these so-called divine messengers is embellished with many legends, partly to be found in the Talmud and in the Midrash, but by Mohammed fashioned to suit his purpose, in order to inspire his antagonists with fear and his votaries with consolation. He likes to identify. himself with the Biblical prophets, puts into their mouth such words as he addressed the Meccans, represents also those messengers of God's as disregarded by their contemporaries, and that hence God's wrath is inflamed, and infidels are caused to perish with ignominy, until finally, however, truth tries to prevail, and the persecuted prophet triumphs, surrounded by the few who believed in him previous to the divine punishment. In pursuance of this system, Mohammed, to be consistent, cannot accept the crucifixion of Christ; for no man ought to atone for the sins of others, nor ought a prophet to be forsaken by God. Therefore the Koran teaches it was not Christ who was crucified, but an infidel Jew whom God invested with the form of Christ, whom the Jews crucified in his stead. "Verily, Christ Jesus, the son of Mary, is the apostle of God, and his word, which he conveyed unto Mary, and a spirit proceeding from him, honorable in this world and in the world to come; and one of those who approach near to the presence of God. Yet Jesus was a mere mortal, and not the son of God; his enemies conspired against his life, but a phantom was substituted for him on the cross, while he was translated to heaven" (Sur. 3:54; 4:156,159). There is also other mention and estimate expressed in the Koran concerning Christ. He is called the living Word and Spirit of God. The miraculous birth of Christ has nothing offensive to Mohammed, for Adam had also been created by the breath of God. Neither does he hesitate to receive all miracles related in the Gospels, since similar ones had been performed by Abraham and Moses. Even the ascension is to him neither new nor incredible, as the same is reported of Elijah and Enoch. Besides the crucifixion, he abhors in the Christian dogmas the supposition that a prophet with his mother are placed next to the Deity, and declares the Trinitarian view to be an impious fiction of the priests. The Mohammedan doctrine of God's nature and attributes coincides with the Christian, in as much as he is by both taught to be the creator of all things in heaven and earth, who rules and preserves all things, without beginning, omnipotent, omniscient, omnipresent, and full of mercy. Yet, according to the Mohammedan belief, he has no offspring: "He begetteth not, nor is he begotten." Nor is Jesus called anything but a prophet and an apostle although Mohammed goes so far as to say that the birth of Christ was due to a miraculous divine operation. But after all it is taught that, as the Koran superseded the Gospel, so Mohammed supersedes Christ, and he is declared to be by far the most illustrious apostle (Sur. 23:40). Of particular importance for Mohammed is the annunciation of a Paraclete, which he applied to himself, either pretending or even actually believing it to be himself. Of equal significance for him, and therefore treated by him with great predilection, is Abraham, first, because of his simple doctrines, to which Mohammed himself adhered in the early period of his prophetic mission; and, secondly, on account of the sacred places and relics in Mecca of which he (Abraham) is called the thunder; and, thirdly and finally, because he was the father of Ishmael, from whom Mohammed and his race claim descent. The Sunnites look in quite a different light upon the prophets. They regard them, as a class, as the simple carriers of revelation, but in all other respects declare them to be common men, liable to human infirmities; while the Shiites pronounce them perfectly pure and sinless, like the angels, instruments of God who only execute and always have executed his orders, except Iblis, who on account of his disobedience Was rejected, and, as Satan, tries to seduce men. An impor-tant dogma with the Shiites is that of the Imamat, or hereditary succession of descendants of the Prophet by his daughter Fatima, consort of Ali — a doctrine which the Sunnites do not acknowledge. Many of them see in the caliphate merely a political institution, which ought to have the welfare of the nations for its foundation and supreme end.

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

Mohammed the last the greatest of them all, and the propagator of the final dispensation.

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

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

Kaaba will be destroyed by the Ethiopians, beasts and inanimate things will speak, and, finally, a wind will sweep away the souls of those who have faith, even if equal only to a grain of mustard seed, so that the world shall be left in ignorance.

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

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

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

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

> **(a)** the religious or *ceremonial law* (parts of which, however, according to our Western notions, belong to the category of state rights); and
>
> **(b)** the civil law, including police and special laws.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

(3) The *marriage* law. A man is allowed to see but the hands and the face of the maiden or widow whom he intends to wed; then follows the courting in person or by proxy; a marriage-contract is concluded, in which the nuptial gift is fixed, i.e. what is allotted to the wife in case the husband dies or has himself divorced; and the ecclesiastic consecrates the marriage. A free man can marry four free women; a female slave he is only allowed to marry if he have not the means to contract marriage with a free person. Polygamy is allowed among Mohammedans, we see, then, surrounded by a number of restrictions. Hear the Koran on this point: *"Take* in marriage of the women who please you, two, three, or four; but if ye fear that ye cannot act equitably, one, or those whom your right hand has acquired" —

i, e. slaves (Sur. iv, 3). Minor girls can be forced by their father or grandfather to enter into matrimony as long as they are single; if widows, they have their own choice. Marriage of near relatives, among which niece, nurse, and milk-sister are enumerated, is prohibited. A Moslem may, if urged by excessive love, or if unable to obtain a wife of his own creed, marry a Christian woman or a Jewess, but a Mohammedan woman is not. under any circumstances, to marry an unbeliever. In all cases, however, the child born of a Moslem, whatever the mother's faith, is a Moslem; nor does the wife, who is an unbeliever, inherit at her husband's death. See *MARRIAGE*. Matrimony is annulled by insanity, apostasy from islam, impotence of the male, or corporeal disability for sexual intercourse of the female. *SEE DIVORCE*. The husband is to treat his wives equally; only newly-married women are privileged for a few days. The Shiites sanction also temporary marriage. The free man can give a divorce to his wife twice and retake her, even without her consent, if three menstruations or three months have not elapsed, and then only if in the mean while she had contracted another marriage which has been dissolved by death or divorce, on this point the Mohammedan law differs from the Mosaic law, by which a divorced woman who has contracted another marriage is forever forbidden to the first husband. According to the Mosaic law, the marriage between uncle and niece is permitted, but not between aunt and nephew. Pregnant women are allowed to remarry only after their confinement; if not

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

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

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

(5) *War on Infidels. — The* Koran abounds in contradictions respecting the right and duty of the faithful to make war on infidels; for Mohammed, while he was the weaker party, showed himself very tolerant, and commanded to convert only by the power of the word; but later, when he became more potent, he issued severer ordinances against those who would not submit to his faith. His successors, therefore, have established the following doctrines, and declared null and void the passages of' the Koran adverse to them. Every major Moslem fit for military service is in duty bound to participate in holy wars against infidels who will not submit to the dominion of Moslems, and against the faithful who refuse obedience to the legitimate prince, or adhere to dogmas contrary to the faith. In a war against Moslemite rebels or heretics it is not allowed to kill prisoners of war, nor to attack the wounded or pillage property. As for infidel prisoners of war, who do not adopt the Islam before their capture, women and children are made slaves; men can, according to the pleasure of the prince or political exigency, either be killed, ransomed, or exchanged for Moslem prisoners; or even, as circumstances may dictate, be released or be made slaves. Children of infidels will be educated as Moslems, if their father or mother have been converted to Islam, if they have been captured without parents, or if they are found on Islamitic territory. We omit the direction for the distribution of booty and conquered lands, as we have already alluded to the treatment to be accorded to Jews and Christians. We only remark that, in accordance with the letter of the Koran, as well as the principles of the early imams, war against non-Mohammedans is declared permanent; if it is carried on against pagans, to extinction; against Christians, to subjection; and that, therefore, in earlier times, when the Islamitic powers decided to discontinue hostilities, they simply concluded a truce. In the precepts of this kind, the Moslems come to realize that their sacred scripture contains laws and ordinances not applicable and practicable for all times and circumstances, nor to all countries and people; for the most orthodox ulemas cannot think of urging the sultan to declare war against Russia or Austria, or to forbid Europeans living in Constantinople to ride on horseback or dwell in palaces surpassing in height the houses of the Moslems. Again, in spite of Koran and Sunnah, the idolaters and fire-worshippers were no more exterminated than the Christians were humbled and made to pay capitation tax. Many fire-worshippers in Persia retained not only their lives, but preserved in several places also their pyres. It even occurred that the Mohammedan government corrected ecclesiastics because they wished to transform temples of the Guebers into mosques. The strict execution of the religious precept would have compelled them to massacre all, since their character is very tenacious a proceeding which would prove of great injury to the Islamitic state, and apparently be regarded as too cruel even for execution by bloodthirsty Arabs. The government was not unmerciful against those who remained true to their faith, but it knew no bounds against those converted to the

Islam who, abhorring it in their heart, conspired secretly against the Islam and the State, and tried to undermine the first by old Parsee doctrines and philosophic speculation, and the latter by the revival of Persian nationality.

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

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

further, thou shalt not stretch out thy hand after the property of orphans, unless it be for their benefit, till they are of age; thou shalt give good measure and weight; thou shalt not lay on anybody a burden heavier than he can perform. If thou give judgment, be just even if the person concerned be a relation, and hold fast to the covenant of God." By the prohibition of gambling and drinking wine and other intoxicating beverages, many an excess and vice is of course prevented, and quarrel and enmity avoided. Particularly mockery, haughtiness, and slanderous talk are warned against: "O ye faithful (says the Koran), deride not one another; for it might happen that those on whom ye look contemptuously are better than yourself. Do not insult each other, and do not give each other ignominious bynames! Such words are abominable in the mouth of the faithful. He who does not correct this habit is counted with malefactors. 0 ye faithful! beware of too great suspiciousness, for many a suspicion is sinful. Be not eavesdroppers, and do not speak ill of each other. Would ye fain eat the flesh of your brother, if he be dead ? As ye abhor this, do not soil his honor to his back! O ye people, we have created you of one wife and one man, and divided you in different nations and tribes (think of that!), that yon may know that only the most pious is the most notable before God" In another passage it is said: "Do not strut this earth in self-conceit! Thou canst not perforate the earth, nor attain the height of the mountains (i.e. the lifeless earth extends farther in depth and in height than thou)." In conclusion we read: "Piety does not consist in turning your face towards the east or west; but he is pious who believes in the Deity, in the day of judgment, in the angels, in the scripture and the prophets; who, though fond of property, disposes of the same to relatives, the poor, orphans, travellers, and other indigent persons, or uses it for the delivery of slaves and prisoners; who prays to God and pays his poor-tax (alms); who complies with every bargain entered into, and bears patiently distress, oppression., and all kinds of war-calamities: these are the really pious, these are the God-fearing." Mohammed was, to a certain extent, obliged to proclaim equality and fraternity of all believers as a religions principle; for he himself, as already mentioned, belonged not to the ruling party in Mecca, and his first adherents were for the most part of the lower class, so that the Meccans retorted on him: "If God had pleased to send a prophet, he would have selected him from a more prominent family." Mohammed was frequently censured for being surrounded by slaves, freedmen, and a promiscuous crowd. It is, therefore, natural that he combated with all his might prejudices of birth and rank of every description. If, on the other hand, Mohammed is reported to have said: "He who was of the nobility in paganism remains so in Islam, if he bow before true wisdom ;" this sentence is probably to be placed in that time when he was inclined to all sorts of concessions, in order to make proselytes also among the higher classes. At any rate, he revoked it when the Meccan nobility persisted in their opposition against his doctrine; as he retracted, for a similar reason, his opinion which represented the idols as mediators between God and man, and in a measure representatives of spirits or angels, and branded it even as a sentiment of Satan. But however decidedly Mohammed pronounced in favor of equality of all men, i.e. all the faithful, he failed in the attempt to abolish slavery altogether, though he mitigated its lot in many respects. Nor was he more successful in emancipating woman, albeit he protected her against the arbitrariness of man, and granted her many rights which she had not enjoyed in Arabia before his time. While he prescribed to the faithful to take not more than four women, and allowed intercourse with female slaves only to the unmarried, he proclaimed revelations by which God relieved him of restrictions binding upon others. He had the right to request every faith-rid to divorce his wife, if he desired marrying her himself. He claimed to contract for himself and others any matrimonial connection, without the consent of the girl or her protector. He was permitted to marry as many women as he pleased, and he indeed increased their number to thirteen, and felt not bound to treat them alike. The excessive jealousy of the legislator had the most grievous consequences for the women. It extended so far that his women not only remained excluded from all intercourse with other men during his life, but were also prohibited remarrying after his death, Later, all other faithful women were also ordered to wear a close veil, leaving only the eyes free, when going out, and even in the house not to show themselves unveiled except to their nearest relatives. Thus women who, with pagan Arabs, were the spice of public and social life, were by Mohammed's jealousy confined entirely to the home and the family circle. The fair sex, with the Bedouins as well as with the mediaeval knights of the Occident objects of veneration and worship, was changed by the Islam into a subject of pity and mistrust. The place of their abode was, it is true, called Harem i.e. sanctuary but it was understood to be a sanctuary requiring veil and curtain, and finally lock and bolt and eunuchs to protect it against violation. This system of close confinement had, of course, the saddest consequences for the male sex. The husband found only sensual, but no cordial and mental enjoyment in his ha*rem,* and fell more and more into rudeness and unnatural vices. Mohammed, by his own life and by his ordinances concerning women, has impressed the character of transitoriness and human weakness on himself and his revelations, Here is manifest in the "reformer" himself the want of a strictly moral sentiment, and in his precepts sanctioning polygamy and seclusion of woman he has left a legacy which prevents the professors of his faith making any considerable progress in civilization, and raising themselves by a sound family life to a prosperous life of state. The Jews, on the *oth*er hand, to whom the Mosaic law allows a plurality of wives, have found a rabbi from whom they have accepted monogamy as a law, even in countries where polygamy is not forbidden. The Moslem may soon also, like the Jew of our times, learn to make a distinction between eternal truths and laws and ordinances enacted for transient external circumstances. The Moslem in general is not so firmly attached to his faith as the Jew. We observe this in those Arabs and Turks who have lived a few years in Christian countries, and have participated in European civilization. Should the political independence of the Moslems, which owes its existence only to the mutual jealousies of the European powers, cease, their religion, as it is founded on illusion, spread by the sword, and leaning on secular force, will not long survive it. The professors of Islam will then suffer great change. There will be some who will relapse into former indifferentism to religion, while others will adopt the faith of their conquerors, and probably the larger number. For a revival of the caliphate, i.e. a Mohammedan empire ruled by a head of a supremacy at once spiritual and secular, the necessary elements are lacking unity of faith and nationality. Shiites and Sunnites are still as hostile towards each other as they were a thousand years ago; and to the old incompatibility of the Arabian and Persian element a third one is added, semi-Mongolian the Osmanic — considerably increasing the rupture. A new universal blaze of fanaticism, even if it could prevail against rifled cannon and iron-plated frigates, is no more to be apprehended.

IV. *Mohammedanism and Christianity. — The* friends and advocates of Mohammedanism have repeatedly, especially in our day of comparative religious research, urged upon the Christian world a consideration of the claims Islam has in the advance of humanitarian principles and the propagation of civilizing influences. Islamism, it is declared, started as the outspoken foe of all creature-worship; with emphasis proclaimed the superiority and sublimity of God; and, like the Jew and the Christian, the Moslem based his faith upon the revealed book known as the Bible. It is further urged in defence of the Arabian religion that its successes and rapid spread over a vast portion of the then known world would stamp the religion of Moslem with the approval of the Most High. As a matter of history, we have to record that scarcely a century had elapsed after Mohammed's death when 'Islam reigned supreme over Arabia, Syria, Persia, Egypt, the whole of the northern coast of Africa, even as far as Spain; and, notwithstanding the subsequent strifes and divisions in the interior of this gigantic realm, it grew, and grew outwardly, until the Crescent was made to gleam from the spires of St. Sophia at Constantinople, and the cry "Allah il Allah" resounded before the gates of Vienna, and that but for the successful opposition of Charles Martel, the Moslems might not only have caused the downfall of the Romish hierarchy, but even extirpated Christianity itself. *SEE SARACENS*. If, however, we inquire into the causes of these successes of the Crescent, we find that Mohammed's law was artfully and marvellously adapted to the corrupt nature of man; and, in a most particular manner, to the manners and opinions of the Eastern nations, and the vices to which they were naturally addicted: for the articles of the faith which it proposed were few in number, and extremely simple; and the duties it required were neither many nor difficult, nor such as were incompatible with the empire of appetites and passions. It is to be observed, further, that the gross ignorance under which the Arabians, Syrians, Persians, and the greatest part of the Eastern rations labored at this time rendered many an easy prey to the artifice and eloquence of this bold adventurer. To these causes of the progress of Mohammedanism we may add that these victories of the Crescent were secured, not by the spread of the Koran, but by armies in hostile array, invading peaceful countries for spoil and devastation. It is an error even to place the first conquests and the rapid spread of Islam to the credit of Arabian religious fanaticism. We must reflect that military glory and booty to the Bedouins, who formed ,he flower of the first Arabian armies, were not less enticing than the pleasure-gardens with everblooming virgins, *SEE HOURIS*, vouchsafed to the faithful. Nor must it be forgotten that the state of the countries and nations conquered by the Arabs was decayed and rotten, falling to pieces at the first touch. In Persia and Syria, as well as in Egypt, in Barbary, in Sicily and in Spain, the Arabs were victorious because the population was dissatisfied with their governments, and often in secret understanding with the enemy. Persia was weakened by long wars with Byzantium, and divided by the nobility ruling the court; while, besides, many of its inhabitants of Arabian origin, especially in the Western provinces, sympathized with the kindred troops. A similar condition of things prevailed in Syria, where also the Shemitic population predominated, looking upon the Byzantines as their oppressors. In Egypt, to the antipathy between Copts and Greeks was added an ecclesiastical pressure against the Monophvsites by the Byzantine court, which held to the doctrine of the double nature of Christ; or the subjugation of Sicily the Saracens were mostly indebted to the traitor Euphemius, and count Julian made way for the Arabs in the conquest of Spain, the more rapidly accomplished since a part of the maltreated people were indifferent spectators of the struggle, while another part even aided the enemy. Thus it is explained how the Islam, within a short century, victoriously raised its standard from the Guadalquivir to the Indus. But thus rapidly it also went to decline, when the caliphs became effeminate, and were controlled by foreign mercenaries; when rude force obstructed every scientific elevation; and internal feuds, in consequence of no appointed succession by Mohammed, consumed its best energies. If undisputed legitimate foundation was formerly wanting to strengthen monarchy, because the adherents of Ali believed only his descendants worthy of succession, this difficulty is still greater under the Osmanlis, who are not looked upon as legitimate dynasts even by the Sunnites, and hence it has happened twice in our day that Christian bayonets have had to defend the sultan against an Arabian army commanded by an ambitious Turk (Ali and Ibrahim Pasha). How long European diplomacy will succeed in nursing the sick empire cannot be predicted; but it is certain that if no other reforms than those hitherto introduced, and these mostly on paper, impart a fresh, vigorous spirit to the Mohammedan states and the Islam faith, both Will verge on ruin.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The cause of Mohammedan decline is mainly that Islam is especially designed for nomad and half-nomad races; hence when they settle they lose the strength which arises from their nomadic life, and their religion loses its purity and power. They degenerate, become luxurious and inactive; internal dissensions and divisions arise; the same doctrine (e.g. fatalism) that strengthened them in their success weakens them in their depression. Moreover, the opposition to progress innate in Islam tends to keep Mohammedan nations stationary, while Christian powers advance in strength and wealth. Says Mr. Palgrave, who has given the latest and best account of Mohammedanism in Central and Southern Arabia: Islam is in its essence *stationary* and was framed thus to remain. Sterile like its God, lifeless like its First Principle and Supreme Original, in all that constitutes true life — for life is love, participation, and progress, and of these the

Koranic Deity has none — it justly repudiates all change, all advance, all development. To borrow the forcible words of lord Houghton, the ‘written book’ is the ‘dead man’s hand,’ stiff and motionless, and whatever savors of vitality is by that alone convicted of heresy and defection. But Christianity, with its living and loving God, begetter and begotten, spirit and movement; nay, more — a Creator made creature, the Maker and made existing in one; a Divinity communicating itself by uninterrupted graduation and degree from the intimate union far off to the faintest irradiation, through all it has made for love and governs in love; One who calls his creatures, not slaves, not servants, but friends nay, sons-nay, gods; to sum up, a religion in whose real secret ‘God in man is one with man in God’ must also be necessarily a religion of vitality, of progress, of advancement. The contrast between it and Islam is that of movement with fixedness, of participation with sterility, of development with barrenness, of life with petrifaction. The first vital principle and the animating spirit of its birth must, indeed, abide ever the same; but the outer form must change with the changing days, and new offshoots of fresh sap and greenness be continually thrown out as witnesses to the vitality within; else were the vine withered and the branches dead. I have no intention here — it would be extremely out of place — of entering on the maze of controversy, or discussing whether any dogmatic attempt to reproduce the religious phase of a former age is likely to succeed. I only say that life supposes movement and growth, and both imply change; that to censure a living thing for growing and changing is absurd; and that to attempt to hinder it from so doing, by pinning it down on a written label, or nailing it to a Procrustean framework is tantamount to killing it altogether. Now Christianity is living, must grow, must advance, must change, and was meant to do so; onwards and forwards is a condition of its very. existence; and I cannot but think that those who do not recognise this show themselves so far ignorant of its true nature and essence. On the other hand, Islam is lifeless; and, because lifeless, cannot grow, cannot advance, cannot change, and was never intended so to do.”

The *effects* of Mohammedanism, as shown in life and character, must be briefly noticed. The minuteness of the ritual and social rules, together with the hardness and coldness of the morality taught, produces a great amount of formalism. The name of God and pious ejaculations are constantly on the lips, even in the midst of the most indecent conversation. Mohammedans often say the “ Bismillah” before committing a crime

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

It remains to sum up the good and evil sides of Mohammedanism. On the one hand, it is a rigid foe to idolatry, as it teaches the unity, perfection, providence, and government of God, and hence submission and resignation to his will, together with the great doctrine of a judgment and eternal retribution. It inculcates, moreover, brotherly love and union with fellow-believers, and many social virtues; with almsgiving, temperance, and a certain standard of morality. On the other hand, it perpetuates the great evils of the East-polygamy, slavery, and absolute despotism; it opposes all political and social progress; while the semi-civilized, arbitrary character of its law and justice renders property insecure. Its doctrine of propagation by the sword leads to constant wars and rebellions, with an utter contempt for human life. It is in fact a semi-barbarous religion. On its religious side it fails to satisfy the natural longing for some mediator between God and man, while yet it bows before God as an irresistible power; its morality, in itself defective, is dry, cold, hard, lifeless, without any amiable traits; and, finally, as substituting Mohammed for Christ, it is essentially anti-Christian. While it may be an advance on heathenism, it is an advance which almost excludes the further advance of Christianity, missionary efforts being well-nigh without result.

Christian and Mohammedan Polemics. The contest of Christianity with Islam, so far as it has been a struggle of argument and not of the sword, *SEE SARACENS*, offers few remarkable points. In the first sweep of Mohammedan conquest, when the Christians succumbed not only in the East but even in the West, there was no field for a question of truth. But among nations which were removed from the peril, and yet sufficiently in contact to entertain the question of the claims of the Mohammedan religion, a consideration of its nature, regarded as a system of doctrine, naturally enough arose. Accordingly in Constantinople, and in Spain and the other parts of Western Europe which came into connection with the Moors, works of this character appeared. The history may be conveniently arranged in three periods, each of which is marked by works of defence, some called forth by danger, a real demand, but subsiding into or connected with inquiries prompted only by literary tastes. The first is from the 12th to the middle of the 16th century; the second during the 17th and 18th; the third during the present century.

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

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

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

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

(1) to show that the coming of Mohammed was predicted in the O.T. (<350303>Habakkuk 3:3);

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

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

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

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

(1) respecting the objections about the Trinity;

(2) the Incarnation;

(3) the authority of Scripture;

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

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

3. In the present century the literature in reference to Mohammedanism is, as in the former instances, twofold in kind. Part of it has been called forth by missionary contests in the East; part by literary or historic tastes, and the modern love of carrying the comparative method of study into every part of history. The first class is illustrated by the discussions at Shiraz, in 1811, between the saintly Henry Martyr. (q.v.) and some Persian mollahs. The controversy was opened by a tract, sophistical but acute, written by Mirza Ibrahim (Lee, pages 1-39), the object of which was to show the superiority of the standing miracle seen, in the excellence of the Koran over the ancient miracles of Christianity. Martyn replied to this in a series of tracts (Lee, pages 80 sq.), and was again met by Mohammed Ruza of Hamadan in a much more elaborate work, in which, among other arguments, the writer attempts to show predictions of Mohammed in the Old Testament and in the New, applying to him the promise of the Paraclete (Lee, pages 161-450). These tracts were translated in 1824, with an elaborate preface containing an account of the preceding controversy of Guadagnoli, by Professor S. Lee, of Cambridge *(Controversial Tracts on Christianity and Mohammedanism,* which is the work so frequently cited above). To complete the history, it is necessary to add that a discussion was held a few years ago between an accomplished Mohammedan and Mr. French, a learned missionary at Agra. Since then a very able defence of Christianity and an attack on Mohammedanism was published by Dr. Pfander, "a highly respected missionary of the English Church Missionary Society" (1864), which, though forbidden, found its way to Constantinople and to Mohammedan families, and was replied to by several Moslems. In 1865 a Moslem doctor of India, Syud Ahmed Khan, and P. Scudder Amin, actually brought out a bilingual commentary on the Holy Bible in English and Urdu, placing the Bible and Koran upon the same footing, and equally binding on the Moslems. The Reverend J.T. Gracey, in a review of this work, sent from Bareilly, India, September 26, 1866, and published in the *Methodist,* says: "A resume of the relative bearings of this book might be interesting; but, as nothing is more baffling than the study of contemporaneous history, I dislike to venture my speculations about what is indicated in such a publication, or the probable influence it will exert. 1. Its bearings on the Mohammedan controversy with Christianity are important. The Mohammedan mind is thoroughly impregnated with the belief that the Jewish and Christian Scriptures have been corrupted, and hence are unworthy of credit. Accordingly, when we have urged that, since Mohammed based his claims on the Jewish and Christian Scriptures, Mohammedans were under obligation to regard these, and reconcile with them the Koran, they have always assented to the proposition abstractly, but have charged that interpolations of the Jewish and Christian Scriptures were the cause of the discrepancies in doctrine which appear. *Mohammedanism has, however, it is claimed, always had a philosophical school, which ignored, many popular beliefs.* Syud Ahmed is of this class, and, after examining the Colenso controversy, asserts essential integrity for the record. His book is among the first attempts to popularize this belief, however esoterically it may have been held, by a school; and as the book has had considerable circulation among the most influential persons in the various communities, it can scarcely fail in time to materially modify the. popular notion of the lack of authenticity of the Scriptures. 2. In comparison with the Hindu, the Mohammedan mind of India has been roused but little from its wonted apathy by its contact with -Western civilization. A heavy prize offered in Calcutta recently for the best essay on a subject familiar to the Mohammedan mind called forth less than half a dozen monographs, none of which merited the prize. A like offer to Hindus would have met a very different fate. But this book is, I hope, a harbinger of a better state of affairs, and may do much to induce it, notwithstanding the fact, which the author assures me in personal correspondence, that the limited sale of this second volume does not justify his completing the series, though he has the matter prepared. It is to be hoped that in this he may prove to be in error. 3. This volume clearly supports the opinion expressed in advance by me, that those who talked of this commentary as being about to furnish a refutation of Colenso were simply guilty of idle gossip. It contains on the Noachian deluge a respectable compilation, from archdeacon Pratt mainly, of certain arguments in favor of a partial deluge; but there is not an original respectable argument in it, so far as I know, bearing on the controversy with Colenso and the Reviewers. Nor is anyone who knew the Mohammedan mind disappointed in this, simply because none such expected it to be otherwise than it is. It contains, true to the Mohammedan mind, an amount of mere puerilities, amid a mass of matter that shows a keen appreciation of nice points in a controversy. It adds nothing to European, though it does add much to Asiatic Biblical criticism."

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

V. *Statistics.* — It remains for us to consider the number of Islam's adherents in our day, and the countries that contain them. There are believed to be over 185,000,000 of Mohammedans in the world, and there are a number of countries, outside of Turkey and Egypt, in which Mohammedanism is the predominant religion, or at least a great power. Europe contains only 6,500,000 of the Crescent's adherents, but Asia is the home of nearly 80,000,000 Mohammedans, and Africa is asserted to have even many more. Islamism is still the predominant religion of the entire north of Africa, and its rule extends far down eastward, and into the centre of the continent; and it is believed that fully one half, or about 100,000,000 souls, may be set down as Mohammedans. It. is a remarkable circumstance, however, that by far the most powerful Mohammedan ruler of the globe — the sultan of Turkey — resides in Europe, where the Islam has only a population of about 4,500,000 in the Turkish and 2,000,000 in the Russian dominions. Even the sultan himself has in the European division of his empire more Christian subjects than Mohammedan. In Asia, Mohammedanism strongly predominates in Asiatic Turkey, which has a Mohammedan population of at least 13,000,000. Persia, with its 5,000,000, is an almost exclusively Mohammedan country. The same is the case with Afghanistan, Beloochistan, and the khanates of Independent Tartary. In China the Mohammedans constitute a compact body, both in the north-west and in the south-western provinces. In both places they have endeavored to establish their independence. In the north-west they have so far succeeded that the new Mohammedan empire of Yakoob Kushbegi has for several years successfully maintained its independence, and is still extending its boundaries. On the other hand, the Mohammedan rebels in the south-west, the so-called Panthay, have during the present year succumbed to the victorious Chinese armies. The death of their sultan and the destruction of their capital, Talifu, and their other principal places, seem for the present to have put an end, not only to their rule in those regions, but even to their political influence. In the vast British empire of India the Mohammedan population is estimated at about 40,000,000, and predominates in a number of the native states which are British dependencies. The Mohammedans also constitute a majority of the population of the large and important island of Java, where they are rapidly increasing; and on the island of Sumatra they control, among others, the kingdom of Achin, which has recently attracted attention by its, conflict with the Netherlands. Russia has in its Asiatic possessions a Mohammedan population of about 4,500,000. In Africa, Mohammedanism has, since the beginning of the present century, made great progress in the negro states, and has in particular become the controlling power of Central Africa, and advanced westward as far as Liberia. Morocco, Algeria, Tunis,. Tripoli, Egypt, Zanzibar, are all Mohammedan states; in the south and south-west they do not anywhere predominate, although they are found everywhere in increasing numbers. But although Mohammedanism, since the beginning of the present century, has been making these advances in Central Africa, the number of real and thorough believers is infinitely small; and since it has left off conquering, it has lost also that energy and elasticity which promises great things. Its future fate will depend chiefly, we should say, on the progress of European conquest in the East, and the amount of Western civilization which this will, for good or evil, import into those parts.

Mohammedanism may be said, even in its most successful field — Africa — to be everywhere in a condition of steadily, progressing decay. The most intelligent travellers of modern times show. a remarkable agreement with regard to this point. H. von Maltzahn, who visited, in the disguise of a Mohammedan pilgrim, all the countries from Timbuctoo to Mecca, and the Hungarian, Vambery, who in the same disguise travelled from Teheran to Samarcand; Henry Barth, who penetrated into Central Africa as far as Timbuctoo; and Palgrave, who in 1862 visited Central and Eastern Arabia, and in particular the empire of the Wahabites, all bear witness to this decay of the Islam. The baron of Maltzahn. in his book of the *Pilgrimage to Mecca,* which he joined in 1860, under the name of Sidi Abd’er Rahman ben Mohammed es-Shikdi, says: “The Islam has long been undermined, but now it appears to be on the eve of a general collapse; all that formerly constituted its glory — science, scholarship, art, industry — has long left it; its political power has become a laughing-stock, its commerce has been reduced to zero; one thing only seems to stay for a time the impending collapse-religious fanaticism. A remarkable instance of this decline of Mohammedanism is shown in the decrease of the population of the’ large cities. Thus Bagdad, which at the time of the caliphate had 2,000,000 inhabitants, has now only 100,000; the population of Basrah has been reduced from 200,000 to 80,000; that of Aleppo from 200,000 to 90,000; that of Samarcand from 180,000 to 20,000; that of Katsena, which in the 17th century was the first city of Central Soudan, from 100,000 to 8000. Even the population of the holy city of Mecca, the most licentious city of the East, has been reduced from 100,000 to 45,000. The only country of the Mohammecian world which, during. the last twenty years, has made real and important progress is Egypt; but its progress is clearly traceable to the influence of Christian countries. Most of the rulers of the house of Mehemet Ali have shown their appreciation of the superiority of Western civilization, and made earnest efforts to elevate Egypt to a level with it. All the sons of the present khedive have received a European education: one has been instructed in Paris, a second one in England, and a third one is to enter the Prussian army. Industrial departments have been created, as in the constitutional monarchies of Europe, and a council of state has been created to advise the khedive in all the important affairs of the state. The most influential among the Egyptian ministers, and for many years the chief adviser of the khedive, is an Armenian Christian, Nubar Pasha. Even an assembly of deputies meets annually since 1866, which, as it is officially expressed, is to control the administration and to fix the budget. Sweeping reforms have, in particular, been effected in the department of public education. Since 1868 public schools have been established by the government in all the important places of the country. They numbered in 1870 about 4000 pupils, who received from the government not only gratuitous instruction, but their entire support, inclusive of clothing. These schools embrace both the primary and the secondary instruction. The former embraced Arabic reading and writing, arithmetic, drawing, French, or, according to the location of the place, some other foreign language. From the elementary school the pupils pass into the preparatory department of the secondary school. The course lasts three years, and embraces the study of the Arabic, Turkish, French, and English languages; mathematics, drawing, history, and geography. After completing this preparatory course, the pupil enters one of the special schools which are to finish his education for the service of the state. These special schools are:

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

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

3. The Philological School.

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

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

6. The Naval School in Alexandria.

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

VI. *Literature.* —

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

(2) Of the different works treating on Mohammedanism and its founder, or only the former, one of the oldest European works, by White *(Bampton Lectures,* 1784), treats of this faith in the usual derogatory way. Price's work (Lond. 1811-21, 4 volumes, 4to), compiled from original Persian authorities, and tracing the history from the death of Mohammed to 1556, is generally commended. So also is Mill's *Hist. of Mohammedanism* (Lond. 1812), and likewise Sale's English version of the Koran, prefixed by a dissertation, regarded as "one of the best of the descriptive and historical surveys." De Tassy's works — *Doctrines et Devoirs de la Religion Musulmane, tires du Coran,* and his *Memoire sur des Particularites de la Religion Musulmane dans l'Inde* — are valuable. Neale's *Islamism, its Rise and Progress,* is an ordinary compilation simply, and,Taylor, *Hist. of Mohammedanism,* treats mainly of the sects; but indispensable to every student of Mohammedanism is Von Hammer-Purgstall's *Gesch. des Osmanischen Reiches* (Pesth, 1827-35, 10 volumes, 8vo). One of the best treatises is by Dollinger — *Muhammed's Religion nach ihrer innern Entwickelung u. ihrem Einflusse auf das Leben der Volker* (Ratisbon, 1838). Useful are Renan's *Mah. et les origines de l'Islamisme* (Par. 1857,7th rev. ed. 1864), and Arnold's *Koran and Bible* (Lond. 1866; rewritten and published in 1874, entitled *Islam, its History, Character, and*

Relation to Christianity). The *Islamisme* of the learned Dr. Dozy, of Leyden, is a superior work, and deserves an English dress. It is full in its account of the historical circumstances and preparations out of which Mohammedanism sprang, and gives a well-compiled account of its subsequent influence on the world, and of its sects and actual position at the present day. A very interesting and valuable contribution is the work by Kremer — Ge*schichte der herrschenden Ideen des Islams* (Leips. 1868, 8vo). Worth mentioning are also the *Lectures on Mohammedanism* by Freeman (Oxf. and Lond. 1870, 18mo), by Smith (Lond. 1874, 8vo), and Brown, *Mohammedanism, its present Condition and Influence in India* (Lond. 1873, 12mo). See also Hardwick, *Christ and other Masters;* Clarke, *Ten great Religions,* chapter 11; Milman, *Hist. of Latin Christianity,* 2:108 sq.; Stanley, *Hist. of the Eastern Church,* lecture 8; Wright, *Early Christianity in Arabia,* page 152 sq.; Neander, *Church History,* 3:84 sq.; Cox, *Latin and Teutonic Christendom;* D’Herbelot, *Bibliotheque Orientale;* Malcor, *Hist. of Persia* (2 volumes, 4to); Cazenove, *Mohammedanism* (Lond. 1855; reprinted from the *Christian Remembrancer,* January 1855); Deutsch, *Literary Remains* (Lond. and N.Y. 1874; containing articles reprinted from the *Quarterly Review,* Lond. 1869, 1870). In many travels, especially those in Arabia, the condition and history of Mohammedanism are dwelt upon, as in Burckhardt; and Warburton gives a chapter to it in his *Crescent and the Cross.* See also Wellsted, *Travels to the City of the Caliphs* (Load. 1840, 2 volumes, 8vo); Lane, *The Moslem Egyptians* (5th edition, Lond. 1871); Zincke, *Egypt of the Pharaohs and the Khedive;* General Daumas, *La vie Arabe et la Societe Musulmane.* See also *Harper’s Monthly,* 14:1 sq.; *Christian Examiner,* 1830, 4:360 sq.; *North Amer. Rev.* 1831, page 257; *North Brit. Rev.* 1850. page 101 sq.; Jan. and August 1855; *Christian Remembrancer,* Jan. 1855, art. 3; *Free-will Baptist Qu.* January 1855, art. 1; *Edinburgh Rev.* October 1857; July 1866; *Nat. Qu. Rev.* March 1861, art. 6; September art. 5; *Jahrb. deutscher Theologie,* 10:166; 1862, page 385; *Revue des deux Mondes,* September 1865; *Prospect. Rev.* 2:159; *Journal of Sacred Lit.* volumes 21 and 24; (Lond.) *Quarterly Rev.* 127:293 sq.; October 1869, page 160; *Bibliotheca Sacra,* April 1870; *Meth. Qu. Rev.* 1864, page 141; 1865, page 283; 1866, page 602; 1871, page 62; *Westm. Rev.* 1868, page 245; January 1873, page 124; July, page 115 sq.; *Brit. Qu. Rev.* January 1872, page 100 sq. On Mohammedan law are works by Muradgea, D’Ohsson, Knijzer, Von Tornaw, and Perron. See Osborn, *Islam* (Lond. 1878, 2 volumes).

Mohammedan Sects

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The pseudo-prophets who have arisen have invariably either declared themselves the great Prophet’s legal successors, or, utterly renouncing his doctrines, have sought to build up on the ruins of Islam. The first and most prominent among these was *Mosaylima* (i.e., little Moslem), who was a rival of the Prophet in his lifetime. Mosaylima belonged to the. clan Dul, a division of the tribe of the Bani Hanifah, of Yamama in Nejed. The traditions about his life and age appear to be extremely legendary. It is, however, tolerably clear that he had risen to a certain eminence in his tribe as a religious teacher before Mohammed assumed his prophetical office. The name he was known by among his friends was Rahman, the Benignant or Merciful; a term which Mohammed adopted as a designation of God’ himself. This word, which is Aramaic, was a common divine epithet among the Jews, from whom Mohammed took it, together with a vast bulk’ of dogmas and ceremonies and legends. If, however, as is supposed by some, Mosaylima assumed that name in the meaning of Messiah Saviour, it would prove that he had anticipated Mohammed in the apostleship, which is commonly denied. It was in the ninth year of the Hegira that, at the head of an embassy sent by his tribe, he appeared before Mohammed, in order to settle certain points of dispute, The traditions are very contradictory on the circumstance whether or not Mosaylima was then already the recognised spiritual leader of his tribe. When they were introduced to Mohammed in the mosque, they greeted him with the orthodox salutation of Moslems, “Salam alayk” (Peace upon thee), and, after a brief parley, recited the confession of faith. Shortly after this event, Mosaylima openly professed himself to be a prophet, like Mohammed. The latter sent a messenger to him, as soon as he heard of this, to request him to reiterate publicly his profession of Islam. Mosaylima’s answer was a request that Mohammed should share his power with him. “From Mosaylima, the apostle of God,” he wrote, according to Abulfeda, “to Mohammed, the apostle of God. Now let the earth be half mine, and half thine.” Mohammed speedily replied “From Mohammed, the apostle of God, to Mosaylima, the liar. The earth is God’s: he giveth the same for inheritance unto such of his servants as he pleases, and the happy issue shall attend those who fear him.” Yet notwithstanding these testimonies, of probably late dates, it seems, on the other hand, quite certain that Mohammed made very great concessions to his rival-concessions that point to his having secretly nominated Mosaylima his successor, and that he by this means bought Mosaylima’s open allegiance during his lifetime. It was not a question of dogmas, though they each had special revelations, but a question of supremacy, which was thus settled amicably. “Mohammed,” Mosaylima said, “is appointed by God to settle the principal points of faith, and I to supplement them.” He further had a revelation, in accordance with Mohammed’s: “We have sent to every nation its own prophet,” to the effect: “We have given unto thee [Mosaylima] a number of people; keep them to thyself, and advance. But be cautious, and desire not too much; and do not enter into rival fights.” When Mohammed was at the point of death, he desired to write his will. Whatever he may have wished to ordain is uncertain; it is well known, at all events, that his friends did not obey his order, and refused to furnish him with writing materials, very probably because they did not like’ to be bound by his last injunctions. Sprenger supposes that he wished formally .to appoint Mosaylima his successor, and that it was just this which his surrounding relations feared. Mosaylima then openly declared against Islam, and many parodies of the Koran sprang up in the Nejed, ascribed to him. In the eleventh year of the Hegira it at last came to an open breach between the two rival powers. Abu Bekr, the caliph, sent Khalid, “the Sword of the Faith,” with a number of choice troops, to compel Mosaylinma to submission. Mosavlima awaited the enemy at Rowdah, a village in the Wadi Hanifah. So formidable indeed was Mosaylima’s force that Khalid is said to have hesitated for a whole day and night before he undertook an assault unanimously disapproved of by his council. On the second morning, however, he advanced, and, in a battle which lasted until the evening, contrived, with fearful losses of his own, to gain the victory. Mosaylima fell by the hands of a negro slave, and his head was cut off by the conqueror, and placed at the head of a spear, to convince both friends and foes of his death. Khalid then advanced to the slain prophet's birthplace, in order to slay all its inhabitants. They, however, by a clever stratagem, contrived to conclude an honorable peace, and embraced Islam. The Mosayliman "heresy" was thus stamped out, and only a few scattered remnants of the new faith contrived to escape to Hasa and Basrah, where they may have laid the foundation of the later Karmathian creed. *SEE KARMATHIANS*. It is extremely difficult to come to any clear notion of Mosaylima's real doctrines, as all the accounts that have survived of them come from victorious adversaries — adversaries who have not hesitated to invent the most scandalous stories about him. Thus a love-adventure between Mosaylima and the prophetess Sajah, the wife of a soothsayer of Yamima, who is supposed to have staved three days in his tent, is told with great minuteness, even to the obscene conversation that is supposed to have taken place between them during that time; the fact being that this story, which is still told with much relish by the natives, is without the slightest foundation. From the same source we learn that Mosaylima tried to deceive his followers by conjuring tricks. It seems, on the contrary, that he was of much higher moral standing than Mohammed himself. For it is said that Mosaylima enjoined the highest chastity even among married people: unless there were hope of begetting children, there should be restriction of conjugal duty. Even the nickname "Little Moslem" given to him seems to indicate that he, too, preached the unity of God, or Islam as the fundamental doctrine of faith. How far his religion had a socialistic tendency, and offered less show of dignity and outward morality to its followers, or whether it rejected fatalism, contained an idea of incarnation, and invested its preachers and teachers with a semi-mediatorial character, as the latest explorer of the Nejed, Mr. Palgrave tells us, we have no means of judging. But we must receive these conclusions, probably drawn from the information of the natives, with all the greater caution, as that story of the prophetess Sajah, whom he reports, after his informants, not only to have been properly married to Mosaylima, but to have become, after his death, a devout partisan of Islam, and to have entered an "orthodox alliance," does not, as we have said before, according to the best European authorities on Mohammedanism, deserve the slightest credence.

Next to Mosaylima figures prominently *Al-Aswad,* originally called Aihala, of the tribe of Ans, of which, as well as of that of a number of other tribes, he was governor. He pretended to receive certain revelations from two angels, Sohaik and Shoraik. Certain feats of legerdemain and a natural eloquence procured him a number of followers, by whose aid he made himself master of several provinces. A counter-revolution, however, broke out the night before Mohammed's death, and Al-Aswad's head was cut off; whereby an end was put to a rebellion of exactly four months' duration, but already assuming large proportions.

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

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

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

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

Moharram

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

Mohdi

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

Mohl, Julius Von

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

Brockhaus, *Conversations Lexikon,* s.v.; Vapereau, *Diet. des Contemporains,* s.v. (J.H.W.)

Mohler, Johann Adam

one of Germany’s most distinguished Roman Catholic theologians — the Schleiermacher, as he has aptly been called, of his branch of the Christian Church — was born of humble parentage, May 6, 1796, at Igersheim, near Mergentheim, in Wurtemberg. He received his preparatory training at the gymnasium in Mergentheim, and in his seventeenth year removed to Ellwangen and there studied at the lyceum until, in 1815, the faculty was transferred to Tubingen, and he repaired to that well-known highschool to continue his theological studies. He completed his course at the episcopal seminary in Rottenburg, and in 1819 was made priest, and became vicar of Riedlingen. He continued, however, but a short time in the pastorate. In 1820 he returned to Tibingen University, and there lectured and studied. Proffered a permanent position in the university, he decided, in order to fit himself the more thoroughly for it, to spend some time in making himself acquainted with the routine of the theological courses of other universities-as Gottingen, Berlin, Prague, Vienna, etc.; and in consequence of this thorough preparation, so successfully met his engagement that in 1826, though still very young, he was made extraordinary professor, and only two years later, shortly after receiving his doctorate in divinity, was honored with the full or ordinary professorship in Church history and patrology. This position afforded him a controlling influence over the Roman Catholic young men studying with a view to the priesthood, and he aimed to awaken among them, by the description of great ecclesiastical characters of the early Catholic Church, such as Athanasius and Anselm, a spirit of speculative inquiry in the sphere of faith and in connection with ecclesiastical fellowship; and he also renewed the old confessional controversy on the principles of the Protestant and Roman Catholic creeds by the publication of a work on Symbolism, in which the Reformation, though much of the Protestants’ labors are recognised as relatively justifiable and worthy, is stamped, in contrast with an ideal Roman Catholicity, as a mistake. This book came not only to be regarded as a remarkable work, but actually fixed the attention of the whole theological world upon him; and it has been well said that “his reputation, both posthumous and among his own contemporaries, rests mainly on his *Symbolik”* (in English entitled *Symbolism; or the Doctrinal Differences* *between Catholics and Protestants, as represented by their Public Confessions of Faith,* translated by J.R. Robertson, 2 volumes, London, 1843; New York, 1844; and since republished). D'Aubigne pronounced it "one of the most important writings produced by Rome since the time of Bossuet" *(History of the Ref.* 4:326). It was first published in 1832, passed through five large editions in the next six years, was translated into all the leading European languages, and drew forth numerous criticisms and rejoinders from the Protestant world, of which the most important are: Bauer, *Gegensatz des Katholicismus u. Protestantismus, nach den Principien u. Hauptdogmen der beiden Lehrbegriffe* (Tub. 1834, 8vo); Nitzsch, *Prot. Beantwortung der Symbolik Mohlers* (in *Studien u. Kritiken,* 1834-35, and later separately reprinted); Marheineke, *Recension der Mohlerschen Symbolik* (in *Jahrbuchfur wissenschaftliche Kritik,* Berlin, 1833). To these-particularly, however, the attack by Bauer-Mohler replied in his *Neue Untersuchungen der Lehrgegensltze* (Mayence, 1834; 2d edit. 1835). The polemical bitterness evoked by these controversies made it desirable that Mohler should leave Tubingen, where Bauer then also lectured; and after refusing various positions proffered him by different celebrated German universities, he accepted in 1835 a professorship at Munich, then in the first flush of its efficiency under king Louis. Mohler's first appointment was nominally the chair of Biblical exegesis, but he really devoted himself to the department of Church history, in which his opening course was eminently successful. His uninterrupted and severe labors, however, had taxed him to the utmost, and, after refusing to accept a renewed and very tempting offer from Bonn, he reluctantly consented to change his place at the university for the deanery of Wurzburg, which the king had urged upon him.. Shortly after appointment to this new position he was completely prostrated, and died of consumption April 12, 1838. Mohler is not only generally acknowledged to have been a good and pious man, but is universally recognized also as the greatest theologian the Roman Catholic Church has produced. since Bellarmine and Bossuet. He was certainly the most acute and the most philosophical of the modern. controversialists of his Church. He helped Romanism: again to self-consciousness, and breathed into it a new polemic zeal against Protestantism; although he betrayed the influence which the study of Protestant theology, especially that of Schleiermacher, and of modern culture generally, had exercised on his own idealistic apprehension and defence of the Roman dogmas and usages. He did not, indeed, write a Church history, or discuss the scriptural or traditional evidences of the peculiar doctrines of Roman Catholicism, but rather devoted himself to the exposition of the points and thee grounds of the doctrinal differences of modern sects; yet all his writings have more or less to do with the historical sphere, particularly with the history of doctrines, and are remarkable for their freshness of spirit: and a vigorous and animated style. Says Hagenbach. *(Ch. Hist. of the 18th and 19th Cent.* 2:446), “Whatever vigorous vitality is possessed by the most recent Catholic theological science is due to the labors of this man,. who was cut off early in the midst of his work.” “He sent rays of his spirit,” says Kurtz *(Ch. Hist. from the Reformation,* page 391), “deep into the hearts and minds of hundreds of his enthusiastic pupils by his writings, addresses, and by his intercourse with them; and what the Roman Catholic Church of the present possesses of living scientific impulse and feeling was implanted, or at least revived and excited by him... His ‘Symbolik’ combats Protestant doctrines with the weapons of Protestant science, and silently ennobles and sublimates those of the Roman Catholic Church. Did the Protestants up to this time generally despise or ignore the contributions of Roman Catholic theologians, here a scientific power of the highest significance approached them, to despise which would have been a sign of weakness. In fact, long as was the opposition which existed between both churches, no work from the camp of the Roman Catholics produced as much agitation and excitement in the camp of the Protestants as this.” Yet no work produced by a Romanist has been of greater service than this polemic. Written after a thorough study of the subject, it has gathered a mass of material invaluable to the Protestant student, and in this *Cyclopsedia* we have not unfrequently referred to Mohler’s “Symbolik” with great pleasure. The other principal works from Mohler’s pen are: *Die Einheit in der Kirche oder das Princip des Katholicismus* (Tubing. 1825, 8vo; translated into French by Ph. *Bernard)*: — *Athanasius d. Grosse u. d. Kirche seiner Zeit im Kampfe mit den Arianismus* (Mayence, 1827; 2d ed. 1844, 8vo; translated into French, Paris, 1841, 3 volumes, 8vo): — *Patrologie oder christliche Literaturgeschichte* (Ratisb. 1839,2 volumes, 8vo; translated into French by Cohen, Paris, 1842, 2 volumes, 8vo). His *Nachgelassene Schriften* were published by Dollinger (Ratisb. 1839-40), and his *Patrologie oder Christl. Literaturgesch.* by Reithmayer (Regensb. 1869). See Beda Weber, *Charakterbilder* (Frankf. 1853); D. F. Strauss, *Kleine Schriften, etc.* (Leips. 1862); Hare, *Vindication of Luther,* pages 167-169; Schaff, *Hist. of the Apostol. Ch.* page 60; Ffoulkes, *Divisions in Christendom,* volume 1, § 53; Hase, *Protestantische Polemnik; Werner,Gesch. d. Katholicismus;* and particularly the biographical sketch preceding the 5th edition of the “Symbolik.” See also Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Generale*, 35:734; Herzog, *Real Encyklop.* 9:662; *Bibl. Sacra*, January 1850, page 61; *English Rev.* 2:7; *Christian Examiner*, 37:119; *Brit. and For. Ev. Review*, July 1868, page 591.

Mohnike, Gottlieb Christian Friedrich

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

Moine, Etienne Le

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

Moira

(Μοῖρα, *a share),* the classical personification of that mysterious yet irresistible power whose invisible sceptre controls and directs human events, and assigns to each individual his fate or share. Homer, with a single exception *(b.* 24:29), speaks of but one Moira, a personification of fate, whom he represents as spinning the thread of each man's life, and though counselling with the other gods, yet as having supreme authority in directing and controlling the fate of each individual, and yielding obeisance only to Zeus. Hesiod living a little later, distinguishes three Moirae, and names them as *Clotho,* or the spinning fate; *Lachesis,* or the one who assigns man his fate; and *Atropos*, or the fate that cannot be avoided. These he calls the daughters of Zeus and Thermis, a genealogy from which late; writers differ. Other mythographers picture Clotho as holding the distaff, and ever furnishing the present; Lachesis, twirling the spindle, lays out the future; and Atropos severs the past by cutting the thread with her fatal. scissors. The representations of the character and nature of the Moirae, as varied as they are numerous, may, for our purpose, be classed in two divisions: 1st, those in which the Moirae are but allegorical representations of the duration of human life; 2d, those in which the Moirae are considered strictly as divinities of fate. As used in the first sense, it is supposed the Greeks originally conceived of but one Moira, but on further consideration of her nature and attributes adopted the idea of two, representing life's two boundaries of birth and death. Ultimately the number became three, and personified past, present, and future. Considering the Moirae as strictly divinities of fate, they are viewed as independent, meting out individual destinies in accordance with eternal laws which know, no variations or exceptions. The gods as well as mortals are subject to their authority, and even Zeus is sometimes represented as powerless to annul their decrees. Oftener, however, Zeus is pictured as in the background, weighing out power to them, and interfering with their decrees when disposed to save his favorites or destroy those with whom he is angry. This twofold view of the Moirae, considering them sometimes as possessed of supreme power, and issuing irrevocable decrees, and at other times as interfered with and overruled by Zeus, is easily accounted for in the vain attempts of uninspired man to harmonize the seemingly inconsistent meting out of fate. By this means the ancients were enabled to interpret, satisfactorily to themselves, the varying freaks of fickle fortune, and account for apparent favoritism and injustice. It proved a magic key to open the mysteries of the dealings of Providence, and shifted the burden of human complaints from the shoulders of their beloved Zeus to those of the hated Moirse, while all the praise for sudden prosperity or escape from danger and death was givens to Zeus for his kindly interference with the will of the fates. Without the aid of this double view of the relationship existing between Zeus and the Moirae, the Greeks could see in the strange events of national and personal history naught but the workings of an imperfect divinity; but with this explanatory means they were enabled to clothe Zeus with a robe interwoven with threads both of justice and mercy. For the sake of conceiving a blameless divinity, they were willing even to admit the occasional absence of supreme authority. Like the Erinyes, with whom they are often confounded, the Moirae differ singularly from all the other gods in that they have no sympathy whatever for man, their iron sceptres never being wielded by the hands of mercy. Yet they were worshipped in many parts of Greece, and had sanctuaries at Corinth, Sparta, Olympia, and Thebes. The ancient artists and poets give us many fanciful pictures of the Moire. The earliest of the former represent them as goddesses holding staffs or sceptres in their hands as emblematic of their dominion. In later works of art they form a triplet of grave though beautiful maidens: Clotho holding a spindle or a roll (the book of fate); Lachesis pointing with her staff to the globe; while Atropos holds a pair of scales, a sun-dial, or some cutting instrument. By the poets they are sometimes pictured as aged and decrepit women, typical of the slow and often sorrowful march of fated events, and the various epithets applied to them are not so much the outburstings of human hate as poetical pencillings of the severity, inflexibility, and sternness of fate. See Vollmer, *Mythol. Worterbuch,* s.v.; Smith, *Dict. Greek and Roman Biog. and Mythol.* s.v.; Dwight, *Classical Mythol.* s.v.; Grote, *Hist. of Greece,* 4:197 sq. (H.W.T.)

Moise, Francois Xavier

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

Saints (Paris, 1783, 18mo): — *De l’Opinion de M. Grefjoire daus le proces de Louis XVI* (1801); together with some articles in the *Annales de la Religion, La Chronique Religieuse,* etc.

Mokanna

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

Moket, Richard

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

Mol, Peter Van

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

Mola

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

Mola, Giovanni Battista

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

Mola, Pietro Francesco

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

Mola’dah

(Heb. *Moladah’,* hd;l /m [in Nehemiah , hd;l mo], *birth;* Sept. Μωλαδά v.r. Μωδαδά, etc.), a city in the southern part of the tribe of Judah towards the Edomitish border (<061526>Joshua 15:26), which fell within the portion set off to Simeon (<061902>Joshua 19:2; <130428>1 Chronicles 4:28). It was also occupied after the exile (<161126>Nehemiah 11:26). Reland *(Palaest.* page 901) thinks it was the *Malatha* (Μάλαθα) mentioned by Josephus *(Ant.* 18:6, 2) as a castle of Idurmaea, to which Agrippa retired in chagrin after his return from Rome. Eusebius and Jerome *(Onomast.* s.v. Ἀραμά) allude to it (Μαλαθί) as a place four Roman miles distant from Arad, which latter they describe as an ancient city of the Amorites situated in the wilderness of Kadesh, and twenty miles from Hebron, on the road to Aila (see Reland, *Palaest.* page 885). At a later period Malatha became a Roman colony (Reland, p. 231). Dr. Robinson *(Researches,* 2:621) finds the locality in the present *el-Milh,* first observed by Schubert *(Reise,* 2:454), consisting of extensive ruins with a well, situated at the required distance from the site of Arad (comp. Schwarz, *Palest.* page 100). The present name, signifying “salt,” has little affinity with the Heb. appellation, but may be a corruption of it (Wilson, *Lands of the Bible,* 1:346; Van de Velde, *Memoir,* page 335 ; Ritter, *Pal. und Syr.* 1:124; Tristram, *Land of Israel,* page 369 sq.; Stewart, *Tent and Khan,* page 217).

Molans, Philibert De

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

Molanus, Gerhard Walther

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

Molanus (Vermeulen), John

a Belgian theologian of some note, was born at Lille in 1533. He was educated at Louvain, and there obtained the doctorate in 1570, and then taught theology for several years. By different publications he called attention to his learning, and gradually gained favor at the court and at Rome. He was made a canon of the church of St. Peter, and director of a seminary then founded at Louvain. He died September 18, 1585. Baronius pays him great homage in the preface to his *Martyrologe Romain.* Molanus published: *De Picturis et Imaginibus sacris* (Louvain, 1570, 1574, 1595, 8vo): — *De Historia sacrarum Imaginum et Picturarum,* lib. 4; *Theologie des peintres, sculpteurs, et dessinateurs* (Paris, 1765, 12mo): — *Annales urbis Louvaniensis ac obsidionis illius historia* (Louvain, 1572, 4to): — *Calendarium Ecclesiasticum* (Anvers, 1574,12mo): — *Defide haereticis servanda,* lib. 3; *quartus item defide rebellibus servanda, et quintus defide ac Juramento quae a tyrannis exiquantur* (Cologne, 1584): — *De piis Testamentis* (Cologne, 1584,1661, 8vo): — *Theologiae practicae*

Compendium (Cologne, 1585, 1590, 8vo): — *Orationes III de agnis Dei, de decimis dandis et de decimis recipiendis* (Cologne, 1587, 8vo): — *De Canonicis, lib.* 3 (Cologne, 1587, 8vo): — *Militia sacra Ducum ac Princium Brabantiae cum annotat. Petri Lourvii* (Anvers, 1592, 8vo): — *Medicorum ecclesiasticum Diarium* (Louvain, 1595, 8vo): — *Bibliotheca materiarum Theologica quae a quibus auctoribus, quum antiquis, tum recentioribus, sint pertractae* (Cologne, 1618, 4to).

Molay, Jacques De

the last grand-master of the Knights Templars, was born about the year 1244 in Burgundy, of the families of Longvic and Raon. He was admitted to his order at Baune, in the diocese of Autun. Of his subsequent history but little is known until he was promoted to the grand-mastership about the year 1298. Pierre Dupuy, a French writer, insinuates that he did not obtain his election by his own merits, but through the intrigues of the nobility of France. If this were true it might account for the suspicions and fears which animated Philip IV. against the establishment of the Order of the Temple in France just at this time, when monarchy was endeavoring to rear itself on the political abasement of the Church and the feudal lordships. But there is nothing to prove this assertion, for it is difficult to conceive how the nobility of France could influence an election contested at such a distance. The affairs of Christianity in the East were at this time in a grievous condition. Several important towns had fallen into the hands of the Mohammedans. Many of the last defenders of the Cross had perished. One of the most illustrious grand-masters of the order had recently died. Syria was lost to the Christian arms, and the Templars and Hospitallers had taken refuge in Cyprus and Tortosa, whence they invoked the aid of the Holy See, the princes and people of Europe. All Europe being engaged in great internal contests — monarchy and feudalism and the Church arrayed against each other — help was looked for in vain by the poor Christians of the East. Besides, the Cross had not fallen in Palestine without embittering numbers against the cause, leading many to say that men should not persist in a contest which God himself had abandoned. Jacques de Molay, however, had no sooner been put at the helm than he went forward with his task. He did not wait for succor from Europe, but endeavored to derive some benefit from the projects, of the Mogul Tartars of Persia against Egypt and Syria; so that in the spring of 1299, when the grand khan assembled a powerful force, Jacques de Molay commanded one of the wings of the Tartar army. With the troops confided to him he invaded Syria, and subsequently, under the conduct of the Tartar general, recovered Jerusalem from the infidels. This unexpected event was received with delight by the Christian world. The Mogul Tartars, counselled doubtless by some of the Christian chiefs, sent messengers to Europe, to the pope and the kings of France and England, urging them to engage in a new crusade, which should strike a final blow at the Mohammedan power in the East. But the Tartar messengers had scarcely returned before reverses and treason had destroyed the army of the grand khan. Jerusalem was lost in 1300, and the Templars under Jacques de Molay were obliged to retire to the island of Tortosa, near Tripoli, whence they could simply watch and harass the movements of the enemy. But in 1302 they were finally surprised and defeated, and the grand-master, with those that remained of the order, took refuge in Cyprus, now and then renewing the contest by sudden incursions upon the Mohammedans. The brother and successor of the grand khan still looked for aid from Europe, and even approached the pope, but the replies were evasive. Philip IV, in his attempt to check the feudal power and all ecclesiastical control, feared that the papacy might recover, in an institution like that of the Temple, the military force it needed to defend its theocracy. He dreaded leaving to the nobility an order so entirely filled with its members and benefits, and an organized constitution as a means of rallying and defence; for the Templars had become in almost every kingdom of the West a formidable republic, governed by their own laws, animated by the closest corporate spirit, under the severest internal discipline, and an all-pervading organization; independent alike of the civil power and of the spiritual hierarchy; possessing fifteen thousand of the bravest and best-trained soldiers in the world, armed and accoutred in the most splendid fashion of the time, ready at the summons of the grand-master to embark on any service, their one aim being the aggrandizement of the order. Philip, fearing the strength and the wealth of the order, claiming allegiance only to the pope, as the supreme head of the Church, and greatly desirous of possessing their lands, munitions, arms, ships, and treasures, determined upon its destruction; but, lest his influence might be overpowered in an open contest, he resolved to make the pope his instrument. A new crusade, he saw clearly, would only revive religious passions favorable to the Holy See, and render necessary, inviolable, more important, and more powerful still, these soldier-monks; consequently Philip promptly opposed the opening of a new crusade. June 6, 1306, Clement V summoned the grand-masters of the Templars and

Hospitallers to Europe, under pretext of consulting them in regard to the proposed crusade, and some previously advanced plans for uniting the two orders of Templars and Hospitallers. Promptly Molay returned to Europe, but the manner in which he came was not of a nature to stifle the ambitious designs of his enemies. With sixty of the most distinguished knights of the order and a vast amount of treasure, he made an ostentatious entry into Paris, August 1306, where he was received by the king with great courtesy. If De Molay had been of a less generous and unsuspicious character, he would have understood that every motive that influenced Philip was concentrated in great intensity against his order. The grand-master, lulled into security by the apparent kindness of the French king, proceeded to Poitiers to pay his allegiance to the pope, and to present two memorials drawn up by himself, relative to the state of affairs in the East, and the projected union of the different existent military orders, which he opposed on the ground that by such act their power would only be augmented, and thus consequently provoke greater envy, of which even now there was more than enough; and, so far from suppressing prevailing jealousies among the knights, it would only embitter the strife among the brethren, and cause more frequent collisions. He begged the pope to examine into the sinister rumors which had spread abroad concerning the faith, morals. and secret mysteries of the order; for they had been accused of treachery, murder, idolatry, Islamism, and many other villainies; and demanded a rigid investigation, in order that. if proved innocent, they might receive public absolution; if culpable, suffer condemnation. Under these pretexts, Philip strongly urged the pope to proceed against the Temple, and the latter, finally yielding to the king’s importunity and threats, inaugurated the investigation, and sent to Philip for all possible information. Philip affected to take the request for information as a permission to proceed against the order himself. Accordingly, on October 13, 1307, every Templar in the realm was made a prisoner. Jacques de Molay was seized in the house of the Temple, and summoned before the Inquisition of France, October 24, 1307. According to the report of his interrogatory, he made full confession of having denied Christ, and of having been guilty of other crimes. Confession was bribed out of some by offers of indulgence; wrung from others by the dread of torture, or by actual torture. The pope, enraged by the king’s liberty, suspended the powers of the inquisitor, and forbade the bishops to continue their proceedings against the Temple. Philip IV simulated ready and complete submission; but at the same time he urged all the princes of Europe to follow his example, endeavored to embitter the French against the Templars, and finally invented a circular letter from the grand-master to all the brethren and subjects in prison, advising them to acknowledge the crimes he himself had confessed. August 20, 1308, Jacques de Molay himself was subjected to a second examination by a special commission of cardinals and agents of the king; but as the commission proved very treacherous in their conduct towards him, he finally tired of the proceedings, and demanded that he be brought before the Roman pontiff; “for,” said he, “to the pope alone belongs the power of judging the grand-master of the order, and to his judgment I refer.” March 2, 1310, he was again summoned by the papal commission, but persisted in his determination to be judged by the pope only. While the papal commission was still in session, Philip IV, tiring of their slow progress, and fearing that the power of the Temple was not yet crushed, summoned fifty-four more of the Templars before a council at Paris, and caused them to be burned the same day, May 11, 1310. The pope now became anxious for his own authority, appointed a new commission to hasten a decision in the case of Jacques de Molay, and he was by it condemned to death. Just as the fatal sentence was about to be pronounced, De Molay arose, and in a calm, clear voice thus addressed his judges: “Before heaven and earth, on the verge. of death, where the least falsehood bears like an intolerable weight upon the soul, I protest that we have richly deserved death, not on account of any heresy or sin of which we ourselves or our order have been guilty, but because we have yielded, to save our lives, to the seductive words of the pope and of the king; and so by our confessions brought shame and ruin on our blameless, holy, and orthodox brotherhood.” The cardinals stood confounded, the people could not repress a profound sympathy, and the assembly was hastily broken up to meet another day. But the king, who had been informed of all, ordered the grand-master to be burned immediately. He was led forth to the flames, a feeble old man, loaded with fetters, bent and whitened by age and captivity. He sustained his sufferings with perfect firmness and resolution, protesting to the end in favor of the innocence of his order. and perishing bravely — the last champion of Christianity against the Orient, the last liberator of Jerusalem, the last grand-master of the Temple. See Porter, *History of the Knights of Malta,* 1:180, 190 sq.; Sutherland, *Achievements of the Knights of Malta,* volume 1, chapter 9; Milman, *History of Latin Christianity,* volume 6, book 12, chapter 1 and 2; Hase, *Church History,* page 319; and especially the excellent article in Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Generale,* 35:79 sq, (J.P.L.)

Molcho, Solomon, Or Diogo Pires

as he was called when a Marrano or Neo-Christian, was born about A.D. 1501 in Portugal. He not only received a liberal education, which enabled him to hold a state office as “escrivao aos ouvidores na casa da supplicanao,” but was probably also made acquainted in his childhood with Hebrew and Talmudic lore, as he is the author of a Hebrew work and a synagogal poem written in the Aramaic language (comp. Zunz, *Literaturgesch. d. synagog. Poesie,* page 534). About this time a man named David Rueben appeared in the court of the king of Portugal. He announced that he had come from India, and was sent by his brother, the king of the Jews, to propose an alliance in order to recover the Holy Land from the sultan Solyman. Many of the Neo-Christians believed in him. He passed through Spain, where he made many proselytes; into France to Avignon, and into Italy. He inscribed banners with the holy name of God. In many cities — Bologna, Ferrara, Mantuianumbers believed that he was commissioned to be the leader of the army of Israel. He even had an interview with pope Clement VII. Coming to Portugal, Molcho sought his acquaintance in order to find out whether his visionary revelations, which had all Messianic background, were in harmony with, Reuben’s commission. The latter treated Molcho very coolly, and told him that his military commission had nothing to do with his cabalistic mysticism, being himself no adept in this branch of science. Molcho, however, misunderstood Reuben, believing as he did that this prince and would be Messiah would have nothing to do with him Since he had not the seal of the covenant, and he thus apostatized to Judaism, performing the rite of circumcision himself, which operation became to him the cause of a severe sickness. When Reuben was acquainted with this fact he was very angry, and feared that he might be suspected as the author of Molcho’s apostasy. The Jews relate that Molcho was utterly ignorant while he was a Christian; but immediately on his circumcision “the Lord gave him wisdom, and he became wiser than all men in a very short time, and many wondered at him.” His preaching was of such an inspiring eloquence that the Jews believed it to be dictated by angels. He preached Judaism before kings; even pope Clement VII admitted him to an audience, and gave him the privilege to dwell wherever he would. Solomon Molcho seems to have been permitted to pour out his apocalyptic rhapsodies (pages of them may be read in the *Chronicles of R. Joseph ben-Joshua ben-Meir, the Sephardi,* 2:152-189) without restraint. Bishops and princes the bishop of Ancona and the duke of Urbino, Francesco Maria della Rovere I from credulity, curiosity, or compassion, protected him against his enemies. Two of his prophecies, inundations of the Tiber in Rome and earthquakes in Lisbon, could hardly fail of accomplishment (the former took place October 8, 1530; the latter, January 26, 1531). But he came to a woeful end. He attempted to convert the emperor Charles V. at Ratisbon; but Charles was hard-hearted, and ordered him to be put in prison with his friend Reubeni, whom he met after he was obliged to leave Rome. When peace was restored with Solyman the Turk, the emperor betook himself to Italy, and both prisoners were conveyed to Mantua. Molcho, who was an object rather for a lunatic asylum than the stake, was condemned to be burned as an apostate Christian. “With a bridle on his jaw-bones to prevent his speaking to the people,” as the Jewish chronicle relates, “they brought him out, and all the city was moved about him, and the fire burned before him. And one of the nobles of the emperor said, ‘Take the bridle from between his teeth, for I have a message unto him from the king;’ and they did so. And he said unto him, “The emperor hath sent me unto thee, saying,” If thou turn from thy ways, shalt thou not be accepted and live?’ And he will maintain thee, and thou shalt be before him; and if not, evil is determined against thee.’ But he answered like a saint, like an angel of God, and said, ‘Because I walked in that religion, my heart is bitter and grieved; and now what is good in your sight do, and my soul shall return unto the Father’s house as in its youth, for then it will be better with it than now.’ He was cast into the fire and the Lord smelled the sweet savor, and took to him his spotless soul, and is with him as one brought up with him, rejoicing always before him.” Molcho died in November or December 1532; yet there were Jews who believed that the fire had no power over him, and that he departed — God only knows whither. Comp. Basnage, *Histoire des Juifs* (Engl. translation), page 722; Lindo, *History of the Jews in Spain and Portugal,* page 361 sq.; Milman, *History of the Jews,* 3:367 sq.; *The Chronicles of Rabbi Joseph ben-Joshua ben-Meir, the Sephardi* (transl. from the Hebrew into English by C.H.F. Bialloblotzky, London, 1836), 2:150-192; Jost, *Geschichte d. Judenthums u. s. Sekten,* 3:125; Kayserling, *Geschichte der Juden in Portugal,* page 176 sq., 192 sq.; Cassel, *Leitfadenfur judische Geschichte und Literatur* (Berlin, 1872), page 92 sq.; Finrst, *Biblioth. Judaica,* 2:387 Gratz, *Geschichte der Juden,* 9:264-285; the same in Frankel’s *Monatsschrift* (1856), pages 205, 241, 260 sq. (B.P.)

Moldavia and Wallachia

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

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

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

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

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

5. *Religion.* —

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

(2) *Evangelism.* — Christianity must have early made its way to these parts, and been strengthened during Gothic invasion. St. Nicetas, who flourished about 400, is regarded as the apostle of Roumania. The barbarians in part removed Christian influences, and in 861 Cyril attempted anew the Christianizing of the people, especially the Bulgarians. In consequence the Slavonian language secured a foothold, and in the conflict between Constantinople and Rome this Danubian country sided with the Eastern Church. Rome made repeated efforts to regain her hold, but ineffectually. For political reasons princes now and then favored Rome, but in the 15th century, when it became a dependency of the Turks, the Greek

Church gained absolute adherence. In the days of the Reformation Wallachia remained unmoved, but in Moldavia — John Heraclides (Jacob Basilius), an adventurer who had gained the throne, favored Protestantism (1561-63). Twenty years later the prince was again Protestant-Janked Sass, “the Lutheran” (1584). From that time but little was heard for Protestantism, and even today, though ruled by a Prussian prince, there is only 1 Protestant for 6 Armenians, 50 Romanists, 1450. Greek Catholics, and 280 Jews. Protestant societies exist at Bucharest (one Lutheran and one Reformed), at Crajona, in Wallachia, and at Jassy and Galatz, in Moldavia. Besides these, Protestants live scattered in different places. See Michel de Koyalmtchan, *Histoire de la Valachie, de la Moldavie, et des Valaques Transdanubiens;* the *Reports* of the Gustavus Adolphus Society, St. John, in *Lond. Acad.* August 15, 1874, page 181; Prof. Wells, in *Meth. Qu, Rev.* January 1873, art. 1; Stanley, *East. Ch.* page 104.

Moldenhawer, Johann Heinrich Daniel

a German theologian, was born at Halle, October 29, 1709. He was educated at the “Collegium Fridericianum,” and later at the University of Konigsberg, where he was a diligent student in ancient languages, especially the Greek and Hebrew. He was appointed in 1733 deacon at Kreuzburg, and in 1737 to the Sackheinsche Kirche at Konigsberg, but had very many difficulties in this new position, and did not live in harmony with his colleagues. He therefore gladly accepted a call to the University of Konigsberg as professor of divinity in 1744. He published there in 1745 his *Introductio in libros sacros Veteris et Novi Testamenti,* of which Horne says that few treatises of the kind are more useful than this. He shows the canonical authority of the Bible in general, and treats of the author, time of writing, argument, scope, chronology, etc., of each book in particular. He was appointed in 1756 ecclesiastical counsellor, and also librarian of the Wallenrodsche library. He received a call in 1765 as minister to Hamburg, where he died, April 8,1790. Besides several contributions to journals, he published *Diss. I et II Acta apostoli Pauli chronologiae digesta* (Konigsberg, 1744, 4to): — *Einleitung in die Alterthumer der Egypten, Juden, Griechen, und Romer* (ibid. 1754, 8vo): — *Grundliche Erlauterungen der schweren Stellen der heiligen Bucher des neuen Testaments* (Leipzig und Konigsberg, 1763-70, 4 volumes): — *Betrachtungen uber das Vaterunser* (Hamburg, 1765, 8vo): — *Huptinhalt der Betrachtungen uber die Heilswahrheiten, welche in den Montags-*

Betstunden in der Domkurche 1766-68 *vorgetragen worden sind* (Hamburg, 1768, 8vo): — *Der Brief Pauli an die Romer, nach dem Grundtext ubersetzt, nebst Eriklarungen und Amerkungen* (ibid. 1770, gr. 8vo). He also translated and wrote commentaries on all the most important books of the New Testament. He was likewise the author of *Ausfuhrliche Prufung des funften Fragments aus der Wolfenbittelschen Bibliothek von der Auferstehung Jesu durch welche zugleich die Auferstehungsgeschichte Christi bestatigt und erlautert wird* (Hamburg, 1779, 8vo): *Ausfuhrliche Prufung des dritten Fragments aus desr Wolfenbuttelschen Bibliothek. von dem Durchgange der Israeliten durch’s rothe Meer* (ibid. 1779, 8vo): — *Ausfuhrliche Prufung des zweiten Fragments aus der Wolfenbiittelschen Bibliothek von der Unmoglichkeit einer Offenbarung, die alle Menschen auf eine gegrindete Art glauben konnen* (ibid. 1782, gr. 8vo): — *Der Hauptzweck des Leidens und Sterbens Jesu* (Kothen, 1787, 8vo). See Doring, *Gelehrte Theol. Deutschlands,* 2:557-62.

Mole

Picture for Mole

is the rendering in the Auth. Vers. of the Heb. tm,v,n]Tæ, *tinshe’meth,* in <031130>Leviticus 11:30, where, however, it probably signifies some species of the *lizard* tribe; but in <031118>Leviticus 11:18; <051416>Deuteronomy 14:16, it is rendered “swan,” where it evidently refers to some kind of *bird.* It thus appears to denote two very different kinds of animal, but in neither case the mole. *SEE CHAMELEON*; *SEE SWAN*. The mole is thought to be represented by the Heb. dl,jo, *cho’led,* rendered “weasel” in <031129>Leviticus 11:29. This is an animal very abundant in Palestine. *SEE WEASEL*. The word elsewhere occurs only in the difficult expression, <230220>Isaiah 2:20, t/rPerPoj]l]i, *lachphor’ peroth’* (if regarded as two words, perhaps, *to the hole of the rats* or burrowers, Sept. τοῖς ματαίοις,*Vulg. talpas,* Auth. Vers. “to the moles”), which Gesenius *(Comment.* ad loc.) thinks should be pointed as one word, h/rPe;bij}l]i, *lachapharperoth’*, indicating an animal, hrP,e;bij}, *chapharperah’*, so called from digging into the walls of houses, probably the *rat*, a creature common in every habitable part of the world.

Many scholars “consider the ἀσπάλαξ of the Greeks to be the creature intended by at least the first of the above Hebrew words. Whether this was what modern zoologists would call a *mole* is, however, rather doubtful

Aristotle, in his history of the *aspalax,* evidently derived from personal and careful examination, describes it as absolutely blind. Now the eyes of our common mole *(Talpa Europea),* though they are very minute, and so imbedded in the fur as to be readily overlooked by a cursory examiner, are distinctly open, and could not escape the detection of so accurate a physiologist as Aristotle Hence it has been supposed that the *aspalax* could not have been a *Talpa;* and another animal has been found to inhabit the east of Europe and west of Asia, which, while possessing much of the form, and even the peculiar structure of the moles, together with their burrowing powers, is absolutely and totally void of sight, the eyes, which are rudimentary specks, being completely covered by the skin of the face, which is quite imperforate. For a while it seemed certain that this was the creature intended; and accordingly the genus was technically named *Aspalax* by Olivier, the species receiving the appellation of *typhlus*.. But still more recently a species of true mole, now called *Talpa cceca,* has been discovered inhabiting Greece, in which the eves are as minute, and as useless, because as completely covered by the skin, as in the *aspalax.* As the *aspalax* is larger and more conspicuous than the blind *talpa,* which, moreover, appears to be rare, on the assumption that the former is the *tinshemeth* we here devote a few words to its appearance and habits. It belongs to the family *Muridce* among *the Rodents,* and is in fact a rat under the guise of a mole. Hence it has been called the mole-rat. The animal is from eight inches to a foot in length, with a great round head, no external ears or eyes, the nostrils opening beneath, the limbs very short, with strong nails formed for digging; the body clothed with a short, thick, soft fur of an ashy hue, and the naked skin of the muzzle, white. It is particularly abundant in the south of Russia, excavating the surface of the vast steppes or level plains, and forming long burrows beneath the turf, with many lateral ramifications. The object of its pursuit is not earthworms or subterraneous larvae, which form. the prey of the true mole; for the mole-rat is exclusively a vegetable feeder, and it drives its runs solely for bulbs and roots, especially for the fleshy root of an umbelliferous plant, the *chorophyllum.* At frequent intervals the burrow comes to the surface of the soil, and here hillocks are cast up a couple of yards in circumference, and of proportionate height. Altogether its work closely imitates that of the mole, but on a somewhat larger scale. It is said to work energetically and rapidly, and on the approach of an enemy, of which it is warned probably by an acute sense of smell, it instantly turns downward and penetrates the earth perpendicularly. It is said to devour corn, and to gather large quantities, which it lays up in its deeper galleries for winter supply, in this respect agreeing with many other of the *Muridce.* Like the mole, it can proceed forward or backward in its burrow with equal celerity. During the early hours of the day a pair may often be seen near the entrance of a hole, basking in the sun, but instantly disappearing on alarm. The least noise excites it; though it cannot see, it lifts its head to listen, in a menacing attitude, and if its retreat is cut off, it becomes animated with rage and ferocity, snorting and gnashing its teeth, and biting severely, yet uttering no cry, even when wounded. The superstitious peasants of the Ukraine believe that miraculous healing powers are communicated to the hand which has suffocated one of these creatures. The specimens which have been brought from Syria are smaller, and may possibly possess specific distinctness. Hasselquist testifies to their abundance on the plains of Sharon. He had never seen any ground so cast up by moles as in the region between Ramah and Jaffa. The molehills were scarcely a yard apart *(Trav.,* page 120).

“The other term, *chaphorperoth,* rendered ‘moles’ in <23020>Isaiah 2:20, is rather a descriptive periphrase than an appellative. It might be literally rendered ‘the digholes.’ The Sept. has adopted a different construction: ‘his idols... which he had made for the purpose of bowing down *to the vanities,* to the bats.’ Perhaps the words may be taken generically, of any creatures which burrow in ruined and desolate places. Travellers describe the ruins of Babylon ‘as perforated throughout with cavities which are inhabited by doleful creatures.’ Buckingham speaks of the ‘dens of wild beasts,’ the ‘quantities of porcupine quills’ in the cavities, and the numbers of bats and owls *(Trav. 2:*30). ‘These souterrains,’ observes Sir Robert Ker Porter, ‘are now the refuge of jackals and other savage animals’ *(Trav.* 2:342). ‘The mound,’ says major Keppel, ‘was full of large holes... strewed with the carcasses and skeletons of animals recently killed’ *(Nar.* 1:180). The total and final degradation of idols, and their removal out of sight and remembrance, we may understand by the phrases employed.”

Mole, François Rene

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

Mo’lech

(Heb. *Mo’lek,* Ël m̦o,*king,* always with the art. Ël M̦bi, except in <111107>1 Kings 11:7; Sept. ἄρχων in <031821>Leviticus 18:21; 20:2, 3, 4; Μελχώνν v.r. βασιλεύς in <111107>1 Kings 11:7; Μολὸχ ὁ βασιλεύς in <243235>Jeremiah 32:35; and simply Μολόχ in <122310>2 Kings 23:10, as Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion everywhere render; Vulg. *aMoloch),* called also MOLOCH (Amos 5: 25; <440743>Acts 7:43), MILCOU (<110105>1 Kings 1:5, 33; <122313>2 Kings 23:13), MALCHAM (<360105>Zephaniah 1:5), and MELCOMI (marg. <244901>Jeremiah 49:1, 3, text “their king”), is chiefly found in the Old Testament as the national god of the Ammonites, to whom children were sacrificed by fire.

1. *The Name*. — The root of the word Molech is the same as that of Ël m̦, *me’lek,* or “king,” and hence he is identified with Malcham (“ their king”) in <101230>2 Samuel 12:30; <360105>Zephaniah 1:5, the title by which he was known to the Israelites, as being invested with regal honors in his character as a tutelary deity, the lord and master of his people. Our translators have recognised this identity in their rendering of <300526>Amos 5:26 (where “your Moloch” is literally “your king,” as it is given in the margin), following the Greek in the speech of Stephen, in <440743>Acts 7:43. Dr. Geiger, in accordance with his theory that the worship of Molech was far more widely spread among the Israelites than appears at first sight from the Old Testament, and that many traces are obscured in the text, refers “the king,” in <233033>Isaiah 30:33, to that deity: “For Tophet is ordained of old; yea, for *the king* it is prepared.” Again, of the Israelitish nation, personified as an adulteress, it is said,” Thou wentest to *the king* with oil” (<235709>Isaiah 57:9); Amaziah, the priest of Bethel, forbade Amos to prophesy there, “for it is *the king’s* chapel” (<300713>Amos 7:13); and in both these instances Dr. Geiger would find a disguised reference to the worship of Molech *(Urschrift,* etc., pages 299-308).

Traces of the root from which Molech is derived are to be found in the *Milichus, Aialica,* and *Malcander* of the Phoenicians; with the last mentioned may be compared *Adrammelech,* the fire-god of Sepharvaim. The fire-god Molech, as the tutelary deity of the children of Ammon, was essentially identical with the Moabitish Chemosh. The Hebrew form, as an undoubted proper name, likewise occurs with some variety, as seen above. Solomon had in his harem many women of the Ammonitish race, who “turned away his heart after other gods,” and, as a consequence of their influence, high places to Molech, “the abomination of the children of Ammon,” were built on “the mount that is facing Jerusalem” — one of the summits of Olivet (<111107>1 Kings 11:7). Two verses before, the same deity is called MILCOM, and from the circumstance of the two names being distinguished in <122310>2 Kings 23:10, 13, it has been inferred by Movers, Ewald, and others, that the two deities were essentially distinct. Movers *(Phonicier.* 1:358) is probably correct in regarding the latter as merely an Aramaic pronunciation. It is true that in the later history of the Israelites the worship of Molech is connected with the valley of Hinnom, while the high place of Milcom was on the Mount of Olives, and that no mention is made of human sacrifices to the latter. But it seems impossible to resist the conclusion that in 1 Kings 11, Milcom the abomination of the Ammonites,” in verse 5, is the same as “Molech the abomination of the children of Ammon,” in verse 7. To avoid this Movers contends, not very convincingly, that the latter verse is by a different hand. Be this as it may, in the reformation carried out by Josiah, the high place of Milcom, on the right hand of the mount of corruption, and Tophet in the valley of the children of Hinnom were defiled, that “no man might make his son or his daughter to pass through the fire to Molech” (<122310>2 Kings 23:10,13). In the narrative of Chronicles these are included under the general term “Baalim,” and the apostasy of Solomon is not once alluded to. Tophet soon appears to have been restored to its original uses, for we find it again alluded to, in the reign of Zedekiah, as the scene of child-slaughter and sacrifice to Molech (<243235>Jeremiah 32:35). Kimchi, following the Targum, takes the word Milcom as an appellative, and not as a proper name, while with regard to *sikkuth* (tWKs, A.V. “tabernacle”) he holds the opposite opinion. His note is as follows: “*Sikkuth* is the name of an idol; and (as for) *malkekem* he speaks of a star which was made an idol by its name, and he calls it ‘king,’ because they thought it a king over them, or because it was a great star in the host of heaven, which was as a king over his host; and so ‘to burn incense to the *queen* of heaven,’ as I have explained in the book of Jeremiah.” Gesenius compares with the “tabernacle” of Molech the sacred tent of the Carthaginians mentioned by Diodorus (20:65). Rosenmiller, and after him Ewald, understood by *sikkuth* a pole or stake on which the figure of the idol was placed. It was more probably a kind of palanquin in which the image was carried in processions, a custom which is alluded to in <234601>Isaiah 46:1; Epist. of Jeremiah 4 (Selden, *De Dis Syr*. synt. 1, c. 6).

There remains to be noticed one passage (<101231>2 Samuel 12:31) in which the Hebrew written text has ˆKel]mi, *malken*, while the marginal reading is ˆBel]mi, *malben*, which is adopted by our translators in their rendering "brick-kiln." Kimchi explains *malken* as "the place of Molech," where sacrifices were offered to him, and the children of Ammon made their sons to pass through the fire. Milcom and Malken, he says, are one. On the other hand, Movers, rejecting the points, reads ˆK;l]mi, *malkan*, "our king," which he explains as the title by which he was known to the Ammonites.

2. *Biblical Account of this Deity*. — There is some difficulty in ascertaining at what period the Israelites became acquainted with this idolatry; yet four reasons render it probable that it' was before the time of Solomon, the date usually assigned for its introduction. First, Molech appears — if not under that name, yet under the notion that we attach to it — to have been a principal god of the Phoenicians and Canaanites, whose other idolatries the Israelites confessedly adopted very early. Secondly, there are some arguments which tend to connect Molech with Baal, and, if they be tenable, the worship of Molech might be essentially as old as that of the latter. Thirdly, if we assume, as there is much apparent ground for doing, that, wherever human sacrifices are mentioned in the Old Testament, we are to understand them as being offered to Molech — the apparent exception of the gods of Sepharvaim being only a strong evidence of their identity with him — then the remarkable passage in <262026>Ezekiel 20:26 (comp. verse 31) clearly shows that the Israelites sacrificed their firstborn by fire when they were *in the wilderness*. Fourthly, the rebuke contained in <300526>Amos 5:26, as quoted in <440743>Acts 7:43, appears to imply that some idol similar to this was secretly worshipped as early as the exodus. *SEE CHIUN*. Moreover, those who ascribe the Pentateuch to Moses will recognise both the early existence of the worship of this god and the apprehension of its contagion in that express prohibition of his bloody rites which is found in the Mosaic law. The offender who devoted his offspring to Molech was to be put to death by stoning; and in case the people of the land refused to inflict upon him this judgment, Jehovah would himself execute it, and cut him off from among his people (<031821>Leviticus 18:21; 20:2-5).

Nevertheless, it is for the first time directly stated that Solomon erected a high place for Molech on the Mount of Olives (<111107>1 Kings 11:7); and from that period his worship continued uninterruptedly there, or in Tophet, in the valley of Hinnom, until Josiah defiled both places (<122310>2 Kings 23:10, 13). Jehoahaz, however, the son and successor of Josiah, again “did what was evil in the sight of Jehovah, according to all that his fathers had done” (<122332>2 Kings 23:32). The same broad condemnation is made against the succeeding kings, Jehoiakim, Jehoiachin, and Zedekiah; and Ezekiel, writing during the captivity, says, “Do ye, by offering your gifts, and by making your sons pass through the fire, pollute yourselves with all your idols *until this day,* and shall I be inquired of by you?” (20:31). After the restoration, all traces of this idolatry disappear.

Molech, “the king,” was the lord and master of the Ammonites; their country was his possession (<244901>Jeremiah 49:1), as Moab was the heritage of Chemosh; the princes of the land were the princes of Malcham (<244903>Jeremiah 49:3; <300101>Amos 1:15). His priests were men of rank (<244903>Jeremiah 49:3), taking precedence of the princes. So the priest of Hercules at Tyre was second to the king (Justin, 18:4, § 5), and like Molech, the god himself, Baal Chamman, is *Melkart*, “the *king* of the city.” The priests of Molech, like those of other idols, were called Chemarim (<122305>2 Kings 23:5; <281005>Hosea 10:5; <360104>Zephaniah 1:4).

Most of the Jewish interpreters, Jarchi (on <031702>Leviticus 17:21), Kimchi, and Maimonides *(Mor. Neb.* 3:38) among the number, say that in the worship of Molech the children were not burned, but made to pass between two burning pyres, as a purificatory rite. But the allusions to the actual slaughter are too plain to be mistaken, and Aben Ezra, in his note on <031821>Leviticus 18:21, says that “to cause to pass through” is the same as “to burn.” “They sacrificed their sons and their daughters unto devils, and shed innocent blood, the blood of their sons and of their daughters, whom they sacrificed unto the idols of Canaan” (<19A637>Psalm 106:37, 38). In <240731>Jeremiah 7:31, the reference to the worship of Molech by human sacrifice is still more distinct: “They have built the high places of Tophet... *to burn* their sons and their daughters *in the fire,”* as “burnt-offerings unto Baal,” the sun-god of Tyre, with whom, or in whose character, Molech was worshipped (<241905>Jeremiah 19:5). Compare the statements in <051231>Deuteronomy 12:31; <261620>Ezekiel 16:20, 21; 23:37; the last two of which may also be adduced to show that the victims were slaughtered before they were burned. But the most remarkable passage is that in <142803>2 Chronicles

28:3, in which the wickedness of Ahaz is described: “Moreover, he burned incense in the valley of the son of Hinnom, and burned (r [eŸwi) his children in the fire, after the abominations of the nations whom Jehovah had driven out before the children of Israel.” Now, in the parallel narrative of <121603>2 Kings 16:3, instead of r [eŸwi, “and he burned,” the reading is ryb[Eeh, “he made to pass through,” and Dr. Geiger suggests that the former may be the true reading, of which the latter is an easy modification, serving as a euphemistic expression to disguise the horrible nature of the sacrificial rites. But it is more natural to suppose that it is an exceptional instance, and that the true reading is rbe[}Ÿwi than to assume that the other passages have been intentionally altered. We may infer from the expression, “after the abominations of the nations whom Jehovah had driven out before the children of Israel,” that the character of the Molech-worship of the time of Ahaz was essentially the same. as that of the old Canaanites, although Movers maintains the contrary.

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

The worship of Molech is evidently alluded to, though not expressly mentioned, in connection with star-worship and the worship of Baal in <121716>2 Kings 17:16,17; 21:5, 6, which seems to show that Molech, the flame god, and Baal, the sun-god, whatever their distinctive attributes, and whether or not the latter is a general appellation including the former, were worshipped with the same rites. Another argument might be drawn from <240324>Jeremiah 3:24, in which *Hab-bosheth*, “the shame,” is said to have devoured their flocks and herds, their sons and daughters. Now, as

Bosheth is found, in the names Ishbosheth and Jerubbesheth, to alternate with Baal, as if it were only a contemptuous perversion of it, it would appear that human sacrifices are here again ascribed to Baal. Further, whereas Baal is the chief name under which we find the principal god of the Phoenicians in the Old Testament, and whereas only the two above-cited passages mention the human victims of Baal, it is remarkable that the Greek and Latin authors give abundant testimony to the human sacrifices which the Phoenicians and their colonies offered to their principal god, in whom the classical writers have almost always recognised their own Κρόνος and Saturn. Thus we are again brought to the difficulty, *SEE BAAL*, of reconciling Molech as Saturn with Baal as the sun and Jupiter. In reality, however, this difficulty is in part created by our association of classical with Shemitic mythology. When regarded apart from such foreign affinities, Molech and Baal may appear as the personifications of the two powers that give and destroy life, which early religions regarded as not incompatible phases of the same God of nature.

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

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

According to Jewish tradition, from what source we know not, the image of Molech was of brass, hollow within, and was situated without Jerusalem. Kimchi (on <122310>2 Kings 23:10) describes it as “set within seven chapels, and whoso offered fine flour, they open to him one of them; (whoso offered) turtle-doves or young pigeons, they open to him two: a lamb, they open to him three; a ram, they open to him four; a calf, they open to him five; an ox, they open to him six; and to whoever offered his son, they open to him seven. And his face was (that) of a calf, and his hands stretched forth like a man who opens his hands to receive (something) of his neighbor. And they kindled it with fire, and the priests took the babe and put it into the hands of Molech, and the babe gave up the ghost. And why was it called Tophet and Hinnom? Because they used to make a noise with drums *(tophim),* that the father might not hear the cry of his child and have pity upon him, and return to him. Hinnom, because the babe wailed (µhgm, *menahem),* and the noise of his wailing went up.” Another opinion (is that it was called) Hinnom, because the priests used to say — “May it profit (hghy) thee! may it be sweet to thee! may it be of sweet savor to thee!” All this detail is probably as fictitious as the etymologies are unsound, but we have nothing to supply its place. Selden conjectures that the idea of the seven chapels may have been borrowed from the worship of Mithra, who had seven gates corresponding to the seven planets, and to whom men and women were sacrificed *(De Dis Syr.* synt. 1, c. 6). Benjamin of Tudela describes the remains of an ancient Ammonitish temple which he saw at Gebal, containing a stone image richly gilt seated on a throne. On either side sat two female figures, and before it was an altar on which the Ammonites anciently burned incense and offered sacrifice *(Early Travels in Palestine,* page 79, Bohn). By these chapels Lightfoot explains the allusion in <300526>Amos 5:26; <440743>Acts 7:43, to “the tabernacle of Molech;” “these seven chapels (if there be truth, in the thing) help us to understand what is meant by Molech’s tabernacle, and seem to give some reason why in the prophet he is called *Sikkuth,* or the *Covert God,* because he was retired within so many *Cancelli* (for that word Kimchi useth) before one could come at him” *(Comm. on* <440743>*Acts 7:*43). It was more probably a shrine or ark in which the figure of the god was carried in processions, or which contained, as Movers conjectures, the bones of children who had been sacrificed, and were used for magical purposes. The crown of Malcham, taken by David at Rabbah, is said to have had in it a precious stone (a magnet, according to Kimchi), which is described by Cyril on Amos as transparent and like the day-star, whence Molech has groundlessly been identified with the planet Venus (Vossius, *De Orig. Idol.* 2, c. 5, page 331). A legend is told in Jerome's *Quaestiones Hebraicae* (<132002>1 Chronicles 20:2) that, as it was unlawful for a Hebrew to touch anything of gold or silver belonging to an idol, Ittai the Gittite, who was a Philistine, snatched the crown from the head of Milcom, and gave it to David, who thus avoided the pollution.

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

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

Molesworth, Sir William

an English statesman and celebrated writer on philosophy and political economy, was born in Surrey is 1810. He was at an early age ready for college and sent to Cambridge University, where, however, he failed to complete his course of study, because of a quarrel in which he engaged with one of his tutors, whom he even challenged to a duel. He finally continued his studies at the University of Edinburgh, and subsequently went abroad, and studied for some time in the high-schools of Germany. In 1831 he became prominent in the political affairs of his native country, and soon rose to distinction hi English parliamentary society. He also largely identified himself with literary labors, and in 1834 founded the *London Review,* shortly after merged into the *Westminster Review,* of which he was for many years an editorial associate with the late John Stuart Mill (q.v.). Sir William was also the intimate friend of James Mill and of Bentham, and was generally regarded as the parliamentary representative of the "philosophical Radicals." He is, however, of particular interest to us as the student of Hobbes, whom Sir William greatly admired. He accumulated materials' for a life of the "Philosopher of Malmesbury," which remain in MS. uncompleted. He was more successful in the publication of an edition of Hobbes's works — which he commenced in 1839, and carried to completion at a cost of many thousand pounds — consisting of a reprint of the entire miscellaneous and voluminous writings of Hobbes (Lond. 1842-45, 11 volumes, 8vo), and constituting a valuable contribution to the republic of letters. By Sir William's munificence the works of Hobbes were placed in most of the university and provincial public libraries. The publication, however, did him great disservice in public life, his opponents endeavoring to identify him with the freethinking opinions of Hobbes in religion, as well as with the great philosopher’s conclusions in favor of despotic government; yet he continued a parliamentary career of the greatest energy and usefulness. Indeed, even for his political connections he deserves our notice. He was the first to call attention to the evils connected with the transportation of criminals, and as chairman of a parliamentary committee brought to light all the horrors of the convict system, and by untiring labors remedied this abuse, as well as the disorders generally in colonial administration. In 1855 he became secretary of state for the colonies, and no doubt would have greatly distinguished himself by his wholesome measures, but he died soon after, October 22, 1855. The London *Times* called him the “liberator and regenerator of the colonial empire of Great Britain.” See *English Cyclop.* s.v.; *Fraser’s Magazine,* 17:338; *Lond. Gentleman’s Magazine,* 1845, part 2, page 645; *Blackwood’s Magazine,* 38:506; 43:519; 44:625. *SEE HOBBES*. (J.H.W.)

Mo’li

(Μοολί, Vulg. *Moholi),* given (1 Esdr. 8:47) instead of MALI *SEE MALI* (q.v.), the son of Levi (<150818>Ezra 8:18).

Mo’lid

(Heb. *Molid’,* dylwom., *begetter;* Sept. Μωλήδ v.r. Μωλάδ, Μωλίδ, and Μωήλ), the last named of the two sons of Abishur, of the tribe of Judah, by Abihail (<130229>1 Chronicles 2:29). B.C. long after 1612.

Molieres, Joseph Privat De

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

Molin, Laurent

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

Molina, Antonio de

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

Molina, Luis

a distinguished Spanish theologian, was born at Cuenga, in New Castile, in 1535. In 1553 he entered the Order of the Society of Jesus, studied at Coimbra, and afterwards served for twenty years as professor of theology in the University of Evora, in Portugal. He died at Madrid, October 12, 1601. In his writings, which treat especially of grace and free-will, he propounded a system of doctrine which has since been called *Molinism*, after him. It was while writing a commentary on Thomas Aquinas (published at Cuenca, 1593, 2 volumes, fol.) that he was led to attempt the old *Pelagian Controversy* by a conciliation of free-will in man with the divine foreknowledge, and with predestination, and he finally advocated his system in his *De liberi arbitrii concordia cum gratiae donis, Divina Praescientia, Providentia, Praedestinatione, et, Reprobatione* (Lisbon, 1588, 4to). This book, dedicated to the grand Inquisition of Portugal, at once gave rise to a violent controversy. Molina rejects the sufficiency of grace, asserting that grace is sometimes sufficient, sometimes insufficient, according as the will is cooperating with or resisting it. According to his theory, the efficacy of grace is the result of the consent of the human will; not that this consent gives it any strength, but because this consent is requisite in order that grace should be efficient. He therefore says that man requires grace in order to do good, but that God never fails to grant this grace to those who ask it with fervor; he also asserts that man has it in his power to answer or not to the calling of grace. These opinions, which had found many followers, were first attacked by the Spanish Dominicans as being of a Pelagianizing tendency, while they themselves were firmly attached to the doctrine of Thomas Aquinas, and came hence to be named *Thomists* (q.v.). The innovation was afterwards attacked also by the Calvinists as opposing the theology of Augustine, and also by the Jansenists. Indeed, so much opposition had been encountered by the *Molinists,* as the propagators of this peculiar doctrine were called, that it was thought wise in 1594 to bring the matter to the consideration of pope Clement VIII, who enjoined silence on both parties, and promised to commit the decision of the dispute to a congregation of theologians. Upon this the Dominicans used their influence with Philip II to induce the pope to reopen the question at once; and, the king's persuasion prevailing, the pope in 1597 organized for that special purpose a congregation called *De Auxiliis,* consisting of a president, cardinal Malnici, the bishop of Trent, of three other bishops, and seven theologians of different fraternities. It was made their task to inquire into the nature of the assistance derived from grace, and its mode of operation. On January 16, 1598, the opinions of Molina were thus summarized:

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

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

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

(4) Predestination may be considered as either general (relating to whole classes of persons), or particular (relating to individual persons). In general predestination there is no reason or ground for it beyond the good pleasure of God, or none on the part of persons predestinated; but in particular predestination (or that of individuals) there is a cause or ground in the foreseen good use of free-will. In 1601, finally, the decision of the congregation was rendered. It pronounced in favor of the Thomistic opinions. But notwithstanding this decision, the Jesuits, who were almost en masse with the *Molinists,* succeeded in prevailing on Clement VIII to reopen the case; and a new congregation was appointed, consisting of fifteen cardinals, five bishops, and nine doctors, over whom the pope himself presided on seventy-eight different occasions between March 20, 1602, and January 22, 1605; but when about to pronounce sentence he died, and the congregation's sittings had to be continued under his successor, Paul V, from September 1605, until March 1606. Yet even after the expiration of such a long period of deliberation, covering over two hundred sittings, a settlement of the question seemed less likely than ever; and pope Paul, not wishing to condemn or to approve either party, public policy requiring that the pope should not make an enemy of France by deciding against the Jesuits, nor of Spain by deciding against the Dominicans, quietly concluded to discontinue the sittings, simply announcing that he reserved to himself the right of giving his verdict when he should see fit. Only in dismissing the contending parties, in 1607, he forbade their publishing anything more on the subject. This command, however, was but little regarded, and the *Scientia media* of Molina came to be substantially adopted by Jesuit theologians, while all his adversaries,. the upholders of "efficacious grace," have protested against this system as semi-Pelagianism. Jansenius, for instance, accuses Molina of disregarding St. Augustine, and of misrepresenting his opinions, etc. Bossuet says, in answer to this reproach of semi-Pelagianism (see his answer to Jurieu, *Avertissement aux Protestants),* "As for M. Jurieu's objection of our Molinists being semi-Pelagials, if he had only opened their books he would have seen that they recognised in all the elect a gratuitous preference on the part of divine grace — a grace ever predisposing, ever necessary for all pious deeds. This we never find among the semi-Pelagians. Going further, or making grace to be preceded by some purely human acts with which it is then connected, I do not hesitate to assert that no Roman Catholic will contradict me when I say that this would be a fearful mistake, which would take away the very foundation of humility, and that the Church would never tolerate it, after having so often decided, and lately in the Council of Trent, that everything good, even to the first disposition of the sinner to be converted, comes from an impelling and predisposing grace, which is preceded by no merit.” Molina wrote also *De Justitia et Jure* (Cuenca, 1592, 6 volumes, fol.; Mayence, 1659). See Antonio, *Nova Bibliotheca Hispano;* Alegambe, *De Script. Soc. Jesu*, page 314 sq.; *Abrgeu de Hist. de la Congregation de Auxiliis;* Bossuet, *Avertissement aux Protestants; Encycl. des Gens du Monde;* Fleury, *Eccl. Hist.* 183:4; Le Clerc, *Bibl. Univ. et Hist.* volume 14; Aug. le Blanc, *Hist. Congreg. de Auxil. Gratiae Divin.* (Domin.); Meyer, *Hist. Controv. de Divin. Gratia Auxil.* (Jesuit); Kuhn *Kathol. Dogmatik,* 1:291 sq.; Ranke, *Hist. of the Papacy,* 1:587 sq.; 2:90 sq.; Nicolini, *Hist. of the Jesuits,* page 231, 232; Walch, *Religiose Streitigkeiten ausser d. luther. Kirche,* 1:269 sq.; Schrockh, *Kirchengeschichte s.d. Ref.* 4:295 sq.; Hagenbach, *Hist. Doctrines,* 2:202, 278, 280, 288; Bickersteth, *Christian Student,* section 4, page 233; Wetzer u. Welte (Roman Catholic), *Kirchen-Lexikon,* 7:199 sq.

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

Molinasus

SEE MOULIN, DE.

Molinari, Antonio

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

Lanzi, *Hist. of Painting,* transl. by Roscoe, 2:295; Spooner, *Biog. Hist. of the Fine Arts,* 2:575.

Molinari, Giovanni

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

Molinet, Claue Du

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

Molinier, Etienne

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

Molinier, Jean-Baptiste

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

Molinism

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

Molinos, Miguel De

a Spanish theologian, founder of the Quietists, was born of noble parentage near Saragossa, December 21, 1627. He studied at Pampeluna, and, after finishing his studies at the University of Coimbra, took holy orders, and in 1669 went to Rome, where his pious conduct and the purity of his life caused many to choose him for their spiritual director. He acquired great reputation, but steadily refused all ecclesiastical preferment. In 1675 he published his *Way* or *Guide* to what the Mystics call *a spiritual* or *contemplative life.* This book, written in Spanish, was supported by the recommendations of some of the greatest and most respectable men. In 1681 it was published at Rome in Italian, though it had appeared in that language some time before in other places. Afterwards it was translated into the Dutch, French, and Latin languages; and was very often printed in Holland, France, and Italy. The Latin translation, under the title of *Manuductio spiritualis*, was published by A.H. Franke (Halle, 1687, 12mo). In Italian it bore the title of *Guida Spirituale*. But though the work added greatly to Molinos's celebrity, it also became the subject of bitter opposition. It was soon attacked. There were not wanting many who in the specious but visionary principles of this work discovered the seeds of a dangerous and seductive error. Among these the celebrated preacher Segneri was the first who ventured publicly to call its. orthodoxy into question; but his strictures were by Molinos's friends ascribed to jealousy of the influence which Molinos had acquired with the people. By degrees, however, reports unfavorable to the practical results of this teaching, and even to the personal conduct and character of its author, or of his followers, began to find circulation; and eventually the Jesuits took decided ground against him, and he was accused of heresy. The substance of his system, which his friends interpret in one way and his opponents in another, amounted to this: Christian perfection consists in the peace of the soul, in renouncement of all external and temporal things, in the pure love of God, free from all considerations of interest or hope of reward. Thus a soul which desires the supreme good must renounce not only all sensual pleasures, but also all material and sensual things; silence every impulse of its mind and will, and concentrate and absorb itself in God. Molinos's enemies accused him and some of his disciples of reviving the abuses of the Gnostics, and of teaching, both by their precepts and their example, the most objectionable principles of *Quietism*. According to the propositions which were condemned by the Inquisition, he pushed to such an extreme the contemplative repose which is the common characteristic of Quietism as to teach the utter indifference of the soul, in a state of perfect contemplation, to all external things, and its entire independence of the outer world, even of the actions of the very body which it animates; insomuch that this internal perfection is compatible with the worst external excesses, since these are of no importance so long as the soul remains in communion with God. *SEE QUIETISM*. It is very probable that the opposition to him, especially that of the Jesuits and others who watched over the interests of the Romish cause, was provoked because they perceived that Molinos's system tacitly accused the Romish Church of a departure from true religion. Molinos, though he had a vast number of friends, and though the pontiff himself, Innocent XI, was partial to him, was in 1685 cited before the Inquisition, and submitted to close imprisonment and examination. In addition to the opinions contained in his book, a prodigious mass of papers and letters, to the number, it is said, of 20,000, found in his house, were produced against him, and he was himself rigorously examined as to his opinions. The trial lasted two years; and in 1687 sixtyeight propositions contained in his book were solemnly condemned. By a decree of August 28, 1687, he was declared to have taught false and dangerous dogmas, contrary to the doctrine of the Church and to Christian piety. On September 3 following he was brought out in a yellow scapular, with a red cross before and behind, made to kneel on a scaffold in-front of the church of the Dominicans, and there compelled to recant all he had taught in his books; after which he was compelled to pass the remainder of his life in prison. A bull of Innocent XII, of November 19, confirmed the action of the Inquisition, and condemned, *in globo,* the sixty-eight propositions. A refutation of Molinos's doctrine is to be found in Fenelon's works (Versailles, 1820), and in Bossuet, *Etats d'Oraison.* See Moreri, *Dict. histor.;* Pluquet, *Diction. des heresies; Recueil de diverses pieces concernant le Quietisme et les Quietistes, ou Molinos, ses sentimens et ses disciples* (Amsterd. 1688, 8vo); — *Lettres ecrits de Rome touchanit le Quietisme; ou Molinos, ses sentiments,* etc. (Amsterd. 1688); Herzog, *Real-Encyklopidie,* 9:698; Mosheim, *Ecclesiastes Hist.* 3:339 sq.; Bergier, *Dict. de Theologie,* 4:420; Wetzer u.Welte, *Kirchen-Lexikon,* 7:213 sq.; Scharling, in Niedner's *Zeitschrift,* 1854, page 325 sq., 489 sq.; 1855, page 3 sq.; Baumgarten-Crusius, *Compend. d. Dogmen Gesch.* 1:407 sq.; Hodgson; *Reformers and Martyrs;* Heinroth, *Gesch. u. Kritik d. Mysticismus,* part 3, chapter 3; Walch, *Religiois Streitigkeiten ausser der luther. Kirche,* 1:293 sq.; 2:982 sq.; Schrockh, *Kirchengeschichte s. d. Ref.* 7:453 sq. *SEE MYSTICISM.*

Molkenbuhr, Marcellin

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

Mollah

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

Moller, Heinrich

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

Moller, Henry

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

Mollius or Mollio, Giovanni

a distinguished Italian martyr in the Protestant cause, was a native of Montalcino, in the territory of Siena, and the descendant of a very respectable family. He was born near the opening of the 16th century. When only twelve years of age he was placed in the monastery of Gray Friars, where he made rapid progress in arts, sciences, and languages. He entered the order of *Minorites* while yet a youth, and took priest’s orders when only eighteen. Every minute was improved in study of polite letters and theology, and he came soon to be noted for his learning and industry. After having pursued his studies six years longer at Ferrara, he was made theological lecturer in the university of that city. He subsequently lectured at the universities of Brescia, Milan, and Pavia, and was appointed professor of theology in the University of Bologna about 1533. There, on reading several treatises of the Reformers, he became at heart a zealous Protestant, and began to expound in its purity the Epistle’ to the Romans. Immense crowds soon attended his lectures, and, the report coming to Rome, he was seized by order of the pope, and, being denied a public trial, gave an account of his opinions in writing, confirming them by scriptural authority. Mollius defended himself with such ability and address that the judges appointed by Paul III to try the case were forced to acquit him, in the way of declaring that the sentiments which he had maintained were true, although they were such as could not be publicly taught at that time without prejudice to the apostolical see. He was therefore sent back to Bologna, with an admonition to abstain for the future from explaining the same doctrine (i.e., justification by faith). But continuing to expound the epistles of Paul as formerly, and with still greater applause from his hearers — even the monks of different convents, many of the nobility, and individuals of episcopal orders, attending them — cardinal Campeggio procured an order from the pope to remove him from the university (Pontaleon, *Rerum in Eccl. Gest.* lib. 9, fol. 263). Mollius did not remain idle when relieved of his duties at the university, but continued his studies, and grew in strength among his fellows, He finally became lecturer to the monastery of St. Lorenzo at Naples. But even here he was persecuted; and in 1542 the opposition grew so decided that he was frequently in great danger. He was several times imprisoned, but always escaped until the time of the accession of pope Julius III, when he was hunted down at Ravenna, and transported to Rome. On September 5, 1553, a public assembly of the Inquisition was held with great pomp, and Mollius was brought before that body, attended by six cardinals and their episcopal assessors. All the prisoners brought forward in this session recanted and performed penance except Mollius and another, a native of Perugio named Tisserano, who refused to do violence to their conscience. When the articles of accusation against Mollius were ready, permission was given him to speak. He defended the doctrines which he had taught respecting justification, the merit of good works, auricular confession, and the sacraments; pronounced the power claimed by the pope and his clergy to be usurped and antichristian; and addressed his judges in a strain of bold and fervid invective, which silenced and chained them to their seats, at the same time that it cut them to the quick; and when he had finished his address, he threw the flaming torch which he held in his hand on the ground and extinguished it, thus showing to his accusers that he would rather extinguish life than suffer them to force a lie from him. Of course mercy to such a criminal was not within the gift of Rome, and he was consequently condemned, together with his companion, to instant death. They were at once conveyed to the place of execution, first hung, and then burned to ashes. See *Hist. des Martyrs,* pages 264, 265; Gerdesius, *Ital. Reform.* pages 103; M'Crie, *Ref: in Italy,* pages 95, 124, 261; Young, *Life of Paleario,* 2:113 sq. Fox, *Book of Martyrs,* page 184, gives Mollius's history inaccurately. (J.H.W.)

Molloy, Francis

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

Mo’loch

(Heb. *Me’lek*, Ë l m̦, *king*, as often; Sept. and N.T. Μολόχ), the name of an Ammonitish idol (<300402>Amos 4:26; <440743>Acts 7:43); usually called MOLECH *SEE MOLECH* (q.v.).

Molokans

SEE MALAKANS.

Molten Image

SEE IDOL.

Molten Sea

SEE SEA, MOLTEN.

Moluccas

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The Moluccas, or Spice Islands, in the broad use of the term, lie to the east of Celebes, scattered over nearly eleven degrees of latitude and longitude, between 30 S.80 N. lat. and 1260-1350 E. long., including all the territories formerly ruled over by the sultans of Ternate and Tidore. They are now tributary to Holland, and are virtually under the jurisdiction of the governors appointed by the Dutch, and are divided into the residencies of Amboyna, Banda, and Ternate; a fourth residency, under the governor of the Moluccas, being Menado. Over the northern groups of the Spice Islands the Netherlands exercise an indirect government, the sultans of Ternate and Tidore requiring to have all their appointments of native officials ratified by the resident. The southern groups are directly under European rule. The residency of Amboyna contains that island- sometimes called Ley-Timor, or Hitu, from the two peninsulas of which it is formed-Buru, the Hiassers group. and the west part of Ceram. That of Banda includes the Banda, Keffing, Key, Arru, and other islands; also the eastern part of Ceram. Under the residency of Ternate are placed the Moluccas proper, Gilolo, the neighboring islands, and the north-west of Papua. The population ruled over by the governor of the Moluccas is 767,000. Amboyna, the Banda ‘and Uliasser islands, chiefly supply the cloves, nutmegs, and mace which form the staple exports. The Banda Islands are Neira, or Banda-Neira, Great Banda, Ay or Way, Rhun, Rozingain, and Goenong-Api, containing an area of 588 square miles. ‘Of the population, which is about 6000, 400 are Europeans; in the whole residency, the inhabitants number about 110,000, including the eastern part of Ceram. The principal island of the group is Neira, south-east from Amboyna, in 40 33’ S. lat. and 1300 E. long., separated by narrow straits from Goenong-Api on the west, and Great Banda on the east. The coast is steep, and surmounted by several forts and batteries, which command the straits and roadstead. The town of Neira, on the south side of the island, is the capital of the ,Dutch residency of Banda. It has a Protestant church, school, and hospital. The Banda Islands have a rich soil, and are planted with nutmeg-trees, producing upwards of a million pounds of nuts and over a quarter of a million pounds of mace. Pineapples, the vine, banana, cocoa-nut, and other fruit-trees thrive, and are abundant. Ay is the prettiest and most productive of the group. Goenong-Api is a lofty volcano. The climate is not particularly healthy. The east monsoon begins in May, and the west in December, and both are accompanied with rain and storms. The Uliassers, which, with Amboyna, produce the cloves of commerce, are Saparoua, Oma or Haroukou, and Nousa-Laut. They lie to the east of Amboyna, in 30 40’ S. lat. and 1280 33’ E. long., and have an area of 1071 square miles. Saparoua is the largest, and is formed of two mountainous peninsulas, joined in the middle by a narrow strip of undulating, grassy land. The population amounts to 11,655, of whom 7340 are Christians, having twelve schools, with a very large attendance of scholars. Oma, separated from Saparoua by a strait of a league in width, has eleven villages, of which Harouka and Oma are the chief. It is mountainous in the south, and has several rivers and sulphurous springs. The beautiful village of Harouka, on the west coast, is the residence of the Dutch postholder, who is president of the council of chiefs. Here is the head office of the clove produce. There are two forts on Oma, several churches, and six schools, with 700 pupils. Population 7188; one half Christians, the other Mohammedans. Nousa-Laut lies to the south-east of Saparoua. It is planted with clovetrees, which in 1853 produced 120,283 pounds. There are upwards of 30,000 cocoa-nut-trees. The inhabitants, who were formerly pirates and cannibals, amount to 3479 souls, are all Christians, and have schools in every village — in 1859 they were attended by 870 pupils.

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

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

History, etc. — The Moluccas were first discovered by Europeans in 1511, when the Portuguese, under Antonio de Abreu and Francisco Serrao, landed there. They found, however, that the Arabians had already been there, and had made converts of the natives along the coast — the Malavs. In the mountains they found the Papuans (q.v.), but these Oriental negroes were savages, and in a large measure remain so to this day. The king of Portugal claimed the island, and held undisputed sway until 1599, when the

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

Missionary Labors. — The native tribes of the mountains remain very largely in heathen ignorance. Many of the Moluccans were made converts to Mohammedanism even before the appearance of Christians on the soil, and Islamism is gaining new adherents daily. Christianity, on the other hand, has thus far secured but few in number, as the first impression made by the Portuguese did not result very favorably. The Inquisition at Goa extended its power to these parts, and tried hard to carry the Moluccans into the Christian fold, but failed utterly.

The exchange of ownership imported the Protestant doctrines, but the natives have failed to see much difference between Romanism and the Reformed faith, and Islam is still ahead. All efforts until 1815 made by Protestants are hardly worth mentioning. In that year Jos. Kasse, in the employ of the *Rotterdam Missionary Society* (Zenddinggenootschap), inaugurated successful efforts for the conversion of the Moluccans, and for eighteen years apostolic labors were performed there. In 1819 missionary Jungmichel inaugurated successful labors at Ternate and in the Sangur Islands* At the same time valuable enterprises were inaugurated also at Timor and Amboyna. To the former Lebrun went. He settled at Cupang, the seat of the Dutch governor, on the south coast of Timor. For twenty years there had been no Christian minister among the natives there, who profess Christianity. With so much greater eagerness did they now crowd to the missionary's preaching; and in the very first year ninety pagans were admitted to the Church, which already consisted of 3000 professed Christians. Moreover, the rajah of Rotti submitted himself to Christ crucified; and in 1823 Lebrun baptized in Little Timor, Kissor, Letti, and Moa, 496 persons. The Friendly Society which he established was subscribed to every by some of the pagan princes. He everywhere formed schools, and to the remote churches he addressed pastoral letters, after the manner of the apostles, of the good effect of which there are very pleasing testimonies. A few years before his death, which took place in 1829, eight missionaries more arrived, who distributed themselves among various stations, and made it one part of their business to establish more fundamentally in Christianity the churches and congregations that had been gained to it. Their work, indeed, is often exceedingly harassing and fatiguing. The centre, however, of missionary labors in the archipelago is, and always has been, Amboyna. Its inhabitants have since 1850 been regarded as Christians. The Rotterdam Society has a number of stations there, and a seminary for the education of native teachers. These stations are now subject to the Church at Batavia, and it is anticipated that the Dutch government will recognise the missionaries as stationed pastors, and contribute for their support. See Sonnerat, *Voyage to the Spice Islands;* Forrest, *Voyage to New Guinea;* Crawfurd, *Hist. of the Indian Archipelago,* 1:18 sq.; Earl, *Native Races of the Indian Archipelago*, chapter 6; Daniel, *Handbuch der Geographie,* 1:323 sq.; Grundemann, *Missions-Atlas,* part 2, No. 6; Newcomb, *Cyclop. of Missions,* page 485 sq.

Molyneux, William

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

Mom’dis

*(*Μομδεΐς v.r. Μόμδιος), given (1 Esdras 2:4) in place of MAADAI *SEE MAADAI* (q.v.) of the Heb. (<151034>Ezra 10:34).

Moment

([gir, *re’ga,* the *wink* of an eye, i.e., an *instant;* στιγμή, *a point* of time, <420405>Luke 4:5).

Momiers or Mummers

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

1824); Schweizer, *Die kirchl. Zerwurfiisse im Kanton Waadt;* Mestral, *Mission de l'Eglise libre* (1848); Bost, *Defense des fidbles de l'Elise de Geneve* (Paris, 1825); Von Goltz, *Die reform. Kirche Genfs im* 19: *Jahrah.* (Basle and Gel. 1862); Cheneviere, *Quelques mots sur la Geneve religieuse du baron de Goltz* (Genesis 1863); Aschbach, *Kirchen-Lex.* 4:259.

Mona

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

Monacensis, Codex

SEE MUNICH MS.

Monachism

SEE MONASTICISM.

Monaco, Francisco-Maria del

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

Monaco, Lorenzo

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

Monadology

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

2:86). See Ueberweg, *Hist. Philos.* 2:92 sq., 107 sq.; also pages 27, 54, 130, 145, 312, 316, 336, 507. *SEE LEIBNITZ*; *SEE NEO-PLATONISM*.

Monarchee

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

Monarchia

is the term by which is designated the leading or opening statement in the orderly enunciation of the doctrine of-the Trinity (q.v.), i.e., the doctrine that there is one and only one Ἀρχή, principle or fountain of Divinity, God the Father, the first person in the Trinity, who only is Αὐτόθεος, “God of and from himself” (Pearson *[Expos. of the Creed* (1741, fol.), page 39] is very particular on the form of this statement, and takes exception to Bull, who uses the word “ from” — “of and from himself,” which Pearson considers a contradiction). The doctrine of the Trinity assumes that. the Son and the Holy Ghost derive their divinity from the Father is the one Ἀρχή. The scriptural and only true idea of God involves in its development the idea of the trinity; and the doctrine of the Monarchia may be approached either from the side of the unity of God or from the side of the trinity of persons. Coming to it on the side of the unity, there is presented to the mind, first, the existence of God, then the unity of God, then the underived nature — that is, his self-existence. Coming to the doctrine on the side of the trinity of persons, Scripture reveals God the Son, who is θεὸς ἐκ θεοῦ by an eternal generation; and God the Holy Ghost, who is θεὶς ἐκ θεοῦ by an eternal procession. This refers us to the first person of the Trinity, as him from whom the second and third persons derive their divinity. The doctrine of the Monarchia, flowing as it does directly from the unity of God, in its expression guards that unity; while at the same time it renders it possible that the Son is God, and the Holy Ghost God, by a derivation of Godhead; the full doctrine of the Godhead of the second and third persons being maintained by the further doctrine of the perichoresis. It is to be remarked that as ἀρχή has the meaning of “beginning” with reference to time, as well as the meaning of “principle” with reference to origin, so with regard to the former meaning the Son and the Holy Spirit are ἄναρχοι as well as the Father. Αἰτία, cause, is also used in the enunciation of this doctrine: the Father himself, αἰτία, is ἀναίτιος; the Son and the Holy Spirit are αἰτιατός and αἰτιατόν. Scripture and the Church avoid the appearance of tritheism by tracing back (if we may so say) the infinite perfection of the Son and Spirit to him whose Son and Spirit they are. They are, so to express it, but the new manifestation and repetition of the Father; there being no room for numeration or comparison between them, nor any resting-place for the contemplating mind, till they are referred to him in whom they centre. On the other hand, in naming the Father, we imply the Son and Spirit, whether they be named or not. This is the key to much of the language of holy Scripture which is otherwise difficult to understand, as, e.g. <620520>1 John 5:20; <461204>1 Corinthians 12:4-66; <431416>John 14:16-18 (Newman's *Arians*, page 192). Viewing this doctrine on the side of the second and third persons of the Trinity, it becomes the doctrine of their subordination to the Father. In nature, in perfection of substance, equal to the Father; in authority, in origin, the Son and Holy Spirit are subordinate. Bull expresses it thus: " Pater igitur minor est Filius κατ᾿ αἰτίαν. AEqualis vero est Patri Filius κατὰ φύσιν. Deus ac Dominus est Filius aeque ac Pater; et in hoc solo discrepat a Patre Filius, quod Deus et Dominus sit a Patre Deo ac Domino; hoc est, Deus licet de Deo sit, de vero tamen Deo Deus verus est, ut definivit synodus ipsi Nicaena" (Bull's *Works*, Burton's ed., 6:707). The like things may be said of the Holy Spirit. This subordination, and the ministrations of the Son and of the Holy Spirit in executing the counsels of the individual society of the Godhead, is styled the economy of the Holy Trinity. *SEE PROCESSION*.

Monarchians

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

The Monarchians are generally credited as the adherents of Praxeas, a writer of the Grecian school. They were sometimes called *Patripassians,* because their views led to the conclusion that, if the union between God the Father and his Son Jesus were so intimate as they affirmed, then the former must be supposed to have suffered with the latter all the afflictions of his life and death. Praxeas held that the Word of God (Jesus Christ) meant nothing more than the word of his mouth — the emissions of his voice, to which distinct agency had been metaphorically ascribed. These heretics considered that the doctrine of the Church with respect to the personality of the Son was a disparaging representation of Christ, whom they held to be the supreme God himself, and who, in a way he had never (done besides, had revealed himself in human nature, and had appeared in a human body. They taught that God was to be considered in two different relations: 1, the hidden Being, as he was before the Creation — the *Father;* and, 2, in so far as he revealed himself, the *Son of the Logos;* and it was only in virtue of these considerations that Christ, as the most perfect revelation of God the Father, was called the Son of God. They maintained that this doctrine was most eminently calculated to dignify Christ. (See, however, below.) The Monarchians received both the Old and New Testaments, and held doctrines somewhat resembling modern Unitarianism. This general class, however, comprehended many who differed more from each other than they did even from those reputed orthodox, and who, indeed, had nothing in common but a great zeal for Monotheism, and a fear lest the unity of God should be endangered by the hvpostases of the Alexandrian fathers. Thus Theodotus, Artemon, and Paul of Samosata were placed by the side of Praxeas, Noetus, Beryllus of Bostra, and Sabellius, between whom and themselves, on every essential point of Christian doctrine, there was an unmistakable opposition.

Monarchianism is generally supposed to have originated about the end of the 2d century. It seems to us, however, that this heresy may be traced to the very earliest times of Christianity. Justin Martyr expressly denounces it, and his notice guides us to its source. for he finds the heresy to exist both among Jews and Christians. He condemns the Jews for thinking that, when God was said to have appeared to the patriarchs, it was God the Father who appeared. Such, he says, are justly convicted of knowing neither the Father nor the Son; for they who say that the Son is the Father are convicted of neither understanding the Father nor of knowing that the Father of the universe has a Son, who, being the first-born Logos of God, is likewise God *(First Apol.* chapter 63). In the Dialogue with Trypho he handles the same topic, and extends the charge to Christians. “I am aware that there are some who wish to meet this by saving that the power which appeared from the Father of the universe to Moses, or Abraham, or Jacob, is called an Angel in his coming among men, since by this the will of the Father is made known to men; he is also called Glory, since he is sometimes seen in an unsubstantial appearance; sometimes he is called a Man, since he appears under such forms as the Father pleases; and they call him the Word, since he is also the bearer of messages from the Father to men. But they say that this power is unseparated and undivided from the Father, in the same manner that the light of the sun when on earth is unseparated and undivided from the sun in heaven, and when the sun sets the light is removed with it; so the Father, they say, when he wishes, makes his power go forth, and when he wishes he brings it back again to himself” *(Dial. c. Tryph.* cc. 127, 128). It appears, then, there were persons in Justin’s time who called themselves Christians, but who believed that the Son was merely an unsubstantial energy or operation of the Father (see Bull, *Def. Fid. Nic.* can. 2, qu. 4, 4; Burton, *Bampt. Lect.* note 103). Now in this the Jews had deserted the better teachings of their earlier rabbins; for these ascribed a divine personality to the angel of the Presence, and the doctrine of the holy and undivided Trinity subsisted, though in a less developed form, in the synagogue of old (see Mill, *Panth. Prin.* part 2, page 92 sq.). The cause of this declension in doctrine was, that opposition to the Incarnate Word, when he really appeared, seemed to have predisposed them to accept a heathen philosophy, and to represent the Logos as Philo did as the manifest God not personally distinct from the concealed Deity. This error found its way into Christianity through the Gnostics, who were largely indebted to the Platonic school of Alexandria. It appears as the foundation of the system of Simon Magus, who taught that the originating principle of all (which he asserted to be Fire, for “God is a consuming fire”) is of a twofold nature, having a secret part and a manifest part, corresponding, as Hippolytus remarks, to the potentiality and energy of Aristotle. If this be nothing else than Philo’s representation of the Logos, there is some sure ground for the notion that Simon held the heresy afterwards called Sabellian. Burton rejects the notion, inasmuch as the doctrine of emanations is not to be confounded with the theory of Sabellius; but Hippolytus (whom Burton did not possess) shows that the Logos, in Simon’s theory, employed certain portions of the divine fulness, which portions he called AEons; and that the Logos, although Simon uses the word Begotten, is really the manifest God not personally distinct from the concealed Deity (see Burton, *Bampton Lect.* note 46). Although, therefore, the doctrine of emanations is not to be confounded with the doctrine of Sabellius, it had in its original form, as constructed by Simon, a foundation of Sabellianism. Traces of Sabellianism are found even in the later schools of Gnostics, and the later Sabellianism approached to an emanation theory. A resemblance has been noticed between the tenets of Valentinus and those of Sabellius (Peturius, *Dogmz. Theol.* II, 1:6; Wormius, *Hist. Sabel.* 2:3), and Neander is inclined to think that Marcion may have adopted some of the Patripassian doctrines in Asia Minor *(Clhurch Hist.* 1:796; Burton, *Bampton Lect.* note 103). The leading tenet of the Monarchians thus appears to have been introduced into Christianity principally through the Alexandrian Jews and the Gnostics. It may also have been derived immediately from heathen philosophers, as in the case of Noetus it is ascribed by Hippolytus immediately to Ieraclitus, *SEE NOETIANS*.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

(1) The first prominent advocate of this class of Monarchians, rather than the founder of Monarchianism, was *Praxeas,* of whom we have already spoken above. *Noetus* of Smyrna, who differed but little from Praxeas, is frequently recognised as the leader of a branch of this class; and *Callistus* (pope Calixtus I), who adopted and advocated the doctrines of Noetus, as the leader of a third branch. Those who strictly followed him were called *Callistians,* in distinction from the direct followers of Noetus, who were called *Noetians* (q.v.). Noetus taught (according to Hippolytus, *Philos.* 9:7 sq.) that the one God who created the world, though in- himself invisible, had yet from most ancient times appeared from time to time, according to his good pleasure, to righteous men; and that this same God had himself become also the Son, when it pleased him to submit to being born; he was consequently his own son, and in this identity of the Father and the Son consisted the "monarchia" of God. An associate and disciple of Noetus was Epigonus, who brought the doctrine he professed to Rome; and *his* pupil, again, was Cleomenes, who defended the doctrine of Noetus in the time of bishop Zephyrinus, the successor of Victor. With this Cleomenes, according to Hyppolytus, Callistus, the successor of Zephyrinus, was on terms of friendship, and was of like opinions. Callistus declared the Son to be merely the manifestation of the Father in human form; the Father animating the Son, as the spirit animates the body (<431411>John 14:11), and suffering with him on the cross. "The Father," says he, "who was in the Son, took flesh and made it God, uniting it with himself, and made it one. Father and Son were therefore the name of the one God, and this one person *(πρόσωπον)* cannot be two; thus the Father suffered with the Son." After the death of this pope, Patripassianism virtually disappeared from the Roman Church.

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

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

From this cursory glance at the history of Monarchianism, there is apparent an endeavor to escape from the revolting tenet of Patripassianism, and to retain or supply that which the nature of man almost instinctively requires a superhuman mediation and atonement. The working of these two motives, as the Monarchian adopted either the Arian or the Patripassian alternative, is very remarkable; inasmuch as the return to catholicity appears to be much easier in the school which adopted the former alternative. Where Patripassianism was at once and decisively rejected, it was open to the Monarchian to satisfy the need for a mediator by magnifying the divine element in our Lord, which at first he considered to be only the highest degree of prophetic grace, and passing through stages of Arianism and semi-Arianism to approach nearer and nearer to the truth. Whereas, when Patripassianism had been adopted, and the need was felt for freeing the mind from-a tenet at which one shudders, it was only done by diminishing the divine nature in Christ, through the stages of supposing it to be a portion of the divine fulness, then an emanation from the Godhead. The result was a deliberate Psilanthropism. Regarding the heresy itself of pseudo-Monarchianism, the main points for consideration are the following: First, an eternal mind must needs have in it from eternity an ἔννοια or λόγος, a notion or conception of itself, which the schools term *verbum mentis:* nor can it be conceived without it. "This Word in God cannot be. as it is in us, a transient, vanishing accident, for then the divine nature would indeed be compounded of substance. and accident, which would be repugnant to its simplicity; but it must be a substantial, subsisting Word" (Bull, *Cath. Doct. concerning the blessed Trinity).* The Monarchians denied this (Τελειότατον καὶ ζῶντα καὶ αὐτοῦ τοῦ πρώτου νοῦ λόγον ἔμψυχον*)*. Denying this, they denied also that substantial *vinculum caritatis* in which the Father and the Son are one ἑνότητι Πνεύματος. Secondly, thus is destroyed that αὐτάρκεια which we attribute to God, i.e., his self-sufficiency and most perfect bliss and happiness in himself alone, before and without all created beings. For this we: cannot well conceive without acknowledging a distinction of persons in the Godhead. The Monarchians, it is clear, denied this individual society of the Trinity (comp. Blunt, *Dict. of Sects, Heresies,* etc., page 332). See Mohler, *Athanasius der Grosse* (Mainz, 1827), book 1 *(Der Glaube der Kirche der drei ersten Jahrh. in Betreff der Trinit.* etc.), pages 1-116; Baur, *Die christl. Lehre von der Dreieinigkeit u. Menschwerdung Gottes in ihrer geschichtlichen Entwickelung* (Tub. 1841-43, 3 volumes), 1:129-341; Meier, *Die Lehre von der Trinitat in ihrer hist. Entwickelung* (Hamb. 1844, 2 volumes), 1:45-134; Dorner, *Entwickelungsgeschichte der Lehre von der Person Christi* (1839; 2d. ed. Stuttg. u. Berl. 1845-56, 2 volumes), 1:122-747; Lange, *Gesch. d. Lehrbegriffes der Unitarier vor der nicanischen Synode* (Leips. 1831); Schleiermacher, *Werke,* 1:2, pages 485-574; Vogt, *Lehre des Athanasius von Alexandrius* (Bremen, 1861); Hagenbach, *Hist. of Doctrines,* 1:62 sq., 116 sq., 131 sq.; Mosheim, *Comment. Ecclesiastes Hist.* (see Index); Milman, *Hist. of Christianity,* and *Latin Christianity,* 1:70-73; Pressense, *Early Years of Christianity, Heresy, and Christian Doctrine* (N.Y. 1873, 12mo). chapter 5; Neander, *Hist. Dogmas* (see Index in volume 2), and *Ch. Hist.* volume 1; Ueberweg, *Hist. Philos.* 2:30611; Ebrard, *Dogmengesch.* volume 1; Hase, *Ch. Hist.* page 98 sq., 196, 704; Schaff, *Ch. Hist.* volume 1, § 81 and 83.

Monarchy, Israelitish

(see Kale, *De potestate regia ingente Hebr.* Havn. 1749). According to the sense of the Mosaic constitution, the Hebrews were erected into a kind of republic under, the immediate dominion of Jehovah, forming a strict theocracy (q.v.); the law of the kingdom (<051714>Deuteronomy 17:14-20) being partly expounded by the Pentateuch itself, which alludes to it as a future institution, and partly organized on a permanent basis by Solomon, largely independent of the Mosaic law (see Staudlein in Bertholdt’s *Theol. Journ.* 3:259, 361 sq.; Hengstenberg, *Pentat.* 2:246 sq.). It was inaugurated by Samuel in compliance with a general request of the people, which had grown out of the bitter experience of many years, rendering it an inevitable necessity sooner or later (Ewald, *Israel. Gesch.* 2:140 sq.), as the order of judges was but a temporary and precarious safeguard against total anarchy. The king, however, was only empowered to administer the theocratic government as *a viceroy of Jehovah*, the heavenly sovereign (<190202>Psalm 2:2), and was bound to this law as the highest authority, so as to exclude the idea of an independent and absolute monarch. In particular cases the Urim and Thummimn, or a prophet, or some other medium of divine communication (<092806>1 Samuel 28:6; 30:7 sq.; <100201>2 Samuel 2:1; <112207>1 Kings 22:7 sq.; comp. <431151>John 11:51), might be referred to in order to direct and confirm the theocratic regent as to the will of Jehovah, so that in this way the monarchical administration still retained the character of a divine government, and the kings were-reminded of their dependency (see Kalkar, *Over de Israel. Godesregering*, in his *Verhandling van het Haagsche Genootschap*, etc., 2:3 sq.). But in practice the Israelitish kings assumed the right of declaring war and concluding peace (<091105>1 Samuel 11:5 sq.), as well as of exercising judicial functions in the highest cases (<101502>2 Samuel 15:2; <110316>1 Kings 3:16 sq.; comp. <242112>Jeremiah 21:12), and of pronouncing amnesty (2 Samuel 14). The king was also the patron of the religious cults (<110802>1 Kings 8:2 Kings 12:4 sq.; 18:4 sq.; 23:1 sq.), and in war he was likewise the ideal leader of his troops (<090820>1 Samuel 8:20). Despotism was held in check sometimes by a sort of coronation-oath a *Magna Charta*, as it were (<091025>1 Samuel 10:25; <100503>2 Samuel 5:3; <111204>1 Kings 12:4 sq.; <121117>2 Kings 11:17; comp. Josephus, *War*, 2:1, 2) — and sometimes by a mass meeting of the tribes (<130441>1 Chronicles 4:41 sq.; the heads of families formed a kind of popular representatives, <132901>1 Chronicles 29:1 sq.; comp. 13:2);, and there even occurs an example of the direct intervention of the people (<091445>1 Samuel 14:45 sq.); but especially the prophets, who from the time of Samuel were set to guard the theocracy, and constituted a species of continually selfrenewing order, often made the most unshrinking opposition to the prince, either by introducing themselves officially into the royal cabinet (Nathan, Isaiah), or by demanding a special audience (<112022>1 Kings 20:22 sq., 38; <120115>2 Kings 1:15, etc.), and even went so far as open resistance, by their severe invectives at least, to unlawful measures of government (compare <092217>1 Samuel 22:17 sq.). *SEE PROPHET*.

The regular succession was confined to the house of David. Usually the first-born son (even when a minor [<121121>2 Kings 11:21] there is found no provision for a guardian or regent [yet see the Sept. at <111224>1 Kings 12:24]; the queen-dowager, however, seems to have a position as counsellor in such cases [<241318>Jeremiah 13:18; comp. <122412>2 Kings 24:12]) appears to have as a matter of course assumed the reins of government, but occasionally the father is stated to have designated a particular son to the throne (<110117>1 Kings 1:17, 20; <141122>2 Chronicles 11:22); sometimes the people themselves interfered (<122124>2 Kings 21:24; 23:30), and even foreign powers at length imposed rulers as their own vassals upon the nation: (<122334>2 Kings 23:34; 24:17). In the kingdom of *Israel* the first king was inducted into office by a prophet (<111131>1 Kings 11:31 sq.), and the succession was thenceforth hereditary (descending to the son, or, when the direct line failed, to the brother, <120301>2 Kings 3:1); but the brief dynasties followed each other with many interruptions through extinction, conspiracy, or deposition (<111609>1 Kings 16:9, 16, 21), and several interregna occurred. An association in the throne, or rather viceroyship, of the successor in consequence of the disability of the ruling monarch is mentioned in <142702>2 Chronicles 27:21; and numerous other instances are rendered probable by the discrepancies in the regnal years. *SEE CHRONOLOGY*. In-the election of a king, ancient nations had great regard to personal size (<091023>1 Samuel 10:23) and beauty (<091612>1 Samuel 16:12; <262812>Ezekiel 28:12; comp. <194003>Psalm 40:3; Homer, *Il.* 3:166 sq.; Herod. 3:20; Strabo, 15:699; 17:822; Athen. 12:566; Barhebr. *Chronicles* page 384; see also Dougtsei *Analect.* 1:131); and Hebrew kings were required to be native citizens (<051715>Deuteronomy 17:15). Those who instituted a new dynasty sought to strengthen their power by the extinction of the previous reigning family (<111611>1 Kings 16:11; <121011>2 Kings 10:11, 17; 11:1; comp. Josephus. *Ant.* 15:7, 10), as is customary still in the East (Tavernier, *Voyage*, 1:253). The first kings, Saul (<090916>1 Samuel 9:16; 10:1; 15:1, 17) and David (<091612>1 Samuel 16:12 sq.; <100204>2 Samuel 2:4; 5:3; 12:7), also Solomon (<110134>1 Kings 1:34, 39; 5:1 so likewise Absalom unlawfully, <101911>2 Samuel 19:11), were regularly anointed by a prophet or the high-priest; but in later times this was done only in the case of Josiah, whom the priesthood restored to the throne in place of the usurping Athaliah (<121112>2 Kings 11:12), and Jehoahaz his son, whom the people raised to the throne (<122330>2 Kings 23:30), besides Jehu of the kingdom of Israel, who established a new dynasty (<120901>2 Kings 9:1 sq.); the principle apparently being in these cases to supply the lack of the hereditary right. The *Anointed of Jehovah* (h/;hy] jyivæe]), or simply the *Anointed*, accordingly appears (in the sacred style) as the official title of the regular sovereign (<090210>1 Samuel 2:10, 35; 16:6; 24:6; 26:16, 23; <101922>2 Samuel 19:22; 22:51; <190202>Psalm 2:2, <250420>Lamentations 4:20, etc.). No other ceremony of investiture seems to have been enjoined; although we occasionally find a popular assembly (<091024>1 Samuel 10:24; 1 Kings , 25,. 39; <120913>2 Kings 9:13; 11:13; <142311>2 Chronicles 23:11; comp.. Josephus, *War*, 1:33, 9), a coronation (<121112>2 Kings 11:12), music (<110140>1 Kings 1:40), and thank-offerings (<110124>1 Kings 1:24). The royal beast of burden is also mentioned (<110138>1 Kings 1:38). See Fort. Scacchi *Dissert. de inaugurat. regum Israel.* in Ugolini: *Thesaur.* volume 32. Regal costumes, consisting of costly and elaborate garments, were also used (at least armlets, <100119>2 Samuel 1:19; 1 Macc. 10:20, 62; 11:5; 14:43), in accompaniment with the simple diadem (rz,ne,<100110>2 Samuel 1:10; <121112>2 Kings 11:12), jewelled crown (hr;f;[}, <101103>2 Samuel 11:30; <220211>Song of Solomon 2:11; comp. <262126>Ezekiel 21:26; 1 Macc. 10:20), the sceptre (fb,ve), and the throne (aSeKi). See each word. Later occurs the purple mantle (1 Macc. 6:15; 10:20, 62; 14:43; comp. <441221>Acts 12:21).

The income of the Israelitish kings, with which they defrayed the expenses of their court and administration, was derived from voluntary but (as still in the East; see Kimpfer, *Amnon.* page 95) valuable presents from their subjects in Palestine and the dependencies (<091027>1 Samuel 10:27; 16:20; <100802>2 Samuel 8:2, 11; <111025>1 Kings 10:25; comp. Herod. 3:87, 97; Elian, *V.H.* 1:31; Heeren, *Ideen, I,* 1:225 sq., 483), from public domains and royal possessions, consisting of lands, vineyards, and olive-yards (<090814>1 Samuel 8:14; <132726>1 Chronicles 27:26 sq.; <142610>2 Chronicles 26:10; comp. Josephus, *Ant*. 6:13, 10; 14:10, 6), which sometimes fell to the crown by confiscation of private property (<112116>1 Kings 21:16 sq.; comp. <264618>Ezekiel 46:18; see Kampfer, *ut sup*. page 96), from monopolies (<111011>1 Kings 10:11 sq., 26 sq.; <300701>Amos 7:1), from public services (<110513>1 Kings 5:13; 9:21; comp. <090813>1 Samuel 8:13), and from regular taxes in kind (comp. <090815>1 Samuel 8:15; 17:25), which were farmed by head collectors (<231601>Isaiah 16:1; <210208>Ecclesiastes 2:8). At times there is mention of an extraordinary levy upon personal property (<122335>2 Kings 23:35); and the king also claimed a share of the booty obtained in war (<100811>2 Samuel 8:11 sq.). *SEE ASSESSMENT*. Hence came the at times so considerable royal treasures (I Kings 10:21; 14:26; <121414>2 Kings 14:14), the rich wardrobes (<121022>2 Kings 10:22), the palaces and parks (<110709>1 Kings 7:9:; 19:2; <122118>2 Kings 21:18; 25:4; <243904>Jeremiah 39:4; 52:7; <220811>Song of Solomon 8:11), the sumptuously served table (<110422>1 Kings 4:22 sq.; comp. <270501>Daniel 5:1 sq.; <170103>Esther 1:3

sq.), to which it was esteemed a great distinction to be invited as a regular guest (<100907>2 Samuel 9:7; see Morier, *Second Journey*, page 148; Rosenmuller, *Morgenl.* 3:163; comp. <122529>2 Kings 25:29; <270105>Daniel 1:5; Herod. 3:132; Heeren, *Ideen*, I, 1:217).ῤ An especial mark of royal luxury was a well-stocked harem (<100513>2 Samuel 5:13; <111101>1 Kings 11:1 sq.; 20:3; comp. Quint. Curt. 3:3, 24; Athen. 12:514; Plutarch, *Artax.* c. 43), which was guarded by eunuchs, and descended to the succeeding king (<101208>2 Samuel 12:8; comp. Herod. 3:68; the regulation in <051717>Deuteronomy 17:17 was interpreted as a limit of eighteen wives, Schickard, *Jus. reg.* page 175). *SEE HAREM*. To aspire to a connection with this was equivalent to being a pretender to the throne (<101622>2 Samuel 16:22; <110221>1 Kings 2:21 sq.; comp. Movers, *Phonic.* 1:491). *SEE ABSALOM*. Among the holidays, the day of the king's birth or ascension was prominent (<280705>Hosea 7:5; <401406>Matthew 14:6; comp. <014020>Genesis 40:20; Herod. 1:133; 9:109; Josephus, *A nt.* 7:3, 1). Music at court and table is early mentioned (<101935>2 Samuel 19:35; <210208>Ecclesiastes 2:8). Kings expressed their favor by rich presents, especially of arms and apparel, *SEE GIFT*; and on royal festive days malefactors were pardoned or their punishment was postponed (<091113>1 Samuel 11:13; <101922>2 Samuel 19:22 sq.; comp. <014020>Genesis 40:20; see Philo, 2:529). It was, however, a still more distinguished honor when the king invited any one to sit at his right hand (<110219>1 Kings 2:19; comp. Sueton. *Nero*, 13; Wetstein, *N.T.* 1:456). The reverence paid to the monarch was very great (<202421>Proverbs 24:21); persons fell prostrate in his presence, so as to touch the forehead to the earth (<092409>1 Samuel 24:9; 25:23; <100906>2 Samuel 9:6; 19:18; even females of royal rank did the same, <110116>1 Kings 1:16), dismounted in the street on meeting him (<092523>1 Samuel 25:23), and greeted him with salvos in the streets and at audiences (<270204>Daniel 2:4; 3:9; comp. Josephus, *War*, 2:1, 1; see Rosenmuller, *Morgenl.* 4:350). A high notion was entertained of his sagacity (<101417>2 Samuel 14:17; 19:27; comp. Rosenmuller, *Morgenl.* 3:142 sq.). His entrance into a city was signalized by pomp (<120913>2 Kings 9:13; <091806>1 Samuel 18:6 sq.; comp. *Josephus, Ant.* 11:2, 1). Of the *rank* of the early Hebrew kings of course nothing can be particularly said; but in later times those created by the Romans held the honor of the senatorial order (comp. Josephus, *Ant.* 14:10,6). Whether in their edicts the Israelitish monarchs, like the Persian (<150418>Ezra 4:18; 7:24), Syrian (1 Macc. 10:19; 11:31; 15:19), and Egyptian (3 Macc. 4:14; 7:2), issued their edicts in the *plural* number (see Fromann, *Opusc.* 1:202 sq.), is uncertain (comp. Theodoret, *Quaest. in Genes.* 19). Any infringement of the regal majesty was followed by the death penalty (<112110>1 Kings 21:10), or if perpetrated by a member of the royal family, it incurred an ignominious expulsion from court (<101424>2 Samuel 14:24, 25). In general Hebrew kings were quite as popular as other Oriental monarchs (<170114>Esther 1:14; 4:11; Herod 1:99; 3:140; Diod. Sic. 2:21; 3:47; Agatharch. ed. Hudson, 1:63; Strabo, 17:821; Harmer, 2:95; Ludecke, *Beschr. d. turk. Reichs*, page 276), often exhibited themselves in the midst of their subjects (<101908>2 Samuel 19:8; <112039>1 Kings 20:39; 22:10; <120626>2 Kings 6:26; 7:17; <243807>Jeremiah 38:7), and were affable with them (<110315>1 Kings 3:15; <120626>2 Kings 6:26 sq.; 8:3 sq., etc.), even to the extent of personal intercourse (<112102>1 Kings 21:2 sq.; for later indications, see the Mishna, *Sanhedr.* 2:2 sq.). After their death the kings were laid in royal sepulchres (those of Judah in Jerusalem) (<110210>1 Kings 2:10; 11:43; 14:31, etc.), but the wicked ones were sometimes denied this honor (<142827>2 Chronicles 28:27 [? 26:23]), which, nevertheless, does not argue the adoption of a death-tribunal on the Israelitish monarchs (Rosenmuller, *Morgenl.* 3:269 sq.), after the Egyptian custom (Diod. Sic. 1:22). The consorts of deceased kings remained in high honor, and even held the title of queen-mother *(*hr;ybiG]*’ mistress,* <111513>1 Kings 15:13; <121013>2 Kings 10:13; <241318>Jeremiah 13:18; 29:2). The title “king” was applied to the princes of the royal house as well (<241720>Jeremiah 17:20; comp. <143204>2 Chronicles 32:4). Monarchs expressed their regard for each other by rich presents (<111002>1 Kings 10:2) and diplomatic embassies, the latter to convey especially their well-wishes and compliments (<102002>2 Samuel 20:2; <122012>2 Kings 20:12 sq.; comp. Herod, 6:39). *SEE SALUTATION.*

The following *official courtiers* are mentioned:

(1.) *Chief major-domo* or *head palace-marshal (*l[idyG;, tyBæhi or tyBæhi l[irva}, <120406>2 Kings 4:6; 18:3; <122318>2 Kings 23:18; 9; <232215>Isaiah 22:15), who directed the court state (Kampfer, page 78), but was also occupied with civil duties. Among his subordinates were the palace *doorkeepers* (µyræ[}vo, <120711>2 Kings 7:11).

(2.) *Chief bailim’(*sMhi l[irva}, <102024>2 Samuel 20:24; <110406>1 Kings 4:6; 12:18; comp. 11:28).

(3.) *Chief warder of the wardrobe* (hh;T;l]Mh; l[irva}, <121022>2 Kings 10:22, or µydæg;B]hi rmevo, <122214>2 Kings 22:14; <143422>2 Chronicles 34:22).

(4.) *Superintendent of the exchequer and lands* (vWkr]h; rmeç,ç <132725>1 Chronicles 27:25 sq.), who had the oversight of the royal herds and domains (perhaps 'the ἐπίτροπος of <420803>Luke 8:3). Similar were the financial officers of Solomon in the twelve districts (µybæxæn],æ <110407>1 Kings 4:7 sq.). The *chamberlains* proper were usually eunuchs (<120806>2 Kings 8:6; Jeremiah 53:25); among whom probably was the cup-bearer (hq,v]mi, <111005>1 Kings 10:5; comp. Josephus, *Ant*. 15:17, 4, 14:11, 4; 16:8,1; see Kampfer, page 81 sq.). A kind of chamberlain or *valet* is apparently designated in <245225>Jeremiah 52:25; <122519>2 Kings 25:19 (ynep]yaer omeµyvin;a}Ë l,Mhi), unless the expression indicates generally the highest officers of the court and state. What official is denoted in <245160>Jeremiah 51:60 *(*hj;Wnm] rci) is doubtful; Hitzig has perhaps conjectured rightly, *the field-marshal*. Finally, here belong the royal life-guard, who had to keep watch of the castle or palace (<121105>2 Kings 11:5), but also saw the royal mandates executed in cases of capital punishment (<101501>2 Samuel 15:1). *SEE CHERETHITE*.

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

Monasteria

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

Monastery

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

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

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

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

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

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

(4) the Order of *Francis,* with its numerous ramifications.

The common appellation of monasteries are the following:

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

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

(3) *Coenobium,* a common dwelling-place.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The monastery was divided into several parts, and directors were appointed over each. Ten monks were subject to one who was called *decanus,* or dean, from his presiding over ten; every hundred had another superior, called *centenarius,* from his presiding over one hundred. Above these were *patres,* or fathers of the monasteries, called also *abbates,* abbot, from the Hebraeo Greek word ἀββᾶ, a father; and *hegumeni,* presidents, and *archinmandrites.* from *mandra,* a sheepfold, they being, as it were, the keepers or rulers of these sacred folds in the Church. The business of the deans was to exact every man’s daily task, and bring it to the *conomus,* or steward of the house, who himself gave a monthly account to the father of them all (Bingham, *Origines Ecclesiasticce,* book 7, chapter 3, § 11).

The rules and regulations of these houses varied according to the difference of the founders, and other circumstances. To give some impression of the routine of a conventual house, we recite the rule of St. Benedict as in operation: “The abbot represented Christ; called all his monks to council in important affairs, and adopted the advice he thought best: he required obedience without delay, silence, humility, patience, manifestation of secret faults, contentment with the meanest things and employments. *Abbot* selected by the whole society; his life and prudence to be the qualifications, and to be addressed *dominus* or *pater*. *Prior* appointed by the abbot; deposable for disobedience. A *dean* set over every ten monks in larger houses. The monks to observe general silence; no scurrility, idle words, or exciting to laughter; to keep head and eyes inclined downwards; to rise to church two hours after midnight; to leave the church together at a sign from the superior. No property; distribution according to every one’s necessities. To serve weekly, and by turns, at the kitchen and table. On leaving their weeks, both he that left it and he that began it to wash the feet of the others; and on Saturday to clean all the plates and the linen which wiped the others feet. To render the dishes clean and whole to the cellarer, who was to give them to the new hebdomary. ‘These officers to have drink and food above the common allowance, that they might serve cheerfully. *Daily routine-Work* from prime till near ten o’clock, from Easter to October; from ten till near twelve, reading. After refection at twelve, the meridian or sleep, unless any one preferred reading. After nones labor again till the evening. From October to Lent, reading till eight A.M., then tierce, and afterwards labor till nones; after refection, reading or psalmody. In Lent, reading till tierce; doing what was ordered till ten: delivery of books at this season made. Senior to go around the house, and see that the monks were not idle. On Sunday, all reading except the officers. Workmen in the house to labor for the common profit. If possible-to prevent evagation-water, a mill, garden, oven, and all other mechanical shops, to be within or attached to the house. *Reflection* in silence, and reading Scripture during meals: what was wanted to be asked for by a sign. Reader to be appointed for the week. Two different dishes at dinner, with fruit. One pound of bread a day for both dinner and supper. No meat but to the sick. Three quarters of a pint of wine per day. From Holyrood-day to Lent, dining at nones; in Lent, till Easter, at six o’clock; from Easter to Pentecost at six; and all summer, except on Wednesdays and Fridays, then at nones. Collation or spiritual lecture every night before compline (after supper); and compline finished, silence. *SEE BREVIARY*;

SEE COMPLINE. Particular abstinence in Lent from meat, drink, and sleep, and especial gravity. Rule mitigated to children and the aged, who have liberty to anticipate the hour of eating. *Dormitory,* light to be burning in. To sleep clothed, with their girdles on, the young and old intermixed. Monks travelling to say the canonical hours wherever they happened to be. When staying out beyond a day, not to eat abroad without the abbot's leave. Before setting out on a journey to have the previous prayers of the house, and upon return to pray for pardon of excesses on the way. No letters or presents to be received without the abbot's permission. Precedence according to the time of profession. Elders to call the juniors brothers; the seniors to call the elders *nonnos.* When two monks met, the junior was to ask benediction from the senior; and when he passed by the junior was to rise and give him his seat, and not to sit down till he bade him. Impossible things ordered by the superior to be humbly represented to him; but if he persisted, the assistance of God to be relied on for the execution of them. Not to defend or excuse one another's faults. No blows or excommunication without the abbot's permission. Mutual obedience, but no preference of a private person's commands to those of the superiors. Prostration at the feet of the superiors as long as they -were angry. *Strangers* to be received with prayer, the kiss of peace, prostration, and washing their feet, as of Christ, whom they represented; then to be led to prayer; the Scripture read to them; after which the prior might break his fast (except on a high fast). Abbot's kitchen and the visitors' separate, that guests coming in at unseasonable hours might not disturb the monks. *Porter* to be a wise. old man, able to give and receive an answer; who was to have a cell near the gate, and a junior for his companion. *Church* to be used only for .prayer. *Admission-Novices* to be tried by denials and hard usage before admission. A year of probation. Rule to be read to them in the interim every fourth month. Admitted by a petition laid upon the altar, and prostration at the feet of all the monks. Parents to offer their children by wrapping their hands in the pall of the altar; promising to leave nothing to them (that they might have no temptation to quit the house); and if they gave anything with them, to reserve the use of it during their lives. Priests requesting admission to be tried by delays; to sit near the abbot; not to exercise sacerdotal functions without leave, and conform to the rule. *Discipline-Upon*-successless admonition :and public reprehension, excommunication; and, in failure of this, corporal punishment. For light faults, the smaller excommunication, or eating alone after the others had done. For great faults, separation from the table, prayers, and society, and neither himself nor his food to receive the benediction: those who joined him or spoke to him to be themselves excommunicated. The abbot to send seniors to persuade him to humility and making satisfaction. The whole congregation to pray for the incorrigible, and if unsuccessful, to proceed to expulsion. No person expelled to be received after the third expulsion. Children to be corrected with discretion, by fasting or whipping" ("Sanctorum Patrum Regulse Monasticoe," in Fosbrooke's *British Monachisnm* page 109). By the strict law of the Church, called the law of cloister or enclosure, it is forbidden to all except members of the order to enter a monastery; and in almost all the orders admission of females to the monasteries of men is denied. Yet must they have been at times admitted, if we may believe the accusations brought against the chastity of monastics, especially since the Middle Ages. In the Greek Church the law of enclosure is far more rigidly enforced than in the West. Thus in the celebrated enclosure of Mount Athos, not only women, but all. animals of the female sex are rigorously excluded.

3. In the East monasteries are supposed to have existed about the time of Christ's stay on earth. *SEE MONASTICISM*. In the West the first monasteries were founded by St. Martin of Tours, about 360, at Liguge, near Poictiers, and at Marmoutier. The chiefs only of these monasteries were in orders, and women who entered the monasteries were permitted to relinquish the monastic state and marry down to the 6th century. *SEE CELIBACY*. The regular life of the community was introduced by Eusebius of Vercelli about 350. Theodoret mentions a large number of monasteries, both in the East and West, some founded by St. Basil about 358, others by St. Augustine in Africa about 390, and some by St. Ambrose at Milan in 377. On British soil St. Patrick is supposed to have started the first monasteries near the opening of the 6th century, when he flourished as bishop of Ireland. During thirty-three years he worked at the conversion of the people to the Christian faith, and filled the island with schools and monasteries, the sites of which are still to be distinguished by the round towers that served as belfries for the conventual churches. The prefix " kill" is the Latin *l'cella*, and marks the "religio loci" of innumerable localities in Ireland; and well has Macaulay said that "without these Christianizing institutions the population would have been made up of beasts of burden and beasts of prey." A missionary spirit has always distinguished the Irish Church. Its monks, as hardy navigators, established themselves in the Hebrides, with Iona for their capital, and passed over to the western districts of Britain; whence they settled upon the coasts of Brittany, together with the British population expelled by Saxon invasion in the 4th and 5th centuries. It was a province of Gaul that had remained comparatively free from Roman rule, and preserved old Celtic habits, while the rest of Gaul was Romanized. The missionary spirit of his race impelled Columban to settle in Gaul, and to found the monastery of Luxeuil, in Burgundy, the mother of numerous conventual establishments, and the capital of Monastic Gaul (Milman, *Latin Christianity,* 4:5). He has been termed the Irish Benedict, and various legends are connected with his name, which are only reproductions of Benedictine fable. Though he treated the Roman see with respect, he never sacrificed his own independence of opinion to its authority; and he gave to the see of Jerusalem precedence in point of honor (Ep. 5, sec. 18). He also gave his monks a rule, but its excessive severity prevented its extended use; and it was superseded by the Benedictine rule, which finally became the universal law of monasticism. The County Down monastery, on the north-west coast of Ireland .and Clonfert were towns of monks rather than monasteries. The former contained more than three thousand under religious vow in the time of Patricius. The founder having been accompanied by learned monks from Gaul and Lerin, these monasteries soon became renowned for their sound learning, as well as for a pure faith. In England all the most ancient sees have been established upon pre-existing monastic foundations. At the close of the 5th century Dubricius, bishop of Caerleon, founded Llandaff monastery. St. David, his successor at Caerleon, built the monastery at St. David's, a site indicated to him by St. Patrick, the wild promontory on which the cathedral now stands. He also rebuilt the convent at Glastonbury; and it was in honor of St. David that the privilege of asylum was indulged to sites in any way connected with his name — a privilege that may occasionally have secured innocence against oppression and wrong, but which became intolerable from abuse in later years. St. Asaph, in its origin, was a convent of nine hundred and sixty-five monks, founded at the end of the 6th century by Kentigern, himself a monk and missionary bishop among the southern Scots and Picts. Bangor, on the Dee, was founded by Ittud, a fellow-disciple with St. David at St. Germain of Auxerre. It contained within its "wide precincts" a whole army of monks. Yet it was only a little more than half the size of the Irish establishment of the same name. The diocese of Bangor owes its origin to the foundation of Daniel, a disciple of Dubricius, at the commencement of the 6th century. Winchester, first established as a monastery by Cenwalch, king of Wessex, under a promise to his dying father, was made an episcopal see by the same king about the middle of the 7th century. Ripon was a monastery founded by Alfrid, king of Northumberland, having Wilfrid for its first abbot. He repaired and beautified the cathedral at York, of which see he became bishop, and built the priory of Hexham in the most elaborate style; the church was said to have been the most beautiful on this side of the Alps. Wilfrid was the first of a series of clerical and monastic architects who for several centuries made Anglican ecclesiastical buildings the glory of Europe. It is curious to find that the churchwarden's sovereign cure for all defects was also introduced by him: "Parietes lavans... alba calce, mirifice dealbavit" (Montalembert, 4:235). Ely was at first a double monastery for monks and nuns of the foundation of Ethelreda, queen of Northumberland: "virgo bis nupta." Columba, like Pelagius, is the classical equivalent for a Celtic name. He is not to be confounded with Columban, the Celtic founder of Luxeull. Columba (born A.D. 521, died A.D. 597), after founding thirty-seven monasteries in Ireland, passed over to the Hebrides, selected Iona, the most desolate of those desolate islands, flat-lying and sandy, as the site of a monastery, and made it the "glory of the West," and the cradle of the civilization of North Britain. *SEE IONA*. From Iona, Aidan went forth as the apostle and bishop of the Northumbrians; and, having found a site as desolate and unattractive as Iona on Lindisfarne (since called Holy Island), there founded a monastery, which became the mother-church of all the provinces north of the Humber. The character of sanctity impressed upon it by St. Aidan long distinguished it; and its abbots, like himself, mostly became bishops of the northern provinces. His great and benevolent character has been nobly drawn by Bede *(H.E.* 3:3, 17). Hilda, foundress (A.D. 658) and abbess of Whitby, received the veil from him. The feminine love of whatever is beautiful in nature led to the selection of a most noble site for her abbey, and contrasts strongly with the masculine austerity and contempt for aesthetics that led the Celtic monks to choose Iona and Lindisfarne. The influence of Hilda was everywhere felt: kings and princes sought her counsel; she was a "mother" by endearment to the very poorest who received alms at the abbey gate. Bede *(H.E.* 4:23) speaks in enthusiastic terms of her tender care and administrative tact. A convent for monks as well as nuns was under her rule, and Bede notes that six prelates, eminent for their piety and learning, received their training at Whitby under her eye. To Hilda also we are indebted for having drawn the earliest Saxon poet, Caedmon, from his obscurity. He was a common herdsman, but at her persuasion became a monk. He anticipated Milton in taking as a theme for poetic song the fall of Satan and the sin of our first parents. The foundation of Wearmouth Abbey by Benedict Biscop, a monk of Lindisfarne (A.D. 665), was remarkable for the introduction of painted glass. Workmen were brought from the Continent, who instructed the Saxon monks in the mystery of their craft (Milman, *Latin Christianity*, 4:4). The sister-foundation, Jarrow, endowed with a domain granted by Egfrid, was the monastery in which the venerable Bede had his cell. In South Britain the most ancient monastery was that founded by Augustine at Canterbury, and placed under Benedictine rule. The deed of gift whereby king Ethelbert conveyed the site (A.D. 605) is, according to Palgrave, the earliest existing document of the public records of England. Gregory followed up the mission with a colony of monks, who also imported all that could be required for the observance of the Romish ritual. Thus the subjugation of England to the see of Rome was the work of the Benedictine monks. One of their number, Mellitus, first bishop of London, founded Westminster Abbey. The first metropolitan recognised by all England was Theodore, an Oriental monk, a native of Tarsus, and placed in the see of Canterbury by pope Vitalianus, A.D. 668. The council held at Whitby on the subject of Easter (A.D. 664) showed that strong traces still remained of the Oriental tendencies of the British Church; and an African monk, Adrian, was sent with the bishop elect as a safeguard and trusty envoy: “ne quid ille contrarium veritati et fidei,. Gracorum more, in ecclesiam cui praecesset, introduceret” (Bede, *H.E.* 4:1). To him is due the creation of the parochial system, by persuading the territorial proprietors to build and endow churches, retaining the advowson in their own hands. The Church-rate is of coordinate date. Theodore was a laborious student, and, with the assistance of Adrian, he gradually made the monasteries of England schools of sound learning. The principal sees having sprung from monastic origin, the canons were naturally monks. After the Conquest disputes arose between the secular and the regular, i.e., between the parochial and monastic clergy; and an attempt was made by Walkelin, bishop of Winchester, to supersede the monastic chapter by a body of forty secular clergy, Lanfranc, however, vigorously opposed the change, and obtained from pope Alexander a constitution in confirmation of the capitular rights of the monasteries affected (Fleury, *H.E.* 61:53; comp. also Soames, *Latin Ch. during the Anglo-Saxon Times* [Lond. 1848, 12mo]; and Soames, *The Anglo-Saxon- Ch.* [Lond. 1856, 12mo, 4th ed.]).

4. In 550 the rule of St. Basil, followed by all Greek monasteries, was introduced at Rome; but St. Benedict gradually absorbed all other monks into his great rule. In 585 St. Columban’s rule of prayer, reading, and manual labor was founded in Gaul. In 649 the Monothelite persecution in the East transferred many monks to the Western Church, and in the 8th century the Iconoclasts were the cause of a still larger assimilation. In the 13th century St. Dominic prevailed on women to observe a stricter rule. The first written rule — that of St. Basil, bishop of Caesarea in the 4th century, who embodied the traditional usages, was derived from that of Pachomius, and aimed at the combination of prayer and manual toil;’ it was modified by St. Benedict, the patriarch of Western monks, but in the 11th century was still vigorous in Naples. Polydore Vergil says that in 373 St. Basil first enacted the triple vows 9f chastity, poverty, and obedience. In 410 Lerins was founded. The Benedictine rule spread rapidly in Italy before his death in 543. Maurus and Plaidus extended it in France and Sicily; others introduced it into Spain, where monasteries are said to have existed in 380; and in less than two centuries all the monastic orders in the West were affiliated to it. St. Columban built the first abbey in England in 563, as he had done in Ireland; in the latter instance it was preceded only by the St. Bridget’s cell at Kildare, which was famous in 521, being established probably by a pupil of St. Patrick. In 802 the Council of Aix-la-Chapelle decreed that the Benedictine rule should be universally adopted. From the 10th century it put forth branches: Clugny in 910, under its abbots, embraced the rule; so did the Camaldolesi in 1020, from St. Romuald;-the Cistercians in 1098, from St. Robert; the Carthusians in 1080, from St. Bruno; the Valombrosans. in 1060, from John Gualberte; the Celestines in 1294, from Peter di Merona; and the Olivetans in 1319. At Bangor in 603 there was a monastery with seven portions, each consisting of three hundred monks. with their provosts or rectors. Benedict Biscop in 677 built the monasteries at Wearmouth and Yarrow of stone; and in 1035 Lanfranc united all the English abbeys into one congregation. St. Maur in 1621 was the last instance of its reform. The lands possessed by monasteries were held under the same tenure as all other land; and, till a comparatively late period, the abbots themselves led their quota of troops into the field. In the time of Charlemagne fourteen monasteries of the empire furnished their proportion of soldiers. In 982 the bishop of Augsburg and the abbot of Fulda were killed in the same battle. Charles Martel was opposed by troops collected and headed by an abbot of Fontenelle.

Monasteries were called *ingenua* if exempt from their foundation, or *libera* if the grant or privilege had been made subsequently. Those which were not exempt were compelled to render to the bishop obedience; annual fees called jus synodale, or circadas; procurations; or the provision of entertainment; solemn processions, and the right of celebrating mass in their minsters. All abbots, however, despite their repugnance, certainly after the 9th century, were compelled to make the profession of canonical obedience to the diocesan when receiving his benediction, and this implied his right to give holy orders, consecrate churches, altars, and cemeteries, and grant chrism and dismissory letters when the abbots travelled out of the diocese.

5. In their first institution, and in their subsequent uses, there can be no doubt that monasteries were among the most remarkable instances of Christian munificence, and they certainly were, in the so-called Dark Ages, among the beneficial adaptations of the talents of Christians to pious and charitable ends. The foundation of the monastery was the dictate of religious motives in the youth of the Church, but the reward of piety was temporal also; the estates of the founder were improved, the vassals educated, order introduced, the sick and aged tended, and handicraft and useful arts taught. “The services,” says Blunt, “that monasticism has rendered to civilization in the transition of society from ancient times to the Middle Ages have been most important. Monks were the skilled agriculturists of the period; and many terms in rural life, and in the fauna and botany of all Northern Europe, may be traced back through them to Greek and Latin terms; e.g. ‘hawky,’ οἴκι, harvest-home; and ‘ranny,’ *aranea,* a shrew-mouse; ‘chervil,’ χηρόφυλλον. The belladonna, which is now found indigenous, was introduced first among the pharmaceutical herbs of the convent-gardens, for the monks were the physicians of the period. As men of letters also and energetic missionaries they kept the lamp of knowledge and civilization from expiring in the very darkest periods; and whatever was done in the way of educating the young was carried on within the walls of the monastery.” Monasteries, indeed, were the sole preservers of learning in the Dark Ages. The Benedictines, bound by the rules of their order to mental as well as bodily labor, performed a work that has been of priceless value. That anything at all has come down to us from classical antiquity is owing in great part to their diligence as transcribers. Gerbert, an abbot, and afterwards pope Silvester II (999), speaks of his care in collecting books, and of the host of copiers that were found in every town: “Tu sai con quanta premura io raccolga da ogni parte libri; tu sai quanti scrittirie nelle citta e nelle ville d’Italia in ogni luogo s’incontrino” (Muratori, *Lit. It.* III, 1:29). Desiderius, abbot of Monte Casino, and subsequently pope Victor III, employed many copyists, “ antiquarii,” as they were called (Muratori, *Stor.* IV, chapter 28; Mabillon, *Act. Bened.).* Three offsets from the Benedictine stock have also rendered invaluable services to literature: the Clugniac monks, dating from the early part of the 10th century; the Carthusians (1084); and the Cistercians (1090). They created a craving for the luxury of books, beautifully written and sumptuously illuminated; and libraries, gradually increasing in size, soon grew up from their labors. “It was their pride to collect, and their business to transcribe books” (Hallam, *Literature of the Middle Ages,* 1:82); and their collections were the “ germ whence a second and more glorious civilization” should in due time spring (Macaulay, *Hist. of England,* chapter 1). But the evils which grew out of these societies more than counterbalanced the good. Being often exempted from all civil or foreign ecclesiastical authority, they became hotbeds of insubordination to the state and of corruption to the Church. The temptations arising out of a state of celibacy, too often enforced in the first instance by improper means, and always bound upon the members of these societies by a religious vow, were. the occasion of great scandals. Moreover, the enormous wealth with which some of them were endowed brought with it a greater degree of pride and ostentation and luxury than was becoming in Christians; and still more in those who had vowed a life of religious asceticism. Thus it came that the intrigues of the friars, the accumulation of wealth, and the decay of discipline wrought the fall of the monasteries. *SEE MONASTICISM*; *SEE MONK*. The monasteries of England were the first to feel the displeasure of the outside world. Corruption had become so apparent in the 8th century as to call for the founding of the Clugniac order on British soil. But this order, in turn, though beginning in the 10th century with a strict rule, sank into luxury in the 12th; the Cistercians then started to shame them, but soon lost all moral vigor; next the Franciscan mendicants appeared, but they degenerated more completely in the first quarter of a century after their introduction into England than other orders had in three or four centuries (comp. Matt. Paris. A.D. 1243; see Brakelond, *Chronicles Abb. S. Ednmundi;* Tho. Elmham. *Hist. Mon. St. Aug. Cantuar.;* Hugh de Poitiers, *Monastere (ke Vezelai).* No wonder, then, that an opposition found ready utterance and prompt organization, and, led successively by the greatest of Anglican scholars and divines, as

Wykeham, Fisher, Alcock, Chichely, Beckington, the countess of Salisbury, and cardinal Wolsey, claimed the monastic endowments for university foundations. “What, my lord,” said Oldham to Fox in 1513, “shall we build houses and provide livelihoods for a company of bussing monks, whose end and fall we may live to see?” *SEE REFORMATION, ENGLISH*. Thus it was not reserved for the period of the Reformation to inaugurate opposition to monasteries. Their dissolution was commenced in England as early as 1312, when the Order of Templars was suppressed, and a portion of their possessions given to the Knights of St. John of Jerusalem. During the 15th century many other houses were dissolved, and their revenues transferred to the universities of Oxford and Cambridge. Henry VIII obtained an act of Parliament for the dissolution of the monasteries, and the transfer of their revenues to the crown. Rome itself had furnished a precedent for Henry’s attack on the monastic institutions. About the year 1517 cardinal Wolsey was desirous of building and endowingi two splendid colleges — one at Ipswich, the place of his birth; the other at Oxford, the place of his academical education. For this purpose Clement VII granted him a bull, which empowered him to visit and suppress certain monasteries. A number of these, variously stated at from nineteen to forty, were consequently dissolved, and their revenues applied by Wolsey to the purpose contemplated.

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

Of lesser monasteries, of which we have the valuation....................	374
Of greater monasteries	186
Belonging to the Hospitallers.......................	48
Colleges	90
Hospitals..	110
Chantries and free chapels	2374
Total..	**3182**

These are in addition to the friars’ houses, and those suppressed by Wolsey, and many small houses of which we have no particular account.

The sum total of the clear yearly revenue of the several houses at the time of their dissolution, of which we have any account, seems to be as follows:

Of the greater monasteries £104,919 13 3

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

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

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

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

Total £140,784 19 2

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

Those of the lesser monasteries dissolved by 27

Henry VIII were reckoned at about 10,000

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

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

One for each chantry and free chapel 2,374

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

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

It is hardly necessary to state that all the Reformed churches in the 16th century discarded the practice of monachism, and suppressed monasteries as useless. In some of the German states, however, the temporalities of the suppressed monasteries were retained, and were granted at pleasure by the sovereign, to be enjoyed together with the titular dignity. In Roman Catholic countries also, as, e.g., France, Spain, Austria, and Italy, the suppression of monasteries has been more or less general in more recent times. *SEE MONASTICISM*. But, as count Montalembert has well put it in his celebrated work on the *A Monks of the West* (Edinb. 1861-7, 5 volumes, 8vo), "this work of spoliation, which may be said to have fairly set in with the Reformation, is now proceeding with methodical gravity." In the five years from 1830 to 1835 no less than "3000 monasteries have disappeared from the soil of Europe.” In Portugal some 300 were destroyed, 200 in Poland, and the number annihilated by queen Christina of Spain, though it has never been estimated, was certainly not much smaller than in Poland. The destruction, however, has proved greatest in the recent reforms in France, and especially in Italy. The great monastery of Clairvaux, which once held St. Bernard and his five hundred monks, is now a prison with five hundred convicts in it. The celebrated abbey at Clugny, which figures so largely in the history of the Middle Ages, has been turned into stud-stables, and in 1844 the place of the high-altar was “the starting-post of the stallions.” The abbey of Le Bec, in Normandy, from which Lanfrane and Anselm came forth successively to fill the see of Canterbury, has been utilized in the same fashion, and horses fatten where monks once fasted and prayed. A china manufactory is carried on in the Chartreux of Seville, and swine have taken possession of the cells in the Cistercian abbey of Cadouin. Everywhere, as the count informs us, the- work of ruin proceeds. “Sometimes,” says he, “the spinning-mill is installed under the roof of the ancient sanctuary. Instead of echoing night and day the praises of God, these dishonored arches too often repeat only the blasphemies and obscene cries, mingling with the shrill voice of the machinery, the grinding of the saw, or the monotonous clank of the piston.” Nor is this all. John Knox has been sometimes stigmatized as a barbarian for the encouragement which he is said to have given the populace in demolishing Christian edifices where the relics of idolatry were enshrined; yet even where the excited rabble did their worst, the ivied ruin still remains to tell of a grandeur which has passed away, and to mark, for the present and other generations, the spot where their fathers prayed. But in France, it appears, the work of demolition is done much more scientifically and thoroughly. They are not content there with confiscation, plunder, profanation; they overthrow, raze from the foundation, leave not a single stone standing on another. “The empire of the East,” says the count, “has not been ravaged by the Turks as France has been and still is by the band of insatiable destroyers who, after having purchased these vast constructions and immense dominions at the lowest rate, work them like quarries for sacrilegious profit. I have seen with my own -eyes the capitals and columns of an abbey-church which I could name employed as so much material for the neighboring road.” And again: “What remains of so many palaces raised in silence and solitude for the products of art, for the progress and pleasure of the mind, for disinterested labor? Masses of broken wall inhabited by owls and rats, shapeless remains, heaps of stones, and pools of water. Everywhere desolation, filth. and disorder” (Introduction, chapter 8). The young and free kingdom of Italy has not been slow to perceive that a sacerdotal class, with interests alien, if not antagonistic, to society and to the family, is necessarily and logically a foe to civil and political liberty. By a law enacted June 28, 1866, all monasteries and similar religious corporations in the kingdom of Italy were suppressed, their members pensioned, and their property sold and funded for the maintenance of public schools. Monte Casino and San Marco, of Florence, were alone exempted. The former is left as a venerable monument of the past; the latter is spared in honor of Savonarola and the beautiful frescos of Fra Angelico da Fiesole. This law has been executed with great rigor: and in spite of allocutions, excommunications, and all the *brutumfulmen* of the Vatican, the work of secularization is already finished. Some of the monks have gladly seized the opportunity of bettering their condition by marriage; others have returned to their homes or accepted the refuge offered by charity; but the great majority of these unfortunates, whose only crime consists in having been misplaced in chronology by being born several centuries too late, and whose habits are too fixed and inveterate to be easily changed, hire houses and live in clubs on the subsidies of the government. While in Italy and France, the two most Catholic nations, the monastic system is thus rapidly disappearing, the tendency to introduce similar institutions in Protestant countries, especially the effort of the Ritualists of the Anglican communion, under the pretence (more or less honest) of promoting Christian charities, can only be regarded as a fatal retrogression and dangerous degeneracy.

In 1870 revelations of corruption, bestiality, and cruelty in a Polish convent contributed more than all else to quicken the Protestant, and we may well say general dislike for monastic institutions. The story of Barbara Ubryk, the Polish nun, however exceptional, could not but raise a sense of horror throughout Europe, and it is not to be denied that the prejudice such an instance excites is in a great degree just. It is one thing to hear of. an exceptional instance of individual cruelty; it is another thing to know that such cruelty can be practiced in the name of religion, and in institutions which, under its shelter, claim peculiar immunities. There is great force in the plea that one such case substantiated justifies the public control of all similar establishments. In England, the famous trial of “Saurin v. Starr” revealed what spiritual tyranny and moral degradation might be concealed in conventual institutions under the most harmless exterior. The convent which Miss Saurin entered was one of those for which the plea is advanced that they do practical service in the cause of education and charity. It is not difficult to imagine that a hotheaded Protestant might have been for the time confused if he had been taken to see Miss Saurin and her fellow-sisters patiently devoting themselves to the instruction of their scholars. Yet, whatever the technical result of the trial, it left all impartial readers with a most painful impression of the degrading and demoralizing atmosphere of the convent. And in consequence Parliament was moved to appoint, March 29, 1870, a select committee to make inquiries concerning conventual or monastic institutions in Great Britain. The result of such investigation was unfavorable in that country, and has turned popular opinion against their existence. In Poland also the Russian government has in very recent times found itself faced with a most alarming spread of treason and corruption generated and fostered in monasteries, and the days of monasticism may be said to be numbered even there. As what is said of English Christianity is so well applicable to all other Protestant countries, we quote Mr. Blunt here in conclusion of this subject: “The day of monasticism has forever set... There is no longer any need for its existence, even if it could be set up again in its best condition. More than Benedictine learning sheds a ray of glory on our colleges. Our Poor-laws render unnecessary the alms for the’ monastery wicket; and such doles would become a positive evil now as an encouragement to idleness and sloth. Our clergy are welcome visitors at the cottage fireside, where the monk of later days was not, with his contributions for the house. The glory of monasticism was the fidelity with which it discharged its earlier mission; the self-sacrifice with which it taught men to rise superior to the trials and calamities of life; the unfeigned piety with which the monk resigned every earthly advantage that he might win a heavenly reward. But it survived its reputation, and there is more hope of recovering to life the carcass around which the eagles have gathered than of renovated monkdom. The ribaldry of Boccaccio and Rabelais, the *Ep. obscuror, vit.,* and the more measured terms of Piers Ploughman and Chaucer, were mainly instrumental in bringing about the downfall of monasticism; but this was after it had already been shorn of its splendor, and when scarcely a ray remained to it of its former glory” (comp. Murphy, *Terra Incognita, or the Convents of the United Kingdom* [Lond. 1873, 8vo; Pauli, *Pictures of Old England* [Lond. 1861, 12mo], chapter 3).

6. In *architectural arrangement,* monastic establishments, whether abbeys, priories, or other convents, followed nearly the same plan. The great enclosure (varying, of course, in extent with the wealth and importance of the monastery), generally with a stream running beside it, was surrounded by a wall, the principal entrance being through a *gateway* to the west or north-west. This gateway was a considerable building, and often contained a chapel, with its altar, besides the necessary accommodation for the porter. The *almery,* or place where alms were distributed, stood not far within the great gate, and generally a little to the right hand: there, too, was often a chapel with its altar. Proceeding onwards, the west entrance of the church appeared. The church itself was always, where it received its due development, in the form of a Latin cross; i.e., a cross of which the transepts are short in proportion to the nave. Moreover, in Norman churches, the eastern limb never approached the nave or western limb in length. Whether or not the reason of this preference of the Latin cross is found in the domestic arrangements of the monastic buildings, it was certainly best adapted to it; for the nave of the church, with one of the transepts, formed the whole of one side and part of another side of a quadrangle; and any other than a long nave would have involved a small quadrangle, while a long transept would leave too little of another side, or none at all, for other buildings. How the internal arrangements were affected by this adaptation of the nave to external requirements we have seen under the head CATHEDRAL, to which also we refer for the general description of the conventual church. Southward of the church, and parallel with the south transept was carried the western range, of the monastic offices; but it will be more convenient to examine their arrangement within the court. We enter, then, by a door near the west end of the church, and passing though a vaulted passage, find ourselves in the *cloister court,* of which the nave of the church forms the northern side, the transept part of the eastern side, and other buildings, in the order to be presently described, complete the quadrangle. The *cloisters* themselves extended around the whole of the quadrangle, serving, among other purposes, as a covered way from every part of the convent to every other part. They were furnished, perhaps always, with lavatories, on the decoration and construction of which much cost was expended; and sometimes also with desks and closets of wainscot, which served the purpose of a scriptorium. Commencing the circuit of the cloisters at the north-west corner, and turning southward, we have first the *dormitory* or *dorter,* the use of which is sufficiently indicated by its name. This occupied the whole of the western side of the quadrangle, and sometimes had a groined passage beneath its whole length, called’ the *ambulatory,* a noble example of which, in perfect preservation, remains at Fountains. The south side of the quadrangle contained the *refectory,* with its correlative, the *coquina* or *kitchen,* which was sometimes at its side, and sometimes behind it. The refectory was furnished with a pulpit, for the reading of some portion of Scripture during meals. On this side of the quadrangle may also be found, in general, the *locutorium* or *parlor,* the latter word being, at least in etymology, the full equivalent of the former. The *abbot’s lodge* commonly commenced at the south-east corner of the quadrangle; but, instead of conforming itself to its general direction, rather extended eastwards. with its own chapel, hall, parlor, kitchen, and other offices, in a line parallel with the choir or eastern limb of the church. Turning northwards, still continuing within the cloisters, we come first to an open passage leading outwards, then to the *chapter-house* or its vestibule; then, after another open passage, to the south transept of the church. Immediately before us is an entrance into the church, and another occurs at the end of the west cloister. The parts of the establishment especially connected with *sewerage* were built over or close to the stream; and we may remark that both in drainage and in the supply of water great and laudable care was always taken. The stream also turned the *abbey mill,* at a small distance from the monastery. Other offices, such as *stables, brewhouses, bakehouses,* and the like, in the larger establishments usually occupied another court, and in the smaller were connected with the chief buildings in the olly quadrangle. It is needless to say that, in so general an account, we cannot enumerate exceptional cases. It may, however, be necessary to say that the greatest difference of all, that of placing the quadrangle at the north, instead of the south side of the church, is not unknown; it is so at Canterbury and at Lincoln, for instance (comp. Hook, *Church Dict.* pages 414, 415). This branch of the subject may be followed out in the several plans of monasteries scattered among topographical works, and especially in Parker, *Glossary of Architecture,* page 146 sq.

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

Monasticism

(Gr. μονάζειν, — *to dwell apart* in solitude; whence μοναχός, a monk), a state of religious retirement, more or less complete, accompanied by contemplation and by various devotional, ascetical, and penitential practices, is in truth *Asceticism* (q.v.), with the elements of religious solitude superadded. Monasticism, until the beginning of the study of comparative religion, was regarded as a strictly Christian institution, but recent researches reveal it as having entered into various religious systems. both ancient and modern. Indeed, it is now clearly apparent that the Western theory of the ascetic life travelled from the East to the West, but the question of the. time when it originated in the East is still clouded in mystery. “The origin of monasticism,” writes Mr. Johnson in his little work on the: *Monks before Christ,* “will always be enveloped in mystery. ‘Its history is shrouded in the same obscurity as the source of the mighty stream upon the banks of which the first ascetics commenced the practice of their austerities’“ (pages 51, 52). The probability is that monachism is a strictly Asiatic institution, and originated among heathen nations. We certainly do not think that monasticism can prove a Christian or even Jewish origin; it is not heavenly, but earthly. Yet do we not desire to have our development theorists infer that we agree with them that it is one of the early religious forms of man. Says one, “The older the religion, the older its ascetic practices; for they were among the first forms assumed by the religious impulse, and not among the later and better ones. They belong to the religion of the passions and emotions, and not to the religion of reason;” and then he logically infers that therefore “monasticism is as old as religion itself; for it does not gain favor with the progress of new ideas, but is gradually falling in the estimation of all.” We are far from believing that monasticism is a primitive institution, and is forsaken by modern civilization. Quite the contrary, we hold that ascetic practices prevail largely among semi-civilized or civilized nations, and only after a clear conception has been formed of man’s dependence on a higher Being, and a desire is manifest for future existence. The inspired religion prepares the way for these, and from religious excesses or alienation spring the ascetic practices. In the far East the very notion of the supreme Lord faded for ages from the grasp of philosophy, and became too subtle and refined a conception for any to retain it in their knowledge; but the inherent evil of matter, of flesh, of sense, and of human life has remained to stimulate the curiosity, to exhaust the efforts of the melancholy victims of the grim delusion, and to shape in various forms the fact that man’s incumbent duty .has ever been to escape from the contamination, and rise above the conditions of the flesh. Indeed, we believe that ascetic tendencies in general, and monasticism in particular, are the outgrowth of a religious enthusiasm, seriousness, and ambition likely to be pursued only by those who have once believed in revealed religion and have retrograded, having. gone from the presence of their God to the idol they reared to represent him. But, whatever may be the differences of opinion as to the relation of the heathen religions to the revealed, it is generally conceded that monasticism cannot prove its heavenly origin, nor honestly identify itself with the Christian religion, as it is known to be *much older than Christianity.* In times far anterior to the Gospel, prophets and martyrs, “in sheepskins and goatskins,” wandered in the Oriental world over mountains and deserts; and dwelt in caves and dens of the earth, as have likewise evangelical monks.

I. *Pagan Monachism.* —

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

2. *Earliest written History of Monachism*. — If from these monuments we descend to an examination of the written books of the ancients, and search in “The Nabatean Agriculture,” which is believed to have been written about the time of Nebuchadnezzar (or B.C. 600) we find in this history of Chaldsea, reaching back several thousands of years before .the beginning of the Christian Vera, that in the very earliest history of which this work gives any account there flourished Azada, an apostle of Saturn, who “founded the religion of renunciation or asceticism,” and that “his partisans and followers were the subjects of persecution by the higher and cultivated classes; but that to the mass of the people, on the contrary, they were the objects of the highest veneration.” Another ascetic whom it mentions flourished about B.C. 2000. He is said to have inveighed against the godliness of those who believed it possible to preserve the human body from decay, after death, by the employment of certain natural agents. “Not by natural means,” warmly replies Dhagrit, “can man preserve his body from corruption and dissolution after death, but only through good deeds, *religious exercises,* and offering of sacrifices — by invoking the gods by their great and beautiful *names — by prayers during the night, and fasts during the day.”* Then Dhagrit goes on, in his monkish zeal, to give the names of various saints of Babylonian antiquity whose bodies had long been preserved, after death, from corruption and change, and says: “These men had distinguished themselves by piety, by abstemiousness, and by their manner of life, which resembled that of angels; and the gods, therefore, by their grace, had preserved the bodies of these men from corruption; whereby those of later times, in view of the same, were encouraged in piety, and in the imitation of those holy modes of life.” See Chwolson, *Ueber die Ueberreste der altbabylonischen Literatur* (St. Petersburg, 1859); M. le Baron de St. Croix, *Recherches Historiques et Critiques sur les Mysteres du Paganisme* (Paris, 1817).

Turning from these written sources, still the subjects of much discussion as to their authenticity, to the well established records of India, Persia, and China, the oldest written records in existence aside from the sacred Scriptures (viz. the Veda [q.v.] and the Laws of Manu [q.v.] — the sacred books of the Brahmins; the Zend Avesta [q.v.] — the sacred book of the Persians or Zoroastrians; and the Shu-King, *SEE CONFUCIUS* — the sacred book of China), we find the hoary parent of monastic rule dwelling in the far East, and gathering obedient millions, under her ample folds, long before the introduction of Christianity, even if we should trace Christian monasticism back to St. Bartholomew and St. Thomas.

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

3. *Probable Origin of Eastern Monachism.* — “At an early period of the present era of Brahminic manifestation,” the legend goes, in the Rig-Veda, “Dhruva, the son of Uttanapada, the son of Manu Swayambhuva, who was ‘born of and one with Brahma,’ began to perform penance, *as enjoined by the sages,* on the banks of the Yamuna. While his mind was wholly absorbed in meditation, the mighty Hari, identical with all natures, took possession of his heart. Vishnu being thus present in his mind, the earth, the supporter of elemental life, could not sustain the weight of the ascetic. The celestials called Yamas, being excessively alarmed, then took counsel with Indra how they should interrupt the devout exercises of Dhruva; and the divine beings termed Kushmandas, in company with their king, commenced anxious efforts to distract his meditations. One, assuming the semblance of his mother, Suniti, stood weeping before him, and calling in tender accents, ‘My son, my son, desist from destroying thy strength by this fearful penance! What hast thou, a child but five years old, to do with rigorous penance? Desist from such fearful practices, that yield no beneficial fruit. First comes the season of youthful pastime, and when that is over it is the time for study; then succeeds the period of worldly enjoyments; and, lastly, that of austere devotion. This is thy season of pastime, my child. Hast thou engaged in these practices to put an end to existence? Thy chief duty is love for me; duties are according to time of life. Lose not thyself in bewildering error — desist from such unrighteous actions. If not, if thou wilt not desist from these austerities, I will terminate my life before thee.' But Dhruva, being wholly intent on seeing Vishnu, beheld not his mother weeping in his presence, and calling upon him; and the illusion, crying out, 'Fly, fly, my child; the hideous spirits of ill are crowding into this terrible forest with uplifted weapons,' quickly disappeared. Then advanced frightful rakshasas, wielding terrible arms, and with countenances emitting fiery flame; and nocturnal fiends thronged around the prince, uttering fearful noises, and whirling and tossing their threatening weapons. Hundreds of jackals, from whose mouths gushed flame as they devoured their prey, were howling around to appall the boy, wholly engrossed by meditation.' The goblins called out, 'Kill him! kill him! — cut him to pieces! eat him! eat him!' and monsters, with the faces of camels and crocodiles and lions, roared and yelled with horrible cries to terrify the prince. But all these uncouth speeches, appalling cries, and threatening weapons made no impression upon his senses, whose mind was completely intent on Govinda. The son of the monarch of the earth, engrossed by one idea, beheld uninterruptedly Vishnu seated in his soul, and saw no other object." How like the legends of Christian monachism are these pagan descriptions! The desert has always been the abode of asceticism, whose devotees, in their struggle against the flesh, peopled its sands with horrible monsters of every kind — with devils, hobgoblins, and giants, who (in the minds of the people) have held possession ever since. The Vedas also command that the tonsure be performed, but, so far as known, they prescribed no rules with regard to the monastic life. Their teachings seem to be confined solely to asceticism. On the other hand, in the Laws of Manu rules are given for the conduct of monastics; and, as these rules were **in** the possession of the people of India long before they were committed to writing, it is no wonder that monasticism is believed to have been practiced for thousands of years before the time of Christ. Hardwick, by no means a superficial student, is led even, in the face of these conditions, to say that "India was the real *birthplace* of monasticism"

(Christ and other Masters, 1:351). A large portion of the Laws of Manu are taken up by regulations to be observed by those who wish to attain to the ultimate good by the practice of monastic observances. The rule of St. Benedict itself does not afford a more decided proof of the existence of the ascetic life. The work is divided into twelve books. The sixth book is entitled "Duties" of the Anchorite and of the Ascetic Devotee." The subject of the eleventh book is "Penitences and Expiations." The Dwijas, for whom these rules are principally laid down, are described as a sort of monks, who practiced tonsure, wore girdle, carried staff, asked alms, fasted, lacerated the body, and dwelt for the most part in the deserts and forests. We have space but for a few illustrations, which will suffice, however, to show the character of this work. From the sixth book, "Duties of the Anchorite and of the Ascetic Devotee," we quote as follows:

> "¶24. The' Dwija, who dwells. alone, should deliver himself to austerities, increasing constantly in their severity, that he may wither up his mortal substance.
>
> "¶ 27. Let him receive from the Brahminical anchorites, who live in houses, such alms as may be necessary to support his existence." (The case was similar in early Christian times: Simon the Stylite, and a host of others, were thus provided for.)
>
> "¶ 49. Meditating with delight on the supreme soul, seated, wanting nothing, inaccessible to all. sensual desire, without other society than his own soul, let him live here below in the constant expectancy of the eternal beatitude.
>
> "¶ 75. In subduing his organs, in accomplishing the pious duties prescribed by the Vedas, and in submitting one's self to the most austere practices, one is able to attain here below to the supreme end, which is to become identified with Brahma." ("Their whole doctrine of spirit, of the supreme-Being, and the relation of man to God, must have made the Brahmins ascetics from the very first. So that, when the origin of this religion can be ascertained, we may say, without further examination, monasticism was there, and gave birth to it?' [Johnson *Monks before Christ.* page 70].)
>
> "¶ 87. The novice, the marled man, the anchorite, and the ascetic devotee form four distinct orders, which derive the origin from the superior of the house.

> “¶ 91. The Dwijas, who belong to these four orders, ought always to practice with. the greatest care the ten virtues which compose their dutiy.
>
> “¶ 92. Resignation, the act of rendering good for evil, temperance, probity, purity, the subjugation of the senses, the knowledge of the Shastras, that of the supreme soul, veracity, and abstinence from choler — such are the ten virtues in which their duty consists.”

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

> “¶ 211. The Dwija, who undergoes the *ordinary* penitence called Prajapatya, ought to eat during three days only in the morning; during the next three days, only at night; during the following three days, he should partake only of such food as persons may give him voluntarily, without his begging for it; and, finally, let him fast three days entirely.
>
> “¶’ 214. A Brahmin, accomplishing the *severe* penitence (Taptakrichra), ought to swallow nothing but warm water, warm milk, cold clarified butter, and warm vapor employing each of them three days in succession.
>
> “¶ 215. He who, master of his senses and perfectly attentive, supports a fast of twelve days, makes the penitence called Paroka, which expiates all of his faults.
>
> “¶ 216. Let the penitent who desires to make the Chandrayana, having eaten fifteen mouthfulls on the day of the full moon, diminish his nourishment by one mouthful each day during the fifteen days of obscuration which follow, in such a manner that on the fourteenth day he shall eat but one mouthful, and then let him fast on the fifteenth, which is the day of the new moon; let him augment, on the contrary, his nourishment by one mouthful each day during the next fifteen days, commencing the first day with one mouthful.
>
> “¶ 239. Great criminals, and all other men guilty of divers faults, are released from the consequences of their sins by austerities practiced with exactitude.

> “¶ 251. By reciting the Hovichyantiya or the Natamanha sixteen times a day for a month, or by repeating inaudibly the hymn Porucha, he who has defiled the bed of his spiritual master is absolved from all fault.”

“The ascetic system,” says Schaff, “is essential alike to Brahminism, *SEE HINDUISM*, and Buddhism (q.v.); the two opposite and yet cognate branches of the Indian religion, which in many respects are similarly related to each other as Judaism is to Christianity, or as Romanism to Protestantism. Buddhism is a later reformation of Brahminism... But the two religions start from opposite principles. Brahminic asceticism proceeds from a pantheistic view of the world — the Buddhistic from an atheistic and nihilistic, yet very earnest view; the one is controlled by the idea of the absolute but abstract unity, and a feeling of contempt of the world — the other by the idea of the absolute but unreal variety, and a feeling of deep grief over the emptiness and nothingness of all existence; the one is predominantly objective, positive, and idealistic — the other more — subjective, negative, and realistic; the one aims at absorption into the universal spirit of Brahma — the other constantly at an absorption into nonentity.” “Brahminism,’ says Wuttke, “looks back to the beginning, Buddhism to the end; the former loves cosmogony, the latter eschatology. Both reject the existing world; the Brahmin despises it because he contrasts it with the higher being of Brahma; the Buddhist bewails it because of its unrealness; the former sees God in all, the other emptiness in all” *(Des Geistesleben der Chinesen, Japaner, und Indier,* 1853, page 593, constituting part 2 of his *History of Heathenism).* “Yet,” adds Schaff, “as all extremes meet, the abstract all — entity of Brahminism and the equally abstract non-entity or vacuity of Buddhism come to the same thing in the end, and may lead to the same ascetic practices. The asceticism of Brahminism takes more the direction of anchoretism, while that of Buddhism exists generally in the social form of regular convent life.” The Hindu monks, the Vanaprastha, or *Gymnosophists* (q.v.), as the Greeks called them, are Brahminical anchorites (q.v.), who live in woods or caves, on mountains or rocks, in. poverty, celibacy, abstinence, contemplation: sleeping on straw or the bare ground, crawling on the belly, macerating the body, standing all day on tiptoe, exposed to the, pouring rain or scorching sun with four fires kindled around them, presenting a savage and frightful appearance, yet greatly revered by the multitude, especially the women. As procreation of at least one child is strictly enjoined by Brahminism, some take their wives along, but never have intercourse with them except at such times as they are most likely to conceive. They are reputed to perform miracles, and not unfrequently complete their austerities by suicide on the stake or in the waves of the Ganges. Thus they are described by the ancients and by modern travellers (see Dubois, *Description of the Character, Manners, and Customs of the People of India* [Philadelphia, 1818]).

The Buddhist monks are less fanatical and extravagant than the Hindu *Yogis* (q.v.) and *Fakirs* (q.v.). They depend mainly on fasting, prayer, psalmody, intense contemplation, and the use of the whip, to keep their rebellious flesh in subjection. *SEE BUDDHISM*; *SEE GOTAMA*. They have a fully developed system of monasticism in connection with their priesthood, and a large number of convents; also nunneries for female devotees. The laws of Buddha, it is true, are often .purely moral, and they do: not profess to be the transcript of a higher than a human mind. Yet they aimed at reducing the entire company of the faithful to strictly monastic rule, to the mortification of all human passion, to the separation and isolation of the sexes, to mendicancy, and to the cessation and relinquishing of all personal and individual rights. Hence India, though she expelled Buddhistic rule, and princes and professors from her soil, yet shows at a hundred points the deep furrow which Buddhist monasticism has drawn across the more hoary superstitions and more agonizing asceticism of Hindu philosophy; and her monuments and literature bear witness to the brave, self-sacrificing devotion of these sons and daughters of Buddha, and to the fact that they went into all Eastern lands to preach the faith of their sires, to build monasteries, to organize worship, to multiply their sacred books, to perform pilgrimage to holy shrines of their faith, to adore the relics of saints and martyrs, and work miracles by their aid, and to adapt themselves to such varying populations as the cultivated philosophers of Nepaul, the ingenious and susceptible Japanese, the Cingalese, and Burmese, to say nothing of the pontifical empire of Tibet (q.v.), intentions, the young prince said, ‘Let us turn back: I must think how to accomplish deliverance.’ A last meeting put an end to his hesitation. He was driving through the northern gate, on the way to his pleasure gardens, when he saw a mendicant, who appeared outwardly calm, subdued, looking downwards, wearing with an air of dignity his religious vestment, and carrying an alms-bowl. ‘Who is this man?’ asked the prince. ‘Sir,’ replied the coachman, ‘this man is one of those who are called *bikshus,* or mendicants. He has renounced all pleasures, all desires, and leads a life of austerity. He tries to conquer himself. He has become a devotee: without passion, without envy, he walks about asking for alms.' 'This is good and well said,' replied the prince. 'The life of a devotee has always been praised by the wise. It will be my refuge, and the refuge of other creatures: it will lead us to a real life, to happiness and immortality.' With these words, the young prince turned his chariot, and re-entered the city" (translated in Muller's *Essays on the Science of Religion).* Buddha then declared to his father and wife his determination to become a recluse, and soon after escaped from his palace in the night while the guards had fallen asleep. The religion which he established is now, after a lapse of 2000 years, professed by one third of the inhabitants of the entire globe. One king is said to have founded 84,000 monasteries for his order, that being the number of discourses which Buddha pronounced during his lifetime. The "Law" which he gave to his order is contained in the first of the three Pitakas, and was orally handed down until about B.C. 100, when it was committed to writing in the island of Ceylon. It is called the Winaya Pitaka. and contains rules for every conceivable monastic observance. It is composed of 42,250 stanzas. To alms-giving Buddha attached an extraordinary importance. He declares that "there is no reward either in this world or in the next that may not be received through almsgiving." Ten centuries later, Chrysostom wrote, '"Hast thou a penny? purchase heaven. Heaven is on sale, and in the market, and yet ye mind it not! Give a crust, and take back paradise; give the least, and receive the greatest; give the perishable, and receive the imperishable; give the corruptible, and receive the incorruptible. Alms are the redemption of the soul... Alms-giving, which is able to break the chain of thy sins... Alms-giving, the queen of virtues, and the readiest of all ways of getting into heaven, and the best advocated there" (comp. Taylor, *Anc. Christianity).* According to the Winaya Pitaka, "The wise priest never asks for anything; he disdains to beg: it is a proper object for which he carries the alms-bowl; and this is the only mode of solicitation." Celibacy, poverty, the tonsure, a particular garb, confession of sins, etc., are made compulsory. The vows, however, are not taken for life; and a monk may retire from the order if he finds it impossible to remain continent. A novitiate is provided for; and there are "nuns" or "sisters" who live in houses by themselves. The novice usually begins her connection with the order in the school, where she is sent while yet quite young. Foundlings were often given to the early Christian monasteries, by whom they were reared for the ascetic life. *No Buddhist* *can attain to Nirvana unless he has served a time as an ascetic.* There are five modes of meditation specified by the Pitaka: 1, Maitri; 2, Mudita; 3, Karuna; 4, Upeksha; 5, Asubha. We read of a monk who was so profoundly sunk in contemplation that he did not wash his feet for thirty years; so that at last the divine beings called *dervas* could smell him a thousand miles off. The monk refrains from severely injuring his body, so that he may practice as long as possible his ascetic rites. Their mode of reasoning on this subject is illustrated by the following quotation from the *Milinda-prasna, a* work in Pali and Cingalese: "*Milinda.* Do the priests respect the body? — *Nagasena. No.* — *Milinda.* Then why do they take so much pains to preserve it? Do they not by this means say, 'This is me, or *mine*?' —*Nagasena.* Were you ever wounded by an arrow in battle? — *Milinda. Yes.* — *Nagasena.* Was not the wound anointed? Was it not rubbed with oil? And was it not covered with a soft bandage? — *Milinda. Yes.* —*Nagasena.* Was this done because you respected the wound, or took delight in it? — *Milinda.* No; but that it might be healed. — *Nagasena.* In like manner, the priests do not preserve the body because they respect it, but that they may have the power required for the keeping of the precepts."

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

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

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

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

(5.) *Jewish Monachism.* — The origin and extent of Jewish monasticism is shrouded in much uncertainty and doubt. Yet it is clearly manifest from the records that have come down to us that Judaism was not altogether alien to asceticism. As far back as the days of Moses, while the Israelites were yet in the wilderness, a special law was made for those who should seek an ascetic life; and the *Nazarites* (q.v.), though, they did not separate themselves from the other people, yet did set themselves *apart* for special divine worship (<040601>Numbers 6:1-21; <071305>Judges 13:5; <090111>1 Samuel 1:11; <420115>Luke 1:15). Later, in Palestine, the Jews had their *Essenes* (q.v.), and in Egypt their *Therapeute* (q.v.), though it must be confessed that these betray the intrusion of foreign elements into the Mosaic religion, and so receive no mention in the New Test., unless the allusion in <401912>Matthew

19:12 refers to these ascetics, which is believed, however, by only a few Biblical scholars. (See, besides the works quoted in the article ESSENES *SEE ESSENES* , Zeller, *Griech-Philos.* volume 3, part 2, page 589; and *Theol. Jahrb.* 1856, 3:358; Keim, *Der Geschichtliche Christus* [Zurich, 1865], page 15; Langen, *Das Judenthum in Palistina zur Zeit Christi* [Freib. 1866], page 186.)

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

II. *Christian Monachism.* —

1. *Origin of Monasticism in the Church.* —The advocates of Christian monasticism claim for it an evangelical origin. They think they find at once its justification and primitive form in the Gospel exhortation to voluntary. poverty (the instance in which Christ charged the rich young man to sell all he had, that; as a follower of his, he should receive a hundred-fold more, “with persecution,” <401921>Matthew 19:21). “But this monastic interpretation of primitive Christianity,” as Dr. Schaff has well said, “mistakes a few incidental points of outward resemblance for essential identity, measures the spirit of Christianity by some isolated passages, instead of explaining the latter from the former, and is upon the whole a miserable emaciation and caricature. The Gospel makes upon all men virtually the same moral demand, and knows no distinction of a religion for the masses and another for the few.” Monachism, in this light, is at variance with the pure spirit of Christianity, inasmuch as it impels men, instead of remaining as a salt to the corrupt world in which they live, outwardly to withdraw from it, and to bury the talent which otherwise they might use for the benefit of the many. “Jesus, the model for all believers, was neither a cenobite nor an anchoret, nor an ascetic of any kind, but the perfect pattern man for universal imitation. There is not a trace of monkish austerity and ascetic rigor in his life or precepts, but in all his acts and words a wonderful harmony of freedom and purity, of the most comprehensive charity and spotless holiness. He retired to the mountains and into solitude, but only temporarily and for the purpose of renewing his strength for active work. Amid the society of his disciples, of both sexes, with kindred and friends, in Cana and Bethany, at the table of publicans and sinners, and in intercourse with all classes of the people, he kept himself unspotted from the world, and transfigured the world into the kingdom of God. His poverty and celibacy have nothing to do with asceticism, but represent, the one the condescension of his redeeming love, the other his ideal uniqueness and his absolutely peculiar relation ‘to the whole Church, which alone is fit or worthy to be his bride... The life of the apostles and primitive Christians in general was anything but a hermit life; else had not the Gospel spread so quickly to all the cities of the Roman world. Peter was married, and travelled with his wife as a missionary. Paul assumes one marriage of the clergy as a rule, and notwithstanding his personal and relative preference for celibacy in the then oppressed condition of the Church, he is the most zealous advocate of evangelical freedom, in opposition to all legal bondage and anxious asceticism.”

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

But though monasticism was not a form of life that sprang originally and purely out of Christianity, yet there can be no doubt that by Christianity a new spirit was infused into this foreign mode of life, whereby with many it became ennobled and converted into an instrument of effecting much which could not otherwise have been effected by any such mode of living. Unless this view is taken, it would, as Dr. Schaff has well said, “involve the entire ancient Church, with its greatest and best representatives both East and West — its Athanasius, its Chrysostom, its Jerome, its Augustine in apostasy from the faith.” And, as he aptly adds, “no one will now hold that these men, who all admired and commended the monastic life, were antichristian errorists, and that the few and almost exclusively negative opponents of that asceticism, as Jovinian. Helvidius, and Vigilantius, were the sole representatives of pure Christianity in the Nicene and next following age” (comp. Kingsley, *Hermits,* pages 14, 15). We shall come to consider the good and evil influences in another part of this article. Here we have to deal simply with its origin and relation to primitive Christianity. In the article ASCETICISM *SEE ASCETICISM* it has been shown that a distinction must be made between it and the monastic life, which was not known until the 4th century. That class of ascetics known as *Hermits* flourished probably as early as the age succeeding Christ’s stay on earth; indeed, it is barely possible that its origin may be traced to John the Baptist and his surroundings. There were, no doubt, many in the early Church who, with a view to more complete freedom from the cares, temptations, and business of the world, withdrew from the ordinary intercourse of life, and took up their abode in natural caverns or rudely formed huts in deserts, forests, mountains, and other solitary places. The pagan depravation of manners must have in no small degree contributed to it. Then there must naturally have been multitudes of outwardly professing Christians, especially in large cities, who sickened the heart of those earnest souls whose spirit and disposition led to a nearness with Christ. Hence we find that hermits are generally spoken of as emanating from large cities, which were seats of corruption, thereby indicating clearly that in the primitive Church the ascetic desire was prompted by man’s noblest impulses. In the writings of the Church fathers we can trace these germs of Christian monachism back to the middle of the 2d century. Thus writes Ricaut, when speaking of Mount Athos *(Present State of the Greek and Armenian Churches* [A.D. 1678], page 218): “Though St. Basil was the first author and founder of the order *of Greek* monks, so that before his time there could be none who professed the strict way of living in convents and religious societies — I mean in Greece — yet certainly, before his time, the convenience of the place, and the situation thereof, might invite *Hermites*, and persons delighting in solitary devotions, of which the world, in the *first* and *second* century, did abound” (comp. Origen, *Ep. ad Rom.* c. 3; Mohler, *Gesch. d. Monchthums in sersten Entstehung*, etc., in *Vermzischte Schriften*, 2:165 sq.). Yet it is as late as the middle of the. 3d century, in which falls the Decian persecution (A.D. 249-251), that there are first brought to light numerous instances of a retirement of devoted Christians to the desert (comp. Sozomen, *Hist. Ecclesiastes* lib. 6 cap. 43). But even these hermits were not monastics in the modern sense of the word. They were accustomed to live singly, each according to his own inclination, without any specific form of union, and that *within* the precincts of the Church to which they severally belonged, unless personal safety required removal to more distant parts. It was reserved for the 4th century — the very age which gave state aid and perpetuity to Christianity — to develop that branch of asceticism which has ever since continued to flourish in a part of the Church, and to this day figures in the history of Christian civilization, sometimes to advantage, and oftentimes to great disadvantage.

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

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

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

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

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

SEE DEACONESSES. There was, to be sure, a class of hermits, the *Sarabaites* (q.v.) in Egypt, and the *Rhemoboths* (q.v.) in Syria; but their quarrelsomeness, occasional intemperance, and opposition to the clergy brought them into ill-repute.

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

Like all the other ascetic institutions, the monastic life also found its home in Egypt. The country was certainly favorable to the production and expansion of just such an institution. “The land where Oriental and Grecian literature, philosophy, and religion, Christian orthodoxy and Gnostic heresy, met both in friendship and in hostility,” was in every way adapted to be “the native land” of the monastic life. We may add also that “monasticism was favored and promoted here by climate and geographic features, by the oasislike seclusion of the country, by the bold contrast of barren deserts with the fertile valley of the Nile, by the superstition, the contemplative turn, and the passive endurance of the national character, by the example of the Therapeutae, and by the moral principles of the Alexandrian fathers; especially by Origen’s theory of a higher and lower morality, and of the merit of voluntary poverty and celibacy.” Even back in the days of Elian we are told by him that the Egyptians bear the most exquisite torture without a murmur, and would rather be tormented to death than compromise truth. Such natures, once seized with religious enthusiasm, were certainly very eminently qualified for saints of the desert.

No wonder, then, that the monastic life soon gained general favor. *Pachomius* (292-348), a disciple of Anthony, is recognized as the founder of this peculiar, ascetic life. Palladius, himself a convert in these early days to this institution, furnishes an account of its progress in connection with an account of its author, which Neander thus presents: “Pachomius, at the beginning of the 4th century, when a young man, after having obtained his release from the military service, into which he had been forced, attached himself to an aged hermit, with whom he passed twelve years of his life. Here he felt the impulse of Christian love, which taught him that he ought not to live merely so as to promote his own growth to perfection, but .to seek also the salvation of his brethren. He supposed unless this is a decoration of the legend — that in a vision he heard the voice of an angel giving utterance to the call in his own breast — it was the divine will that he should be an instrument for the good of his brethren, by reconciling them to God *(Vita Pachom., §* 15). On Tabennae, an island of the Nile, in Upper Egypt, betwixt the Nomes of Tenthyra and Thebes, he founded a society of monks, which during the lifetime of Pachonlius himself numbered three thousand, and afterwards seven thousand members; and thus went on increasing until, in the first half of the 5th century, it could reckon within its rules fifty thousand monks *(Lauriaca,* 6:1, c. 909; also c. 38, fol. 957; Hieronymi *Profat. in regulan. Pachomii, §* 7).” We are told that when Athanasius visited Pachomius three thousand monks passed before him in procession, chanting hymns, and exhibiting practical proofs of direct piety under the monastic rule. Nor was the new movement confined to the Tabenus region. The development in the Nitrian and Thebaid deserts was equally rapid; so that Rufinus *(V. Patr.* 2:7) affirms that the monastic population of Egypt equalled the inhabitants of the towns. In the single district of Nitria, we are told, there were no fewer than fifty monasteries (Sozomen, *Ecclesiastes Hist.* 6:31) and the civil authorities even found it expedient to place restrictions on their excessive multiplication. Neither was the movement confined to Egypt. Arabia, Syria, Palestine, and more especially the region of Mount Sinai, soon swarmed with recluses, and were thickly studded with monasteries. “We daily receive monks,” says Jerome (346-420), writing at Bethlehem, “from India, and Persia, and Ethiopia.” The entire Eastern Church gave this practice confidence, and the greatest teachers of the Church — as Gregory Nazianzen (329-389). Basil the Great (328-379), and the golden-tongued Chrysostom (342-407) became its enthusiastic admirers and promoters. Nor did the desert remain the home of the new life. Monastic institutions were soon transplanted to the towns, and in agitated times these places became safe houses of refuge from the troubles of the world. Indeed, it must be conceded by all honest students of early ecclesiastical history that the example of the monasticism of the early Eastern Church had a powerful influence in forwarding the progress of Christianity; although it is also certain that the admiration which it excited occasionally led to its natural consequence among the members, by eliciting a spirit of pride and ostentation, and by provoking, sometimes to fanatical excesses of austerity, sometimes to hypocritical simulations of rigor. The abuses which arose, even in the early stages of monachism, are deplored by the very fathers who are most eloquent in their praises of the institution itself. These abuses prevailed chiefly in a class of monks called *Sarabaites* (q.v.), who lived in small communities of three or four, and sometimes led a wandering and irregular life.. Yet though many took exception to any abuses growing out of the institution, but few were found, like Jovinian, to assail the principle. And even emperors, as, e.g., Valens and his successors, sought in vain to arrest the too rapid increase of monachism. A picture is drawn by Theodoret, in his *Religious Histories*, of the rigor and mortification practiced in some of the greater monasteries, which goes far to explain the assertion of Protestant writers that the monks were commonly zealots in religion; and that much of the bitterness of the religious controversies of the East was due to their unrestrained zeal; and that the opinions which led to these controversies originated for the most part among the theologians of the cloisters. (Most famous among these was an order called *Acemetce* [Gr. *sleepless]*, from their maintaining the public services of the Church day and night without interruption. *SEE IMAGE-WORSHIP*; *SEE MONOPHYSITES*; *SEE MONOTHELITES*; *SEE TORIANS*.)

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

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

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

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

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

Everywhere the institution now spread rapidly, in the same general forms in which the monasteries were built up in the East. Pachomius had started some of these and given them monastic shape, but it was reserved for Basil the Great (328-379) to give perfect organization to the vast army of monks, and to bind them by a formal vow of chastity, poverty (involving the duty of self-support by manual labor), and obedience to authority. But even Basil’s work was vague and desultory, and St. Augustine was not a little tried in his endeavors to diffuse monasticism in North Africa and Italy. He condemned the idleness of the monks ever fearing the danger which would spring from affording too great freedom to men who had been accustomed to severe corporeal labor and to rigid restraint. Many there were who would be right well disposed to exchange a needy, sorrowful, and laborious life for one free from all care, exempt from labor, and at the same time enjoy the pleasure of being looked up to with universal respect .

Those who discarded the obligation to manual labor ventured, in defending their principles, to pervert many passages of the New Testament. When that precept of the apostle Paul in <530312>2 Thessalonians 3:12, was objected to them, they appealed, on the other hand, to those misconceived passages in the Sermon on the Mount in which all care for the wants of the morrow, hence all labor to, acquire the means of sustenance for the morrow, were forbidden. Christian perfection was made to consist in this-that men should expect, without laboring for their support, to be provided for by the hand of God, like the fowls of the air. This precept of Christ, they contended, Paul could not mean to contradict; the laboring, accordingly, as well as the eating, in those words of Paul, must be understood not in the literal, but in a spiritual sense — as referring to the obligation of communicating the nourishment of the divine Word, which men had themselves received, to others also — an example of the perversion of Scripture worthy to be noticed. But not only Augustine other friends of monasticism soon came to apprehend the obstacles likely to face Christian activity, and a Church, Council, that of Chaledon (A.D. 451), found it necessary to pass canons for the regulation of monks. Yet these changes could affect only the East, the West having no part in its deliberations, and having as its representatives only four papal legates. Hence, while in the East some provisions. were made for the safety of Christian asceticism, in the: garb-of monasticism, the Western Church was constantly and considerably modifying the Eastern practices, until the relaxations of Western monastics threatened apostasy and heresy unlimited. The inmates of different cells under the same head varied in their observance, each recluse retaining his accustomed usage when admitted into the community. And, in truth, no rule could well be universal. In Gaul the monks declaimed against the severe rule of fasting imported from the East. A discipline that was practicable under a burning Syrian sun required modification to suit the colder latitude of Gaul. Discontent and laxity were taking hold everywhere, and monachism would perhaps have been unable to withstand the destructive influences which, in this and the following times, were spreading far and wide;, and the irregularities prevailing in the spiritual order would have become more widely diffused in Western monachism, which had a still laxer constitution, had not a remarkable man introduced into the monastic life a more settled order and a more rigid discipline, and given it the shaping and direction of a hierarchical religious order, by which it became so influential an instrument to Christianity, particularly for the conversion and the culture of rude nations (Neander, 2:259). This remarkable man was *Benedict,* an Italian monk of the early part of the 6th century. His religious rules were at first intended and framed merely for the government of the convent Monte Cassino (q.v.). over which he presided, but they afterwards were adopted by or forced upon a very great number of monasteries. His rule was founded on that of Pachomius, though in many respects it deviated from it. His great object seems to have been to render the discipline of the monks milder, their establishment more solid, and their manners more regular than those of other monastic establishments. “Benedict,” says Neander, “aimed to counteract the licentious life of the irregular monks who roamed about the country, and spread a corrupting influence, both on manners and on religion-by the introduction of a severer discipline and spirit of order.” The dominant principles of Benedict’s rule are obedience and labor; being administrative rather than creative in its origin, and presupposing the existing rules of chastity and poverty. The founder speaks of his rule as merely a beginning, a tentative ordinance — “Hanc minimam inchoationis regulam,” etc. (c. 73). The principal of every establishment was enjoined to take counsel, either of the whole house in capitular assembly, or of the decanal body chosen from the different decades of the community. A candidate for the novitiate was long kept without the walls to try his constancy... When admitted within, he was placed for two months under the tuition and surveillance of an experienced monk, and warned daily with respect to the hardships and discipline of the monastery. If the novice still wished to take the vow, the laws of the society were read over to him, and permission given him to return to the world if he so pleased. The same opportunity was three times repeated during the year of novitiate, at the expiration of which time he was admitted as a member of the community. The sixty-three heads under which the rule is arranged refer to the relative duties of the principal and subordinate members — divine worship, discipline, household economy, and various ordinances referring to hospitality, missions, nursing, etc. The prescribed dress was in all probability that which had always been adopted by recluses, for it is almost the .same. coarse garb as that which Columella *(De Re Rustica*, 11:1) recommends for the farm serf in all kinds of weather. The whole time of the monks of his order he .directed to be divided between prayer, reading, the education of youth, and other pious and learned labors. All who entered his order were obliged to promise when they were received as novitiates, and to repeat their promise when they were admitted as full members of the society, that they would in no respect and on no account attempt to change or add to the rules which he had instituted. Doubtless aware that the ascetic severity of many of the monastic orders in the East was unsuited to the rude men of the West, and also to the more unfriendly climate, Benedict did not require of his monks many of the mortifications which were sometimes imposed upon those of the East, and allowed them several indulgences which were there sometimes forbidden. His rule was consequently embraced by nearly all the monks of the West. In some of the more isolated churches, as, for instance, that of Britain, it would seem that the reformations of St. Benedict were not introduced until a late period; and in the churches of that country, as well as those of Ireland, they were a subject of considerable controversy.

Benedict admitted both the learned and unlearned into his order; it was the duty of the first to assist at the choir, of the latter to attend to the household economy and temporal concerns of the monastery. At this period, it may be observed, the recitation of the divine office at the choir (as it is called by the Roman Catholics) was confined to the monks; afterwards it was established as the duty of all priests, deacons, and subdeacons. The Benedictines at first admitted none into their order who were not well instructed how to perform it; but it was not necessary that they should be priests, or even in holy orders. Afterwards many were admitted who were ignorant of the duty of the choir; they were employed in menial duties: hence the introduction of *Lay Brothers into* the Benedictine order. When first introduced, they were not considered as a portion of the monastic establishment, but as merely attached and subordinate to it; but in course of time both the order and the Church acknowledged them to be, in the strictest sense of the word, professed religious. All other religious orders, both men and women, following the example of the Benedictines, have admitted lay brothers and sisters. In 1322 the Council of Vienna ordered all monks to enter into the order of priesthood. The monks of Vallombrosa, in Tuscany, are the first among whom lay brothers are found under that appellation. *SEE LAY BROTHER*; *SEE PRIESTHOOD*. One of the most important modifications of monachism in the West, it will be noticed by the careful reader, regarded the nature of the occupation in which the monks were to be engaged during the times not directly devoted to prayer, meditation, or other spiritual exercises. In the East, manual labor formed the chief, if not the sole external occupation prescribed to the monks; it being held as a fundamental principle that for each individual the main business of life was the sanctification of his own soul. In the West, besides the labor of the hands, mental occupation was also prescribed, not, it is true, for all, but for those for whom it was especially calculated. From an early period, therefore, the convents of the West became schools of learning, and training-houses for the clergy and the missionary. At a later period, most monasteries possessed a *scriptoriun,* or writing-room, in which the monks were employed in the transcription of MSS.; and though- much of the work so done was, as might naturally be expected, in the department of sacred learning, yet it is to the scholars of the cloister we owe the preservation of most of those masterpieces of ancient classic literature .which have reached our age (comp., however, Leckey, *Hist. Europ. Morals,* 2:220 sq.), Thence also went out those who became founders of Christianity in heathen countries. In this way Germany and Switzerland were converted. In these, as well as in the Slavic countries, it was not only by preaching, but still more by the establishment of convents. having the character of agricultural establishments, that conversion was advanced (comp. *Maclean, Hist. of Christian Missions in the Middle Ages*, page 406 sq.).

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

Grammont the *Congregation of St. Maur,* and the celebrated monks of *La Trappe.*

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

Other orders also arose, mainly devoted to special benevolent or religious purposes. Thus, e.g., the *Order of St. Anthony* (1095) and the *Hospitallers* (1078) devoted themselves to the nursing of the sick, the *Order of Fontevraud* (1094) to the correction of lewd women, and the *Trinitarians* (1198) to the redeeming of Christian prisoners. Even the warlike tendencies of those times sought a union with the monastic spirit by the establishment of several orders of knights, such as the Knights of St. John, the Templars, the Teutonic Knights, the orders of St. Jago, Calatrava, Alcantara, Avis, and St. Maurice. *SEE KNIGHTHOOD*. During this period convents of nuns were also established, the institutes and regulations of which were similar to. those adopted by the Benedictines and Augustines, or to the reformed branches springing from those’ two. great orders.

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

At this juncture arose the two *mendicant* orders, (1) the *Minors or Franciscans* (q.v.), and (2) the *Preachers* or *Dominicans* (q.v.), both destined for two centuries to play a leading part in all the fortunes of the Church. *SEE MENDICANTS*. They aimed at being the best soldiers of the Church militant, and they had therefore a marked influence on subsequent Church history. They renounced every kind of worldly goods and founded what was termed an “order of penitence” (the third estate of friars), composed of the laity (especially the working classes), who, while pledged to do the bidding of the pope and to observe the general regulations of the institute, were not restricted by the vow of celibacy, nor compelled to take their leave entirely of the world. We thus see that the *spiritual egotism*, so to speak, of the early monachism, which in some sense limited the work of the cloister to the sanctification of the individual, gave place to the more comprehensive range of spiritual duty, and made the spiritual and even the temporal necessities of one’s neighbor, equally with if not more than one’s own, the object of the work of the cloister. But more than that. The mendicants thus created for themselves a numerous and influential party among the laity by these territories, and the Church, prizing this hold on the community, stood ready to give place to such aids. They wandered over all Europe, instructing the people, both old and young, and exhibiting such an aspect of sanctity and self-denial that they speedily became objects of universal admiration. Their churches were crowded, while those of the regular parish priests were almost wholly deserted; all classes sought to receive the sacraments at their hands; their advice was eagerly courted in secular business, and even in the most intricate political affairs; so that in the 13th and two following centuries the mendicant orders generally, but more especially the Dominicans and Franciscans, were intrusted with the management of all matters both in Church and State. They also secured many of the chairs of the theological schools in spite of the secular clergy, and the most illustrious representatives of the 13th and 14th centuries (Thomas Aquinas, Bonaventura, Albertus Magnus, Alexander of Hales, etc.) were either Dominicans or Franciscans. Several of their number filled the highest ecclesiastical positions, even the papal chair. They certainly raised monachism to the zenith of its power, influence, and prosperity. Besides the Franciscans and the Dominicans, there were the *Carmelites* and the. *ermits of St. Augustine*, but both of these were much inferior in number, reputation, and influence to the Franciscans and Dominicans. Having thus become both important and powerful, the mendicants rapidly multiplied, and the most serious results were likely to arise, as they were generally independent of episcopal jurisdiction, and were rivals to bishops and priests. The high estimation, moreover, into which monachism had risen, more particularly through the wide-spread influence of the begging friars, awakened a spirit of bitter hostility, not simply in all orders of the clergy, but also in the universities. In England the University of Oxford, and in France the University of Paris, arduously labored to overthrow its now spreading power. Pope Gregory X, with a view to check the overgrown-evil, went so far even as to issue a decree prohibiting all the orders which had originated since the time of Innocent III (A.D. 1200), and reduced the mendicants to four orders — the Dominicans, Franciscans, Carmelites, and Augustinians. The Church of Rome, says Butler, “has acknowledged only these four orders to be mendicant,” and the reason given is that “an order is considered to be mendicant, in the proper import of that word, when it has no fixed income, and derives its whole subsistence from casual and uncertain bounty, obtained by personal mendicity. To that St. Francis did not wish his brethren, to have recourse till they had endeavored to earn a competent subsistence by labor, and found their earnings insufficient. But soon after the decease of St. Francis, the exertions, equally incessant and laborious, of his disciples for the spiritual welfare of the faithful appeared, in the universal opinion of the Church, to be both incompatible with manual labor and much more than a compensation to the public for all they could possibly obtain from it by mendicity. This opinion was unequivocally expressed by St. Thomas' Aquinas, and sanctioned by a bull of pope Nicholas III; since that time the friars have not used manual labor as a means of subsistence, but resorted in the first instance to mendicity." Mendicity seems to have made no part of the original rules of the Dominicans, Carmelites, or Hermits of Augustine; and, in consequence of the evils attendant on it, the Council of Trent confined mendicity to the Observantines and Capuchins, allowing the other Franciscan establishments, and almost all the establishments of the three other orders, to acquire permanent property.

In the 14th century, though partly checked by the mendicant orders, a general degeneracy of monachism commenced, and the corruption, from which hardly a single order kept itself entirely free, became so overwhelming that towards the close of the Middle Ages the name monk was often used by writers as synonymous with rudeness and ignorance. "The monks," says Hardwick, "gorged with the ecclesiastical endowments, lost the moral elevation they had shown throughout the early periods of the Church, and with it forfeited their hold on the affections of the people. Except the Order of Carthusians, none of them adhered to the letter of their institute. Their intellectual vigor at the same time underwent a corresponding deterioration, insomuch that few if any works of merit, either in the field of science or in that of theology, proceeded in this age from the cloisters of the West" *(Ch. Hist. M.A.* page 343; comp. Gieseler, *Ecclesiastes Hist.* 3:85 sq., 286 sq.). The monks, like a swarm of locusts, covered all Europe, proclaiming everywhere the obedience due. to the holy mother Church, the reverence due to the saints (and more especially to the Virgin Mary), the efficacy of relics, the torments of purgatory, and the blessed advantages arising from indulgences. Reformatory attempts were vainly made in every century. Different new orders — as the *Jesuits, Brigittines, Servites, Hieronymites,* and others — were founded; but their influence was weak in comparison with that of their predecessors, and frequently, after an existence of fifty or one hundred years, they themselves were as far astray from the primitive standard of rigid asceticism. "The progress of monasticism," says Cramp, " was distinguished for several centuries by unexampled prosperity and its ordinary attendant, corruption. Replenished with wealth, which the ignorant and superstitious people lavished upon them, thinking to gain favor with God thereby, the monks indulged in every kind of licentious excess, till they were as infamous for vice as their predecessors had been renowned for piety. Reformation was frequently attempted, and many new orders arose, professing at first great zeal for purity, and adopting the strictest modes of discipline, verging sometimes to the extremity of human endurance. But these also soon shared ‘the general fate, and sank to the same low level of shameless sensuality” (comp. *Concil.,* Labbe et Cossart, ed. Mansi, tom. 18:270; Gieseler, *Ecclesiastes Hist.* 2:120). The councils of Constance (A.D. 1415) and Basle (A.D. 1431), in their endeavors to brace up monastic discipline afresh, devised reformatory measures; but they produced only transitory changes, and those only in few places. As a whole, it was daily more apparent that monasticism was growing almost incorrigible, and was ripening daily for the scythe. One of the strongest evidences of such a tendency was the formation of four spiritual associations to take the place of the monastic orders. Thus flourished, in spite of the indiscriminate denunciation of pope and priest and persecution by the Inquisition, the *Beguards* or *Beguines,* who must be regarded as an offshoot of monasticism, though they exhibited a freer and less hierarchical spirit. They flourished mainly in Germany and the Netherlands; but other groups, in which the Beguard influence was apparent, began to spread rapidly throughout the West. They were religious brotherhoods and sisterhoods, distinguished for their zeal in visiting the sick, or, as in the case of those to whom the name of *Lollards* (q.v.) was popularly given, for singing at funerals, and for otherwise assisting in the burial of the dead. This associational principle was further developed by the *Brethren of the Free Spirit,* a confraternity which owed their origin to Gerhard Groot (middle of the 14th century), and who for some time seemed to be preparing the way for an entirely new phase of monachism. In their reformatory labors they frequently came into collision with the highest Church authorities, especially the Inquisition, though this did not prevent their spread. Their numerous societies were equally distinguished for their mysticism and their usefulness. Some of the brethren were engaged in instruction, others employed themselves in various kinds of handicraft for their livelihood. One of their chief objects was always to advance the religious education of the common people, and especially to raise up from them a pious clergy, so that they soon became fruitful nurseries for monks. This activity, and the respect in which the brethren were held by the people, excited powerfully the envy of the mendicants, but they gradually slackened their opposition when they found their own numbers increasing through the labors of these *Fratres communis vitae*. The most remarkable of the new orders established in this period was that of the *Minimi*. Their founder, Francis of Paula, a small town in Calabria, after having lived for a short time in an unreformed Franciscan convent, established himself as a hermit in the neighborhood of his native city, and from 1457 gathered around him a society of those who shared his views. The fame of his miraculous power soon extended his society, which was confirmed by Sixtus IV (1474), under the name of the Eremities. Francisci, first in Italy, and afterwards in France, where the superstitious Louis XI had summoned the founder of the order to his aid in the last extremity (1482); and at a later period in Spain. The order, distinguished always from the rest of the Franciscans b)v the observance of the vita quadragesimalis, received afterwards a rule from its founder, and, to distinguish themselves from the Fratres Minores, and to go one step beyond them, assumed the name of “Ordo minimorum fratrum eremitarumn Fratres Francisci de Paula.” *SEE MINIMAS*.

The Reformation of the 16th century may well be called the Revolutionary period in the history of monachism. The deep decline which this institution had suffered during and immediately following the Crusades, a period in which, as we have seen, even the knights and barons subjected their profession of warriors to the forms of monkish laws, had been, it is true, to a very great extent relieved by a period of spiritual activity, ushered in by the mendicants. At their commencement they undoubtedly contributed to the restoration of primitive simplicity, their avowed object, but gradually most of them also became disorderly and worldly; and a leading feature in the corruption of the Church was perceived to be in those very orders founded to promote apostolic simplicity in the Christian Church. The best and most influential men in the Church cordially joined in the demand for a thorough reformation; they willingly and frankly admitted that the crisis had been in part occasioned by the corruption of the clergy, secular as well as monastic, and they urged, in particular, the imperious necessity of a reformation of the religious orders (comp. Gieseler, *Ecclesiastes Hist.* 4:131-156). The protest of the Reformers met with a cordial response in the breasts of multitudes whose attachment to the Church of Rome. was warm and almost inextinguishable. In Italy attempts were made to renovate their youth; but on the Continent, especially in Germany and the

Netherlands, the people would be satisfied with nothing short of the dissolution of monkery (Ranke, *Papacy,* 1:129, 384): they were determined that no monasteries or convents should longer subsist. This opposition had been engendered partly by a gradual alienation of all monastics from the people, but even more by the attacks that had been made upon it by many of the leading Reformers, who sought reformation within the Church. Foremost among them was that declared foe of all superstition, the immortal Erasmus (q.v.). In his early days he had tasted, by constraint, something of monkish life, and his natural abhorrence of it was made more intense by his bitter recollection, and by the trouble it cost him, after he had become famous, to release himself from the thraldom to which his former associates were inclined to call him back. He was very competent, therefore, to bear testimony for or against the monkish life, and when he became its opponent his opinions commanded the attention of all the thoughtful. And not only became he now an opponent, but a lifelong warfarer against the monks and their ideas and practices. His tongue and his pen also were used freely. His *Praise of Folly,* and, in particular, the *Colloquies,* in which the idleness, illiteracy, self-indulgence, and artificial and useless austerities of "the religious" were handled in the most diverting style, were read with infinite amusement by all who sympathized with the new studies, and by thousands who did not calculate the effect of this telling satire in abating popular reverence even for the Church establishment as a whole. It is not to be wondered, then, that popes, bishops, and councils urged upon the reformers within the religious orders to speed the day of transformation. Indeed, the internal history of nearly every order records, at this point of time, strong resolutions in favor of an enforcement of the rigorous primitive rules. "As early as 1520," says Ranke, "and since, in proportion to the advances made by Protestantism in Germany, there arose in countries which had not yet been reached by' it, a feeling of the necessity of a new amelioration of the hierarchical order. This feeling made its way even in the religious orders themselves; sometimes in one, sometimes in another of them." Even the Order of the Camaldoli, secluded as they were, owned themselves implicated in the general corruption, and instituted reforms, by founding in 1522 a new congregation, that of *Monte Corona* (comp. Helyot, *Hist. des ordres monastiques,* 5:271). Its leader, Paul Giustiniani, held, in order to the attainment of Christian perfection, three things to be essential, viz. solitude, vows, and the separation of the monks into separate cells. Those small cells and oratories, such as are yet to be found here and there, on the highest hills, in charming wilds, such as seem to conduct the soul at once to sublime flights and to more profound tranquillity, are spoken of by him in some of his letters with special satisfaction. The reforms of the hermits of Monte Corona extended to all parts of the world. But not only in the smaller orders did this spirit of reform bear fruit. In the most numerous and powerful order, that of the Franciscans, who had perhaps become the most profoundly corrupt of any, yet another new effort at reformation was attempted, in addition to the many that had been made before. The more rigorous party achieved a complete success over those inclined towards laxity, and several new reformed congregations branched off from them, among which the Capuchins were the most prominent. These friars contemplated the restoration of the regulations of their original founder-divine service at midnight, prayers at appointed hours, discipline, and silence; in short, the whole severe rule of life laid down in the original institution. One cannot but smile at the importance which they attached to things of no consequence; but, setting that aside, it must be acknowledged that they again behaved with great courage, as, for example, during the pestilence of 1528.

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

But whatever might be accomplished by all these congregations in their own circles, either the limited extent of their object, as in the instance we have last mentioned, or that circumspection of their means, which was involved in the nature of the case, as on the part of the Theatines, hindered their exercising a general and thoroughly efficient influence. They are remarkable as signalizing, in the spontaneity of their origin, a powerful tendency, which contributed immensely to the restoration of Roman Catholicism; but other forces were requisite in order that the bold advance of Protestantism might be effectually withstood. These forces developed themselves in a similar, but in a very unlooked-for and extremely peculiar manner; and as heretofore, so even now, monasticism proved Rome’s strongest ally, and the papacy once more leaned on the new-born babe of the monastic spirit. Leo X had died, leaving the fierce flame of insubordination untrammelled, and Paul III had vainly tried to subdue the indomitable will of that fierce monster, the Reformation, when suddenly there arose in the Iberian peninsula a semi-monastic organization, which, growing out of the Capuchin order, laid the foundation for the strongest religious society the world has ever known. The Society of Jesus, or *Jesuits*, as it is generally called, took a middle rank between monks and the secular clergy, approaching nearer to the regular canons than to any other order. They lived separate from the multitude, and were bound by religious vows; but they were exempt from stated hours of worship, and other strict observances, by which the monks were bound. In short, instead of spending their time in devotion and penance and fasting, they gave themselves to the active service of the Church. Their principal duty was to direct the education of youth and the consciences of the faithful, and to uphold the cause of the Church by their missions, and their pious and learned labors. They were divided into three classes, the first of which were the professed members. These, besides the ordinary vows of poverty, chastity, and obedience, bound themselves to go, without murmur, inquiry, deliberation, or delay, wherever the pope should think fit to send them: they were monastics without property. The second class comprehended the scholars: these were possessed of large revenues; their duty was to teach in the colleges of the order. The third class comprehended the novices, who lived in the houses of probation. *SEE JESUITS*. The constitution of the Jesuits was controlled, more than that of any other order before or after, by the principle of an absolute submission to the Church and the pope. The order was to be an instrument in the hands of the Church; the individual, therefore, was advised to become, with regard to the commands of his superior, as destitute of self-will "as a corpse," or "as a cane in the hands of an old man." No order ever carried out its fundamental principle more faithfully, and in subsequent battles of the Roman Catholic Church the Jesuits stood in the front rank. Other orders also were founded which proved more or less valuable supports of the papacy. There arose even several female orders among them the *Elizabethines* (q.v.), the *Ursulines* (q.v.), and the *Sisters of Charity*. *SEE CHARITY, SISTERS OF*. One of the strongest orders which arose in the 17th century was the *Lazarist* (q.v.).

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

If the Romish Church sought to strengthen itself by the new measures adopted by monasticism in providing such education for the coming generations as the Church could endorse, another measure was still needed to give the Church strength abroad. Great loss of territory and numbers had been suffered in consequence of the reformation. This want also the monastics soon provided for. They became very extensively missionary organizations. Instead of confining their labors; as was their wont to do, to the home work, they now directed their attention to the foreign missionary ‘cause. Most of the larger orders, especially the mendicants and the Jesuits, engaged in it with great zeal and emulation. The latter even took, besides the usual three vows, a fourth obligation, viz. to go without hesitation as missionaries to any country where it might please the pope to send them. In consequence, the extent of their missionary operations in Europe, Asia, Africa, and America excelled anything the Roman Catholic Church had done in this field before. *SEE MISSIONS*. Indeed, the great majority of the Roman Catholic missions in all pagan countries have ever since been conducted by the members of religious orders (see *Harper’s Monthly* for February 1875).

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

The downfall of the Napoleonic rule gave brighter prospects to the friends of monasticism, and as an evidence of its revival may be cited the re-establishment of the Jesuits by Pius VII in 1114. These now rapidly rose again to considerable strength and influence wherever they were not forcibly suppressed. *SEE JESUITS*. In the countries of the Latin races, both in Europe and America, the fate of monachism was closely allied with the political strife of the conservative and the liberal or progressive parties, the former patronizing it, together with all other ecclesiastical institutions; the latter subjecting it to prohibitive rules, or suppressing it altogether. In consequence of the successes of the liberals, monachism was greatly reduced in South America, and in Italy (in 1848, and again in 1859, 1860, 1866, and 1870, until it is now on the eve of complete suppression by law of the state, 1875). *SEE MONASTERY*. It was also wellnigh extinguished in Spain (1835), and especially in Portugal (1834). In France alone the vicissitudes of political rule have thus far failed to affect monasticism — indeed, the rapid growth of monastic institutions in that country have not been in point of zeal, activity, and general prosperity behind what they had been during the golden sera of their existence. Under the Bourbons, and under Louis Philippe, the liberal party. occasionally demanded coercive measures against them; but since the establishment of the. republic in 1848 even the liberals, having given a wider interpretation to religious liberty than Americans have ever dared to give, have accustomed themselves no longer to refuse the free right of association to the members of religious orders. Nearly every one of the old orders established itself in France, and a number of new congregations were formed, and there is at present a greater variety of monastic institutions in that country than any state has possessed at any previous period. In July, 1860, M. Dupin, in a speech before the senate of France, stated that there were then in the country 4932 authorized and 2870 unauthorized establishments and since then their number has somewhat increased. Next to France, they are most numerous, wealthy, and influential in Belgium, where, as in France, public instruction is very largely under their control.

Among the Teutonic nations the monastic establishments have, throughout the British possessions, Holland, and North America (see below; see also *Sisters of Charity),* partaken more or less of the blessings of liberal institutions, and can hardly be accused of departure from their rules except in isolated, instances. Public opinion, however, has provided for one measure in their constitution not known elsewhere, viz. that any member wishing to leave their establishments shall have liberty to do so. Austria protected monasticism, but kept the inhabitants of convents under a bureaucratic guardianship until 1848, when it was changed into a zealous support and encouragement. Since 1866, however, the monasteries have been under a shadow, and it is more than likely that ere long monastic institutions will be done away with in that Roman Catholic country. In many of the other German countries, the revolution of 1848 has procured for monasticism a favorable position; and in lands where formerly it was either proscribed or but barely tolerated, it has since flourished. Even those states whose codes retain laws against their admission in general, as Saxony and the neighboring countries of Sweden and Denmark, have admitted the Sisters of Charity. *SEE DEACONESSES* and *SEE SISTERHOODS*. In Russia the monastics suffered severe losses, but in Turkey they have as missionaries done much to build up the Christian faith.

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

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

In a literary point of view monastics do not at present share the reputation of their predecessors in former centuries. though men like Lacordaire, Ravigna, Gratry, and Hyacinthe in France, Rosmini and Secchi in Italy, and Haneberg in Germany, occupy a high place in the annals of contemporaneous literature. In respect to their present moral condition, Roman Catholics admit the existence in some places, particularly in Central and South America, of considerable corruption and ignorance in many convents of the older orders. In some of them, also, the ancient constitutions have fallen more or less into disuse. The regular connection of the general superiors with their subordinates has been in great part interrupted, and the holding of general, assemblies has ceased. The present pontiff at the commencement of his reign proclaimed’ it as one of his chief tasks to carry out a thorough reform of monastic orders; and in some orders, as the Dominicans, an extensive reformation has since taken place. The whole number of monastic institutions in the Roman Catholic Church throughout the world was estimated by the *Catholic Almanac* for 1870 to be 8000 establishments for males, with an aggregate of 117,500 members, and 10,000 for females, with an aggregate-membership of 189,000, making a grand total of 306,500 members. It is beyond the scope of this work to give in this place a list of all the monastic organizations; they are severally treated under their respective names. It may not be out of place, however, to call the reader’s attention to the fact that the different monastic institutes of the West are almost all offshoots or modifications of the *Benedictines* (q.v.); of whom the most remarkable are the *Cartlesians Cistercitus, Grammonites, Clugniacs, Praemonstratensians,* and above all the

Maurists, or Benedictines of St. Maur (q.v.). Among the eremitical orders are the Hermits of St. Augustine, who trace their origin to the early father of that name, but are subdivided into several varieties, which had their rise in the 11th, 12th, and 13th centuries; also the Camaldolese, founded by St. Romuald in 1012; the Celestines, a branch of the Franciscans, established by Peter Murrone, afterwards pope Celestine V; the Hieronymites (q.v.), established first in Castile in the 14th century, and thence introduced into other parts of Spain and into Italy by Lope d’Olmeda in 1424; and the Paulites, so called from St. Paul, the first hermit, but an institute of the 13th century, which had its origin in Hungary, and attained to a wider extension and a greater popularity than perhaps any other among the eremitical orders.

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

6. *Nature and Effect of Monasticism*. — We have already indicated in some measure the character of monachism, as we have traced its origin and progress. It remains to consider briefly the spirit as well as the results of monasticism. In surveying monasticism as an institution coming down from the 4th century till the Reformation, we freely admit that, in the circumstances in which the world found itself placed during that period of time, it was far from being an unmitigated evil. In its origin, at least, it was a great human effort to remedy the moral disorder by which mankind in all ages are infected. When children raise a ladder upon the hill-top with the: design that upon it they may climb upwards, and thus draw near to God, we cannot make light of their motives, even though we should smile at their plans ; and so every attempt of man to eradicate the selfishness of his nature, to turn back the tide of the world's corruption, and to elevate himself in the scale of morality, is so far praiseworthy, even though we have no faith that this is to be done *by* men and women entering voluntarily into a prison, shutting themselves up, and barring the world out. "It was the spirit of monachism," says Neander, "which gave special prominence to that Christian point of view from which all men were regarded as originally equal in the sight of God; which opposed the consciousness of God's image in human nature, to the grades and distinctions flowing out of the relations of the state... The spirit of contempt for earthly show, the spirit of universal philanthropy, revealed itself in the *pure* appearances of monachism, and in much that proceeded from it" (2:251; comp. page 238). In the darkest of the ages, souls truly pious, there can be no doubt, often withdrew to such places that they might without distraction prepare for another world. In times of lawless force and bloodshed, every one knows that the monastery was an asylum where weak. and timorous spirits, ill able to cope with the rude society in which they found themselves, could retire for shelter and safety. The old monks, in their earliest and best days, before their indolence was fostered by wealth and luxury, were often the only examples of peaceful industry in a district, and taught their less skilful neighbors how to till the earth, and draw from the reluctant soil a more generous return for their labor. In their lonely cells they often spent their leisure in copying valuable manuscripts and. producing original works, which, though seldom. rising to the rank of classics, have preserved many valuable facts, and are true photographs of the bright and the dark, the comely and ungainly features of their times. "The cloisters, moreover," says Neander, "were institutions of education, and, as such, were the more distinguished on account of the care they bestowed on religious and moral culture, because education generally in this period had fallen into neglect" (2:252). Perhaps it is not too much to say that in the deluge of barbarism that overflowed the civilization of Christendom in the early mediaeval ages, the Scriptures and the classics must have perished had it not been that they were deposited in those monastic edifices, for which the wildest pagans, in many instances, entertained a superstitious respect. Moreover, in cases without number, the monastery was a missionary training-school, planted within the limits of some heathen land, from which the monks went forth courageously and devotedly to propagate the religion of the age, such as it was, in the surrounding districts to be the pioneers of civilization and the advance-guard of Christianity among a rude and idolatrous population. The conversion of the pagan English, and particularly of the southern kingdoms, to the faith of Christ, was mainly due to the energy and sacrifice of the monks and bishops of Rome, and it was accompanied by a parallel conversion to the authority of St. Peter. It was at that time a vast and unspeakable blessing to England to be brought in this way into association with other people, and to become thus an integral part of the Christian commonwealth. The ideal of the divine life which was set before the young and crude converts was impressive, and upon the whole beneficial, even though it lacked the freedom and naturalness of true life, and cramped and resisted the grace of God. Dean Milman tells us that the calm example of the domestic virtues in a more polished but often, as regards: sexual intercourse, more corrupt state of morals, is of inestimable value, as spreading around the parsonage an atmosphere of peace and happiness, and offering a living lesson on the blessings of conjugal fidelity. But such Christianity would have made no impression on a people who still retained something of their Teutonic severity of manners, and required, therefore, something more imposing-a sterner and more manifest self-denial — to keep up their religious veneration. The detachment of the clergy from all earthly ties left them at once more unremittingly devoted to their unsettled life as missionaries. It is probable that the isolation and the self-torture of the monks did produce a deep impression on those who had neither moral energy nor mental concentration equal to such a task. It is possible that the claims of a hierarchy were more rapidly introduced by these means, so that it became more easy to create new institutions, to organize Christian worship, to build vast ecclesiastical edifices, to promote literature, to divide the labor of Christian workmen, as soon as the available strength of young Christendom was all brought under severe drill, taught to monopolize the highest grace, and invested with preternatural powers. In old feudal times. when the strong were so ready to domineer over the weak, and society had so little thought of providing for the unfortunate, in the monastery, spirits bruised and bleeding found advice, the sick found medicine, the hungry poor found bread, and the benighted and Storm-stayed traveller entertainment and rest. It would be uncandid not to admit, with very little exception indeed, the statement of count Montalembert that the monasteries "were for ten centuries and more the schools, the archives, the libraries, the hostelries, the studios, the penitentiaries, and the hospitals of Christian society."

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

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

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

M. de Montalembert, the latest and perhaps ablest defender of monachism, breaks ground with a vindication of monasteries from the charge of being the asylums of broken hearts; for weak, exhausted, and disappointed energies; for men. and women tired of the world, and unfit for the strife and battle of life; maintaining that they were peopled rather by the young and the brave, and by those who, as far as this world is concerned, had everything to lose in assuming monastic vows; by those who had a large surplusage of dauntless energy for the conquest of nature, for industrious grappling with the barrenness of the desert, or the riotous prodigality of the primaeval forest. He also asserts that these mysterious precursors of civilization and order, these men of prayer and faith, solved the mystery of life, and showed to a barbaric and selfish world the secret of real happiness; and urges that, so far from wishing to escape from their vows, or from the fellowship of the cloister, they conceived a passionate attachment for each other and to their self-imposed restraints; that their mutual affection was stronger than death; and, that, instead of morose and hopeless abnegation of humanity — benignitis, simplicitas, hilaritas — gayety and songs of joy transformed their exile from the world into the paradise of God. But “monasticism,” Dr. Schaff has well said, “*M* is not the *nominal* form of Christian piety. It is an abnormal phenomenon, a humanly devised service of God (comp. <51016>Colossians 2:16-23), and not rarely a sad enervation and repulsive distortion of the Christianity of the Bible. It is to be-estimated, therefore, not by the extent of its self-denial, not by its outward acts of self-discipline” (which may all be found in heathenism, Judaism, and Mohammedanism as well), but by the Christian spirit of humility and love which animated it. For humility is the groundwork, and love the all-ruling principle of the Christian life, and the distinctive characteristic of the Christian religion. Without love to God and charity to man, the severest self-punishment and the utmost abandonment of the world are worthless before God (comp. <461301>1 Corinthians 13:1-3)... Even in the most favorable case monasticism falls short of harmonious moral developments and of that symmetry of virtue which meets us in perfection in Christ, and next to him in the apostles. It lacks the finer and gentler traits of character, which are ordinarily brought out only in the school of daily family life and under the social ordinances of God. Its morality is rather negative than positive. There is more virtue in the temperate and thankful enjoyment of the gifts of God than in total abstinence; in charitable and well-seasoned speech than in total silence; in connubial chastity than in celibacy; in self-denying practical labor for the Church than in solitary asceticism, which only pleases self and profits no one else.” Believing this, we are constrained to maintain further that, although the monastic orders have done much to promote the good of man, the ideal which they have proposed to themselves is no more that of genuine sacrifice than a collection of probable statements is history. The highest forms of self-surrender are those of which the world knows nothing, and whose beauty is derived not from the halo of sacerdotal sentiment, but from the quiet discharge of unromantic and, it may be, irksome duties.

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

Literature. —

(1.) *Greek writers:* Socrates, *H. Ecclesiastes* lib. 4, cap. 23 sq.; Sozomen, *H.E.* lib. 1, cap. 12-14; 3:14; 6:28-34; Palladius, *Historia Lausiaca* *(*Ἰστορία πρὸς Λαῦσον, a court-officer under Theodosius II, to whom the work was dedicated), composed about 421, with enthusiastic admiration, from personal acquaintance, of the most celebrated contemporaneous ascetics of Egypt; Theodoret (t 457), *Historia religiosa, seu ascetica vivendi ratio (*φιλόθεος ἱστορία*)*, biographies of thirty Oriental anchorets and monks, for the most part from personal observation; Nilus the elder *(j* about 450), *De vita ascetica, De exercitatione monastica*, *Epistolae* 355, and other writings.

(2.) *Latin writers:* Rufinus (1410), *Hist. Eremitica, s. Vite Patrum;* Sulpicius Severus (about 400), *Dialogi III* (the first dialogue contains a lively and entertaining account of the Egyptian monks, whom he visited; the two others relate to-Martin of Tours); Cassianus (1432), *Institutiones cenobiatis, and Collationes Patrum* (spiritual conversations of Eastern monks). Also the ascetic writings of Athanasimus (Vita Antonii), Basil, Gregory Nazianzen, Chrysostom, and Isidore of Pelusium among the Greek; Ambrose, Augustine, Jerome (his lives of anchorets, and his letters), Cassiodorus, and Gregory the Great among the Latin fathers.

(3.) *Later literature:* Holstenius (a Roman convert), *Codex regularum monastic.* (Rom. 1661; enlarged, Paris and Augsb. 6 volumes, fol.); the older Greek *Menologia* (μηνολόγια) and *Mencea (μηναῖα),* and the Latin *Calendaria* and *Martyrologia* — i.e. Church calendars or indices of memorial days (days of the earthly death and heavenly birth) of the saints, with short biographical notices for liturgical use; Herbert Rosweyde (Jesuit), *Vitac Patrum, sive Historic Eremiticae,* lib. 10 (Antwerp, 1628); *Acta Sanctorum, quot quot'toto orbe coluntur* (Antwerp, 1643-1786, 53 volumes fol. begun by the Jesuit Bollandus, continued by several scholars of his order, called *Bollandists,* down to October 11 in the calendar of saints' days, and resumed in 1845, after long interruption, by Theiner and others); D'Achery and Mabillon (Benedictines), *Acta Sanctorum ordinis S. Benedicti* (Paris, 1668-1701, 9 volumes folio [to 11003); Helyot (Franciscan), *Histoire des ordres monastiques ireligieux et militaires* (Par. 1714-19, 8 volumes, 4to; new ed., with an additional volume on the modern history of monachism by Migne, 1849, 4 volumes); Butler (R.C.), *The Lives of the Fathers, Martyrs, and other principal Saints,* arranged according to the Catholic calendar, and completed to December 31 (1745, and often since best ed. Lond. 1812-13, 12 vols.; another, Baltimore, 1844, 4 volumes); Gibbon, chapter 37 ("Origin, Progress, and Effects of Monastic Life;" very unfavorable, and written in lofty philosophical contempt); Henrion (R.C.), *Histoire des ordres religieux* (Par. 1835); Biedenfeld, *Ursprung sammutlicher Monchsordens im Orient Occident* (Weimar, 1837, 3 volumes); Schmidt (R.C.), *Die: Minchs, Nonnen, u. geistlichen Ritterorden nebst Ordensregeln u. Abbildungen* (Augsb. 1838 sq.); Paul Lacroix, *Military and Religious Life in the Middle Ages and at the Period of the Renaissance;* Day, *Monastic Institutions: their Origin, Progress,* etc. (Lond. 1846, 2d ed.); Milman (Anglican), *History of Ancient Christianity* (book 3, chapter 11), and his *Latin Christianity;* Ruffner (Presbyterian), *The Fathers of the Desert* (N.Y., 1850, 2 volumes), full of curious information, in popular form; Montalemerto (R.C.), *Les Moines d'Occident depuis St. Benoit jusqua St. Bernard* (Paris, 1860 sq.; translated into English, *The Monks of the West,* etc., Edinb. and Lond. 1861 sq.); another extensive work has been in preparation for some time by the Benedictine Dom Gueranger, of France; Zockler, *Kritische Geschichte der Askese* (Frankfurt-am-Main, 1863); comp. also Hefele, *Conciliengeschichte* (the several volumes); Wessenberg, *Kirchen versammlungen,* 1:119 sq. (see Index in volume 4); Ozanam, *Etudes Germaniques.;* Guizot, *Hist. Civilization,* 2:279 sq.; and the relevant sections of Tillemont, Fleury, Schrockh (vols. 5 and 8), Neander, Schaff, and Gieseler. Regarding *Christian monasticism as compared with other* *forms of asceticism,* see Hospinian, *De origine etprogressu monachatus,* lib. 6 (Tig. 1588; enlarged, Geneva, 1669, folio); Mohler (R.C.), *Geschichte des Monchthums is der Zeit seiner Entstehung u. ersten Ausbildung* (1836; collected works, Regensb. volume 2, page 165 sq.; Taylor (Independent), *Ancient Christianity* (Lond. 1844), 1:299 sq.; Vogel, "Ueber das Monchthum" (Berlin, 1858), in the *Deutsche Zeitschriftf. christl. Wissenschaft,* etc.; Schaff, "Ueber den Ursprung und Charakter des Monchthums," in Dorner's etc., *Jahrbucherfur deutsche Theologie* (1861), page 555 sq.; Cropp, *Origines et Causea monachatus* (Gott. 1863); Lea, *Hist. Sacerdotal Celibacy,* chapters 7, 30; Lecky, *Hist. Rationalism* (see Index); id., *Hist. European Morals* (see Index); Gould, *Origin of Religious Belief* (N.Y., 1871, 2 volumes, 8vo), 1:339 sq.; *Edinburgh Review,* January 1849; *Eclectic Magazine,* April 1849; *English Review,* 2:77, 424; [Lond.] *Quar. Rev.* 127, July 1861; *Eclectic Review,* July 1859; *Brit. and For. Ev. Rev.* July 1868; *British Quar. Rev.* art. 8 July 1868; *Edinb. Rev.* April 1868; *St. James's Magazine,* March 10, 1870.

Monboddo, James Burnet, Lord

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

Moncada, Louis-Antoine De Belluga De

a Spanish prelate, was born at Motril, in the kingdom of Granada November 30, 1662. He entered the Church, where his distinguished birth placed many ecclesiastical honors within his power, but. with pious modesty, he refused them all Philip V appointed him bishop of Carthagena and Murcia in 1705. Soon after the archduke, who disputed the crown with Philip, invaded Spain. Moncada remained faithful to his sovereign, and so strongly evinced his devotion that Philip rewarded him, with the titles of viceroy of Valencia and captain-general of Murcia in 1706. But, notwithstanding these royal favors, his zeal did not degenerate into servility, and he resisted the court when he thought the interests of the Church were compromised. Thus he obstinately opposed a duty placed on the property of the clergy. At the height of his quarrel with the king's party, he was included in a promotion of cardinals; but, believing in faithful submission to the administration of his country, though a prelate, he declared that he would not accept the purple without the king's consent.

This permission had only been delayed to test the bishop’s constancy, and, according to Saint-Simon, “the affair ended with unequalled glory for Belluga.” “Subsequently,” adds Saint-Simon, “Belluga, who had more zeal than discretion, wished to institute some reforms, which the bishops of Spain could not permit. They opposed his plans with great success, and Belluga, not being able to procure for his country the advantages he proposed, became greatly disgusted, and entreated the king to release him from the bishopric of Murcia, and permit him to retire to Rome.” He was there; as in Murcia, a very faithful subject to his king, and still preserved an anxious interest in all his affairs. His virtue, which lifted him above all politics, acquired for him a veneration and consideration during the whole course of his long life. He died at Rome, February 22, 1743. See Moreri, *Grand Dict. Histor.* s.v.; Saint-Simon, *leanoires,* 11:197-199 (edit. Cheruel).

Monceaux (Moncaeus), Francois De

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

Morclar, Jean-Piere-Francois De Ripert, Marquis de

a French religious writer, noted as a defender of the Huguenots, was born October 1, 1711, at Apt, Provence. He was descended from the family of the dauphiness, and was the son of a magistrate whom the chancellor Daguesseau had surnamed L’Amour du bien, December 19, 1732, he succeeded his father as procurator general to the Parliament of Provence;

he was then twenty-one years of age. He was a ready orator, a brilliant lawyer, and profoundly versed in public law. From 1749 he energetically declared himself in favor of the Protestants, and endeavored to obtain for them civil rehabilitation and liberty of conscience. In his article, on the clandestine marriages of the Reformed, he raises his voice, in the name of justice and humanity, against the iniquitous laws which condemned to ignominy and illegitimacy the fruits of their unions; and at the same time he demonstrated, by learned calculations, that was greatly to the interest of the state to favor the progress of population. In 1752 the republic of Gendva a prey to civil dissensions, rendered homage to the integrity of the magistrate by choosing him as arbiter of the two parties in collision. — “At this time,” says M Villemain, “an event occurred which developed the talents of several men in the parliaments of the kingdoms this was the trial and expulsion of the celebrated society of the Jesuits. Monclar took a lively and active interest in this affair, and his expose of their doctrines was a masterpiece of method and clearness, without exaggeration, and without false eloquence. In the remonstrance, that he was charged to draw up in the name of those opposed to the Jesuits, Monclar knew how to unite dignified firmness with the respect due to the sovereign and to avoid that rather republican severity with which Voltaire reproaches Malesherbes.” He was instrumental in restoring Venaissin to France (in 1768), and received for his services from Louis XV a pension and the title of marquis (October 1769). Monclar, after forty years of active life, withdrew to his estate of Saint-Saturnin, where he died, February 12, 1773. Romanists claim that Monclar in his dying hour made known to his confessor a regret for what he had said against the Holy See and the Society of Jesus. But there seems to be no ground for the declaration, as the whole life of the marquis speaks against any such change. He wrote *Moire theologique et polique au sujet des marinage clandestins des Protestants en France* (1755, 8vo); at the time of its appearance it aroused a warm discussion: more than twenty pamphlets were published for or against: — *Compte rendu des Constitutions des Jesuite* (1762, 2 volumes, 12mo); reprinted since with the *Requisitoire du 4 Janvier,* 1763, and the *Conclusions du* 5 *Mars,* 1765, on the bull *Apostolicum pascendi* (Paris, 1769, 2 volumes, 4to and 8vo). The complete works of Monclar, comprising 8 volumes, 8vo, were published in 1855. See Bordly, *Eloge de Monclar,* pronounced November 1843; Achard, *Dict. de Provence,* s.v.; Villemain, *Tableau du dix-huitieme siecle,* de leon; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Gezerale,* s.v.

Moncon, Jean De

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

Monconys, Balthasar, Dr.

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

Moncrieff, Sir Henry, Bart., D.D.

a Scottish divine, son of the Rev. Sir William Moncrieff, was born in Blackford, Perthshire, February 6, 1750. After receiving an elementary education in his native place, he repaired to the University of Glasgow for the purpose of fitting himself for the pulpit. In the midst of his collegiate course he had the misfortune to lose his father. The patrons of the charge thus left vacant, moved by a strong affection for Sir William, and a confidence in the more than ordinary talent displayed by his son, reserved the pastorate for “Sir Harry,” as he was familiarly called. He repaired to Edinburgh, and there entered upon a theological course, which he completed in August 1771; was then ordained a minister of the Church of Scotland, and installed as successor to his father. His talents were too remarkable to allow of his remaining long in this humble position, and the attention he attracted soon caused him to be called to Edinburgh, where, in 1775, he became the officiating minister of St. Cuthbert’s, the largest parochial charge in the Scottish capital. Though the numerical strength of his parish prevented him from coming into frequent personal contact with all, still he seems to have been dearly beloved as a pastor and friend. He had a commanding appearance, was gifted with a powerfully argumentative oratory, and was zealous as well as learned. In the pulpit his style was characterized by force more than by elegance. Avoiding flights of fancy and displays of rhetorical talent, he used his cultured intellectual strength to make truth strike the heart rather than please the brain. In his time the moderate party held the majority in the Scottish Church, but his hatred of intolerance and love of freedom led him to take a stand with the liberal and evangelical party, while his natural independence of character made his position one of boldness and prominence. The deliberations of the General Assembly, which met yearly at Edinburgh, were of a mixed political and religious nature. In these meetings Sir Harry took an active part, and his talents as a debater soon ranked him among the ablest of Scotland’s platform orators. In 1785 he was unanimously chosen as moderator of the Assembly, an honor which was conferred on him several times thereafter. In these religious discussions he showed great abhorrence of everything savoring of bigotry or intolerance, and was ever ready to listen to and engage in any argument which aimed at the discovery of truth. Yet his religious beliefs were tenaciously adhered to and boldly advocated. Politically also he was active, and, to use his own expression, as “a Whig of 1688.” He earnestly opposed all civil disabilities for religious creeds, and heartily supported “the constitution as founded upon the rock of lawful resistance by the patriots of the first James and Charles’s time, and as finally purified by those of the Revolution.” Indeed, it has been truly said that “in him Scotland found a warm-hearted lover of mankind, a strong advocate of political and religious freedom, and a zealous party leader.” He continued to labor in this wide field of usefulness as pastor of St.

Cuthbert’s and leader of the liberal party until the time of his death, June 14, 1827. In the latter part of his life he adopted the additional surname of WELLWOOD; but he is better known as “ Sir Harry,” he being in his day the only man of noble rank who ministered in the Church of Scotland. He published several treatises concerning the ecclesiastical discussions of his time, also *Discourses on the Evidences of the Jewish and Christian Revelations* (1815), and an *Account of the Life and Writings of Dr, John Erskine* (1818). His *Sermons,* with a memoir by his son, have also been published in three volumes (1829-31). “Those who read these sermons,” says a critic in the *Edinb. Rev.* (6:112), “will never be disturbed with the author’s admiration of himself or his misconception of the subject; nor will their impatience be excited by anything puerile, declamatory, verbose, or inaccurate. They will find everywhere indications of a vigorous and independent understanding; and, though they may not always be gratified with flights of fancy or graces of composition, they can scarcely fail to be attracted by the unaffected: expression of goodness and sincerity which runs through the whole publication.” See *Edinb. Rev.* 47:242; *Encyclop. Britannica,* s.v.; Chambers, *Biog. Dict. of Emninent Scotsmen,* 4:456; *Blackwood’s Magazine,* 22:530; Allibone, *Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors,* s.v. (H.W.T.)

Mondonville, Jeanne Juliard, Dame Turles De

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

Monegonde, Sainte

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

Monergism

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

Monestier, BLAISE

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

Moneta

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

Money

(Heb. ãsK, *ke’seph, silver,* as often rendered, Chald. ãsK] *kesaph’*, Gr. ἀργυρίον, *silver*, or a piece of silver, as often rendered; also κέρμα, *coin*, i.q. νόμισμα, lit. a *standard* of valuation; χαλκός, *brass*, as sometimes rendered: and χρῆμα, lit. whatever is *used* in exchange). In the present article we shall confine our attention to the consideration of the subject in general, leaving the discussion of particular coins for the special head of NUMINSATICS *SEE NUMINSATICS* . The *value* of the coins is a relative thing, depending, with respect to the several pieces and kinds of metal, in part upon the ascertained *weight* (i.e., *intrinsic* value, for which *SEE METROLOGY*), and in part upon the interchange of the mintage of various ages and countries prevalent in Palestine (i.e., *current* value; *SEE COIN*); but, in point of fact. still more upon the depreciation of the precious metals as a standard of value in comparison with purchasable articles, arising from the fluctuating balance of supply and demand (i.e., *mercantile* value). In the. following discussion we give a general view of this extensive subject, referring to other articles for subsidiary points.

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

II. *Bullion as a Circulating Medium.* —

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

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

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

2. The first notice in the Bible, after the flood, of uncoined money as a representative of property and medium of exchange, is when Abraham came up out of Egypt "very rich in cattle, in silver, and in gold" (<011302>Genesis 13:2; 24:35). In the further history of Abraham we read that Abimelech gave the patriarch "a thousand [pieces] of silver," apparently to purchase veils for Sarah and her attendants; but the passage is extremely difficult (<012016>Genesis 20:16). The Sept. understood shekels to be intended *(*χίλια δίδραχμα, 1.c. also verse 14), and there can be no doubt that they were right, though the rendering is accidentally an unfortunate one, their equivalent being the name of a coin. We next find "money" used in commerce. In the purchase of the cave of Machpelah it is said, "And Abraham weighed (lqov]yiw) to Ephron the silver which he had named in the audience of the sons of Heth, four hundred shekels of silver current with the merchant" (rjeSold rbe[o; Sept. δοκίμου ἐμπόροις, <012316>Genesis 23:16). Here a currency is clearly indicated like that which the monuments of Egypt show to have been there used in a very remote age; for the weighing proves that this currency, like the Egyptian, .did not bear the stamp of authority, and was therefore weighed when employed in commerce. A similar purchase is recorded of Jacob, who bought a parcel of a field at Shalem for a hundred *kesitahs* (<012318>Genesis 23:18, 19). The occurrence of a name different from shekel, and, unlike it, not distinctly applied in any other passage to a weight, favors the idea of coined money. But what is the *kesitab* (hfycq)? The old interpreters supposed it to mean a lamb, and it has been imagined to have been a coin bearing the figure of a lamb. There is no known etymological ground for this meaning, the lost root, if we compare the Arabic *kasat*, "he or it divided equally," being perhaps connected with the idea of division. Yet the sanction of the Sept., and the use of weights having the forms of lions, bulls, and geese, by the Egyptians, Assyrians, and probably Persians, must make us hesitate before we abandon a rendering so singularly confirmed by the relation of the Latin *pecunia* and *pecus.* Throughout the history of Joseph we find evidence of the constant use of money in preference to barter. This is clearly shown in the case of the famine, when it is related that all the money of Egypt and Canaan was paid for corn, and that then the Egyptians had recourse to barter (<014713>Genesis 47:13-26). It would thence appear that money was not very plentiful. In the narrative of the visits of Joseph's brethren to Egypt, we find that they purchased corn with money, which was, as in Abraham's time, weighed silver, for it is spoken of by them as having been restored to their sacks in "its [full] weight" (<014321>Genesis 43:21). At the time of the exodus money seems to have been still weighed, for the ransom ordered in the law is stated to be half a shekel for each man — "half a shekel after the shekel of the sanctuary, [of] twenty gerahs the shekel" (<023013>Exodus 30:13). Here the shekel is evidently a weight, and of a special system of which the standard examples were probably kept by the priests. Throughout the law money is spoken of as in ordinary use; but only silver money, gold being mentioned as valuable, but not clearly as used in the same manner. This distinction appears at the time of the conquest of Canaan. When Jericho was taken, Achan embezzled from the spoils 200 shekels of silver, and a wedge (Heb. *tongue)* of gold (γλῶσσαν μίαν χρυσῆν*)* of 50 shekels' weight (<060721>Joshua 7:21). Throughout the period before the return from Babylon this distinction seems to obtain: whenever anything of the character of money is mentioned the usual metal is silver, and gold generally occurs as the material of ornaments and costly works. Thus silver, as a medium of commerce, may be met with among the nations of the Philistines (<012016>Genesis 20:16; <071605>Judges 16:5,18; 17:2 sq.), the, Midianites (<013728>Genesis 37:28), and the Syrians (<120505>2 Kings 5:5, 23). By the laws of Moses, the value of laborers and cattle (<032703>Leviticus 27:3 sq.;

<040345>Numbers 3:45 sq.), houses and fields (<032714>Leviticus 27:14 sq.), provisions (<050206>Deuteronomy 2:6, 28; 14:26), and all fines for offences (Exodus 21, 22), were determined by an estimate in money. The contributions to the Temple (<023013>Exodus 30:13; 38:26), the sacrifice of animals (<030515>Leviticus 5:15), the redemption of the first-born (<040345>Numbers 3:45 sq.; 18:15 sq.), the payment to the seer (<090907>1 Samuel 9:7 sq.) — in all these cases the payment is always represented as silver. It seems probable from many passages in the Bible that a system of jewel currency or ring-money was also adopted as a medium of exchange. The case of Rebekah, to whom the servant of Abraham gave “a golden ear-ring of half a shekel weight, and two bracelets for her hands of ten shekels’ weight of gold” (<012422>Genesis 24:22), proves that the ancients made their jewels of a specific weight, so as to know the value of the ornaments in employing them as money. That the Egyptians kept their bullion in jewels seems evident from the plate given by Sir Gardner Wilkinson, copied from the catacombs, where they are represented as weighing rings of silver and gold; and is further corroborated by the fact of the Israelites having, at their exodus from Egypt, borrowed “jewels of silver and jewels of gold,” and “spoiled the Egyptians” (Exod. 12:35, 36). According to the ancient drawings, the Egyptian ring-money was composed of perfect rings. So, too, it would appear that the money used by the children of Jacob, when they went to purchase corn in Egypt, was also an annular currency (<014235>Genesis 42:35). Their money is described as “bundles of money” (Sept. δέσμοι), and when returned to them, was found to be “of [full] weight” (<014321>Genesis 43:21). The account of the sale of Joseph by his brethren affords another instance of the employment of jewel ornaments as a medium of exchange (<013728>Genesis 37:28); and that the Midianites carried the whole of their bullion wealth in the form of rings and jewels seems more than probable from the account in Numbers of the spoiling of the Midianites — “We have therefore brought an oblation for the Lord what every man hath gotten *(Heb. found)*, of jewels of gold, chains, and bracelets, rings, ear-rings, and tablets, to make an atonement for our souls before the Lord. And Moses and Eleazar the priest took the gold of them, even all wrought jewels” (<013150>Genesis 31:50, 51). The friends of Job, when visiting him at the end of the time of his trial, each gave him a piece of money (hfycæ]) and an ear-ring of gold (bhz;µzn; Sept. τετράδραχμον χρυσοῦ καὶ ἀσήμου*)*, thus suggesting the employment of a ring-currency. (For this question, see W. B. Dickinson in the *Num. Chron.* volumes 6 to 16 *pasaim).* A passage in

Isaiah has indeed been supposed to show the use of gold coins in that prophet’s time: speaking of the makers of idols, he says, “They lavish gold out of the’ bag, and weigh silver in the balance” (<014606>Genesis 46:6). The mention of a bag is, however, a very insufficient reason for the supposition that the gold was coined money. Rings of gold may have been used for money in Palestine as early as this time, since they had long previously been so used in Egypt; but the passage probably refers to the people of Babylon, who may have had uncoined money in both metals like the Egyptians. Supposing that the above-quoted passages relative to *a gold* medium of exchange be not admitted, there is a passage recording a purchase made in *gold* in the time of David. The threshing-floor of Ornan was bought by David for 600 shekels of *gold* by weight (<132125>1 Chronicles 21:25). Yet even this is rendered doubtful by the parallel passage mentioning the price paid as 50 shekels *of silver* (<102424>2 Samuel 24:24).

It seems then apparent, from the several authorities given above, that from the earliest time *silver* was used by the Hebrews as a medium of commerce, and that a fixed weight was assigned to single pieces, so as to make them suitable for the various articles presented in trade. Unless we suppose this to be the case, many of the above-quoted passages (especially <012316>Genesis 23:16; comp. <121204>2 Kings 12:4 sq.) would be difficult to understand rightly. In this latter passage it is said that the priest Jehoiada “took a chest and bored a hole in the lid of it, and set it beside the altar,” and “the priests that kept the door put in all the money that was brought into the house of the Lord.” These passages not only presuppose pieces of metal of a definite weight, but also that they had been recognised as such, either in an unwrought form or from certain characters inscribed upon them. The system of weighing (though the Bible makes mention of a balance and weight of money in many places-<012316>Genesis 23:16; <022217>Exodus 22:17; <101812>2 Samuel 18:12; <112039>1 Kings 20:39; <243209>Jeremiah 32:9, 10) is not likely to have been applied to every individual piece. In the large total of 603,550 half-shekels (<023826>Exodus 38:26), accumulated by the contribution of each Israelite, each *individual half-shekel* could hardly have been weighed out, nor is it probable that the scales were continually employed for all the small silver pieces which men carried about with them. For instance, that there were divisions of the standard of calculation is evident from the passage in <023013>Exodus 30:13, where the *half-shekel* is to be paid as the atonement money, and “the rich shall not give *more,* and the poor shall not give *less”* (verse 15). *The fourth part of the shekel* must also have been an *actual piece*, for it was *all the silver* that the servant of Saul had at hand to pay the seer (<090908>1 Samuel 9:8, 9). If a quantity of pieces of various weights were carried about by men in a purse or bag, as was the custom (<120523>2 Kings 5:23; 12:10; <014235>Genesis 42:35), without having their weight marked in some manner upon them, what endless trouble there must have been in buying or selling, in paying or receiving. From these facts we may safely assume that the Israelites had already, before the exile, known silver pieces of a definite weight, and used them in trade. By this is not meant *coins*, for these are pieces of metal struck under an authority. A curious passage is that in Ezekiel (<261636>Ezekiel 16:36), which has been supposed to speak of *brass* money. The Hebrew text has ËTæ2]v j u]ËpeV,hæê[yi, which has been rendered by the Vulg. " quia effusum est aes tuum," and by the A.V. "because *thy filthiness* was poured out." As brass was the latest metal introduced for money into Greece, it seems very unlikely that we should have brass money current at this period in Palestine: it has, however, been supposed that there was an independent copper. coinage in farther Asia before the introduction of silver money by the Seleucidae and the Greek kings of Bactriana. The terms ãsk,yxeri(<196830>Psalm 68:30) and trwgoa} ãsK,(<090236>1 Samuel 2:36) are merely expressive of any small denomination of money. *SEE SILVER*.

III. *Coined Money*. —

1. *The Antiquity of Coinage.* There are two generally received opinions as to who were the inventors of the coining of money. One is that Phidon, king of Argos, coined both gold and silver. money at Egina at the same time that he introduced a system of weights and measures (Ephor. ap. Strabo,. 8:376; Pollux, 9:83; AElian, *Var. Hist.* 12:10; *Marm. Par.).* The date of Phidon, according to the Parian marble, is B.C. 895, but Grote places him between 770 and 730, while Clinton, Bockh, and Miller place him between 783 and 744 (Grote, *Hist. of Greece*, 4:419, note). The other statement is that the Lydians "were the first nation to introduce the use of gold and silver coin" (Herod. 1:94). This latter assertion was also made, according to Pollux (9:6, 83), by Xenophalies of Colophon, and is repeated by Eustathius (ap. Dionys. Perieg. 5:840). The early coins of Egina and Lydia have a device on one side only, the reverse being an incuse square *(quadratum incusunm).* On the obverse of the AEginetan coins is a tortoise, and on those of the Lydian the head of a lion. The reverse, however, of the AEginetan coins soon shows the incuse square divided into four parts by raised lines, the fourth quarter being again divided by a diagonal bar, thus forming four compartments. Apart, however, from the history relative to these respective coinages, which decidedly is in favor of a Lydian origin (Rawlinson, *Herod.* 1:683; Grotefend, *Num. Chronicles* 1:235) against the opinion of the late colonel Leake *(Num. Hell.* App.), the Lydian coins seem to be ruder than those of AEgina, and it is probable that while the idea of *impress* may be assigned to Lydia, the perfecting of the silver and adding a *reverse type,* thereby completing the art of coinage, may be given to AEgina (W.B. Dickinson, *Num. Chronicles* 2:128). It may be remarked that Herodotus does not speak of the coins of Lydia when a kingdom, which coins have for their type the heads of a lion and bull facing, and which in all probability belong to Craesus, but of the *electrum* staters of Asia Minor. If we conclude that coinage commenced in European and Asiatic Greece about the same time, the next question is whether we can approximately determine the date. This is extremely difficult, since there are no coins of a known period before the time of the expedition of Xerxes. The pieces of that age are of so archaic a style that it is hard, at first sight, to believe that there was any length of time between them and the rudest, and therefore earliest, of the coins of AEgina or the Asiatic coast. It must, however, be recollected that in some conditions the growth or change of art is extremely slow, and that this was the case in the early period of Greek art seems evident from the results of the excavations on what we may believe to be the oldest sites in Greece. The lower limit obtained from the evidence of the coins of known date may perhaps be conjectured to be two, or at most three, centuries before their time; the-higher limit is as vaguely determined by the negative evidence of the Homeric writings, of which we cannot guess the age, excepting as being before the first Olympiad. On the whole, it seems reasonable to carry up Greek coinage to the 8th century B.C. Purely Asiatic coinage cannot be taken up to so early a date. The more archaic Persian coins seem to be of the time of Darius Hystaspis, or possibly of Cyrus, and certainly not much older. and there is no Asiatic money, unless of Greek cities, that can be reasonably assigned to an earlier period. Croesus and Cyrus probably originated this branch of the coinage, or else Darius -Iystaspis followed the example of the Lydian king. Coined money may therefore have been known in Palestine as early as the fall of Samaria, but only through commerce with the Greeks, and we cannot suppose that it was then current there. The earliest coined money current in Palestine is supposed to be the Daric (see below).

Picture for Money 1

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

Picture for Money 2

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

Picture for Money 3

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

Picture for Money 4

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

Picture for Money 5

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

Picture for Money 6

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

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

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

Picture for Money 7

3. *Coined Money mentioned in the Bible*. — The earliest mention of coined money in the Bible refers to the Persian coinage. In Ezra (<150269>Ezra 2:69) and Nehemiah (<160807>Nehemiah 8:70) the word µynæ/mK]r]Di occurs, and in Ezra (<150827>Ezra 8:27) and 1 Chronicles (<132907>1 Chronicles 29:7) the word µynæK r]dia}, both rendered in the Sept. by χρυσοῦς, and in the Vulg. by *solidus* and *drachma.* Many opinions have been put forward concerning the derivation of the words *adarkon* and *darkemon;* but a new suggestion has recently been made, which, though ingenious, will not, we think, meet with much support. Dr. Levy *(Jild. Miinzen,* page 19, note) thinks that the root-word is ËrD; "to stretch," "tread," "step forward," from the forward pacing of one foot, which a man does in bending the bow. and that from this word was formed a noun, ˆwkrd, or with the *Aleph* prefixed ˆwkrda, “archer,” which is the type upon these coins, especially as the ancients called the old Persian coins τοξόται. That the more extended form ˆwmkrd could have been formed from the simple ˆwkrd is very possible, as the *Mem* could easily have been inserted. All, however, agree that by these terms the Persian coin *Daric* is meant. This coin was a gold piece current in Palestine under Cyrus and Artaxerxes Longimanus. The ordinary Daric is not of uncommon occurrence; but Levy (l.c.) has given a representation of a *double piece,* thereby making the ordinarily received Daric a *half-Daric.* Of the *double piece,* he says, only three are known. In this he is mistaken, as Mr. Borrell, the coin-dealer, has a record of not less than eight specimens (F.W. Madden, *Hist. of Jewish Coinage,* etc., page 272, note 4). Besides these gold pieces, a silver coin also circulated in the Persian kingdom, named the *siglos. SEE DARIC*. Mention is probably made of this coin in the Bible in those passages which treat of the Persian times (<160515>Nehemiah 5:15; comp. 10:32). Of these pieces twenty went to one gold Daric (Mommsen, *Gesclhichte des Romi. Aiiunzwesens,* pages 13 and 855), which would give a ratio of gold to silver of one to thirteen (Herod. 3:95). These coins also have an archer on the obverse. As long, then, as the Jews lived under Persian domination, they made use of Persian coins. and had no struck coins of their own. In these coins also were probably paid the tributes (Herod. 3:89).

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

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

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

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

4. *Money in the New Testament*. — The coins mentioned by the evangelists, and first those of silver, are the following: the *stater is* spoken of in the account of the miracle of the tribute money. The receivers of *didrachmns* demanded the tribute, but Peter found in the fish a *stater,* which he paid for our Lord and himself (<401724>Matthew 17:24-27). This stater was therefore a tetradrachm, and it is very noteworthy that at this period almost the only Greek imperial silver coin in the East was a tetradrachm, the didrachm being probably unknown, or very little coined.

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

The *denarius,* or Roman penny, as well as the Greek *drachm,* then of about the same weight, is spoken of as a current coin. There can be little doubt that the latter is merely employed as another name for the former. In the famous passages respecting the tribute to Caesar, the Roman denarius of the time is correctly described (<402215>Matthew 22:15-21; .<422019>Luke 20:19-25). It bears the head of Tiberius, who has the title Caesar in the accompanying inscription, most later emperors having, after their accession, the title Augistus: here again therefore we have an evidence of the date of the Gospels. *SEE DENARIUS*; *SEE DRACHM*. copper coins the farthing and its half, the mite, are spoken of, and these probably formed the chief native currency. *SEE FARTHING*; *SEE MITE*.

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

Money-Changer

(κολλυβιστής <402112>Matthew 21:12; <411115>Mark 11:15; <430215>John 2:15). According to <023013>Exodus 30:13-15, every Israelite, whether rich or poor, who had reached or passed the age of twenty, must pay into the sacred treasury, whenever the nation was numbered, a half-shekel as an offering to Jehovah. Maimonides *(Sheeial.* cap. 1) says that this was to be paid annually, and that even paupers were not exempt. The Talmud exempts priests and women. The tribute must in every case be paid in coin of the exact Hebrew halfshekel, about 151d. sterling of English money. The. premium for obtaining by exchange of other money the half-shekel of Hebrew coin, according to the Talmud, was a κόλλυβος *(collybuis),* and hence the money-broker who made the exchange was called κολλυβιστής. The *collybus,* according to the same authority, was equal in value to a silver *obolus,* which has a weight of 12 grains, and its money value is about 11d. sterling. The moneychangers *(*κολλυβισταί*)* whom Christ, for their impiety, avarice, and fraudulent dealing, expelled from the Temple, were the dealers who supplied half-shekels, for such a premium as they might be able to exact, to the Jews: from all parts of the world, who assembled at Jerusalem during the great festivals, and were required to pay their tribute or ransom money in the Hebrew coin; and also for other purposes of exchange, such as would be necessary in so great a resort of foreign residents to the ecclesiastical metropolis. The word τραπεζίτης *(trapezites),which* we find in Matt. 25:29, is a general term for banker or broker, so called from the table *(*τραπέζης*)* at which they were seated (like the modern “bank,” i.e., *bench). SEE EXCHANGER*. Of this branch of business we find traces very early both in the Oriental and classical literature (comp. <401724>Matthew 17:24-27: see Lightfoot, *Hor. Heb.* on <402112>Matthew 21:12; Buxtorf, *Lex. Rabbin.* col. 2032). — Smith. It is mentioned by Volney that in Syria, Egypt, and Turkey, when any considerable payments are to be made, an agent of exchange is sent for, who counts paras by thousands, rejects pieces of false money, and weighs all the sequins either separately or together. It has hence been suggested that the “current money with the merchant” mentioned in Scripture (<012316>Genesis 23:16), might have been such as was approved of by competent judges, whose business it was to detect fraudulent money if offered’ in payment. The Hebrew word r jwes, *socher’,* signifies one who goes about from place to place, and is supposed to answer to the native exchange-agent or money-broker of the East, now called *shroff*. *SEE MERCHANT*. It appears that there were bankers or money-changers in Judaea, who made a trade of receiving money in deposit and paying interest for it (<402527>Matthew 25:27). In the *Life of Aratus,* by Plutarch, there is mention of a banker of Sicyon, a city of Peloponnesus, who lived 240 years before Christ, and whose whole business consisted in exchanging one species of money for another. *SEE CHANGER OF MONEY*.

Money, Love Of

*(*φιλαργυρία, <540610>1 Timothy 6:10, *avarice or* cupidity). *SEE COVETOUSNESS*.

Money, Piece Of

(hf;ycæq] *kesitah’*, <013319>Genesis 33:19; <184211>Job 42:11; “piece of silver,” <062432>Joshua 24:32; στατήρ, <401727>Matthew 17:27). *SEE KESITAH*; *SEE STATER*.

Money, Ecclesiastical

SEE NUMISMATICS; *SEE USURY*.

Money-stone

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

Monfort, David, D.D.

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

Monfort, Peter

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

Mongin, Edmonde

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

Mongitore, Antonino

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

Mongolia

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

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

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

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

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

The Mongols are, with a few exceptions, nomadic in their mode of life, living in tents and subsisting on animal food, the product of their flocks and herds. The Mongol tent, for about three feet from the ground, is cylindrical in form ; it then becomes conical, like a pointed hat. Its wood-work is composed below of a trellis-work of crossed bars, which fold up and expand at pleasure. Above these a circle of poles, fixed in the trellis-work, meets at the top, like the sticks of an umbrelia. Over the wood-work is stretched a thick covering of coarse felt. The door is low and narrow, and is crossed at the bottom by a beam which serves as a threshold. At the top of the tent is an opening to let out the smoke, which can at any time be closed by a piece of felt hanging above it, to which is attached a long string for the purpose. The interior is divided into two compartments — that on the left being for the men, while that on the right is occupied by the women, and is also used as a kitchen, the utensils of which consist chiefly of large earthen vessels for holding water, wooden pails for milk, and a large bell-shaped iron kettle. A small sofa or couch, a small square press or chest of drawers (the top of which serves as all altar for an idol), and a number of goats’ horns fixed in the woodwork of the tent, on which hang various utensils, arms, and other articles, complete the furniture of this primitive habitation. The odor pervading the interior of the Mongol tent is, to those not accustomed to it, disgusting and almost insupportable. “This smell,” says M. Huc, “so potent sometimes that it seems to make one’s heart rise to one’s throat, is occasioned by the mutton-grease and butter with which everything on and about a Tartar is impregnated. It is on account of this habitual filth that they are called Tsao-Ta-Dze (‘stinking Tartars’) by the Chinese, themselves not altogether inodorous, or by any means particular about cleanliness.” Household and family cares among the Mongols are assigned entirely to the women, who milk the cows, make the butter and cheese, draw water, gather fuel, tan skins, and make cloth and clothes. The occupation of the men consists chiefly in conducting the flocks and herds to pasture, which, as they are accustomed from infancy to horseback, is an amusement rather than a labor. They sometimes hunt wild animals for food or for their skins, but never for pleasure. When not on horseback, the men pass their time in absolute idleness, sleeping all night and squatting all day in their tents, drinking tea or smoking. Their education is very limited. The only persons who learn to read are the lamas or priests, who are also. the painters, sculptors, architects, and physicians of the nation. The training of the men who are not intended for priests is confined to the use of the bow and the matchlock, and a thorough mastery of horsemanship. M. Huc says: “When a mere infant, the Mongol is weaned, and as soon as he is strong enough he is stuck upon a horse’s back behind a man, the animal is put to a gallop, and the juvenile rider, in order not to fall off, has to cling with both hands to his teacher’s jacket. The Tartars thus become accustomed from a very early age to the movement of the horse, and by degrees and the force of habit they identify themselves, as it were, with the animal. There is perhaps no spectacle more exciting than that of Mongol riders in chase of a wild horse. They are armed with a long, heavy pole, at the end of which is a running-knot. They gallop — they fly after the horse they are pursuing, down rugged ravines and up precipitous hills, in and out, twisting and turning in their rapid course, until they come up with their game. They then take the bridle of their own horse in their teeth, seize with both hands their heavy pole, and, bending forward, throw by a powerful effort the running-knot around the wild horse’s neck. In this exercise the greatest vigor must be combined with the greatest dexterity, in order to enable them to stop short the powerful untamed animals with which they have to deal. It sometimes happens that the cord and pole are broken; but as to a horseman being thrown, it is an occurrence we never saw or heard of. The Mongol is so accustomed to ride on horseback that he is like a fish out of water when he sets foot on the ground. His step is heavy and awkward; and his bowed legs, his chest bent forward, and his constant looking about him, all indicate a person who spends the greater portion of his time on the back of a horse or a camel. The Mongols marry very young, and their marriages are regulated entirely by their parents, who make the contract without consulting the young people at all. No dowry is given with the bride, but, on the contrary, the bridegroom's family pay a considerable price for the maiden. A plurality of wives is permitted, but the first wife is always the mistress of the household. Divorce is very frequent, and is effected without the intervention of either the civil or the ecclesiastical authorities. The husband who wishes to repudiate his wife sends her back to her parents without any formality, except a message that he does not require her any longer. This proceeding does not give offence, as the family of the lady retain the cattle, horses, and other property given to them at the time of the marriage, and have an opportunity of selling her over again to a fresh purchaser. The women, however, are not oppressed, and are not kept in seclusion; they come and go at pleasure, ride on horseback, and visit from tent to tent. In their manners and appearance they are like the men — haughty, independent, and vigorous. The chiefs of the Mongol tribes and all their blood-relations form an aristocracy, who hold the common people in a mild species of patriarchal servitude. There is no distinction of manners nor of mode of living between these classes; and though the common people are not allowed to own lands, they frequently accumulate considerable property in herds and flocks. Those who become lamas are entirely free."

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

Religion. —

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

(b) *Christianity.* — The Nestorians (q.v.), who dwelt in large numbers among the Mongolians, seem to have exerted but little if any influence on this heathen people. What was by the early Christians regarded as an indication of their leaning towards the religion and culture of the Christian dispensation, proves to have been only a temporary accommodation. The Western or Roman Church has made repeated attempts to convert the Mongols. In the 13th century, when their invasion threatened to overthrow European society and civilization, the Western pontiff, Innocent IV (1245), sent two embassies, one to charge these sanguinary warriors to desist from their desolating inroads, the other to win them over to Christianity. The first of these, consisting of Dominicans, headed by one named Ascelin (Neander, *Kirchengeschichte*, 7:66), approached the commander-in-chief of the Mongol forces in Persia, but was unsuccessful. The other, consisting of Franciscans, headed by an Italian, Johannes de Plano Carpini, a disciple and devoted friend of Francis d'Assisi, pushed quite to the Tartaric court, and approached the khan in person (1246); but though they secured a hearing before the Mongolian throne, they yet failed to accomplish more than that the Mongol chief, like Vladimir of Russia, gave a patient hearing to Romanist, Nestorian, Buddhist, and Mohammedan, who each in their turn sought his conversion and influence. In 1253 Louis IX, hearing of the Mongolian's tendency towards Christianity, despatched another Franciscan, — William de *Aubruiquis (Neander, 7:69); but he reported that the Mongolian chief listened patiently to Christian emissaries, “filled with the idea that the Mongol conquests would come to an end unless the gods of foreign countries were propitiated.” Only one Christian Church had been founded. Rubruiquis, however, succeeded in baptizing about sixty persons; yet, after all, Rubruiquis’s success was not flattering, and he finally returned to Europe disheartened. The removal, five years later, of the capital of the Mongol empire to China (q.v.), further obstructed the progress of Christianity in Mongolia. There developed, however, among its simple pastoral tribes an article of belief which promised much for the final establishment of Christianity, viz. the belief in the existence of one almighty Being. In their heathen views, of course, they could not content themselves with acknowledging an earthly ruler unless a supernatural origin could be assigned to him, and they made the khan the son of this one almighty Power. an earthly ruler whom all men were bound to obey. While thus there was room for the most comprehensive toleration, there was room also for every kind of superstition; and the desire to bring the one Supreme, living apart in awful isolation, into nearer communion with his feeble worshipper — to bridge over the awful chasm between them — predisposed the people to a composite religion of Buddhism and Lamaism (see Hardwick, *Christ and other Masters,* volume 2, Append. 2; 3:89; *Middle Ages,* page 235). Still, “the son of Heaven” entertained a respect for all religions, and not least for Christianity. Marco Polo, who had been sent there by Gregory X in 1274, reports Kublai Khan as saying: “There are four great prophets who are reverenced by the different classes of mankind. The Christians regard Jesus Christ as their God; the Saracens, Mohammed; the Jews, Moses; the idolators, Sakyamuni Buddha, the most eminent among their idols. I honor and respect all the four” *(Travels,* page 167, ed. Bohn, 1854). One of the most successful of the early Christian laborers from the West was John de Monte Corvino, who went to Pekin in 1292, and for eleven years kept alive the flickering spark of Christianity in the Tartar realm. He translated the Scriptures for its people, educated their youth, and trained a native ministry. Yet even his labors bore fruit only while he was on earth; for soon after the close of his life, in 1330, “every vestige of his work was obliterated” (Gieseler, *Ecclesiastes Hist.* 4:259, 260; Hardwick, *Ch. Hist. M.A.* pages 235, 237). This was caused no doubt in a large measure by the termination of the Mongolian rule in China, and the accession of the Ming dynasty in 1370, which, fearing everything foreign, banished Christianity as dangerous to their interests. It remained for the Jesuits to plant Christianity anew. The missionary work performed in Persia, and in the border lands of the Caspian Sea and in Middle Asia, was so insignificant that it is not even Worth mentioning. See Maclean, *Hist. of Christian Missions in the M. A.* (Lond. 1863, 12mo), pages 370-77; Assemani, *Bibl. Orient.* 3:2 sq.; Hue, *Journey through the Chinese Empire; Recollections of a Journey through Tartary and Thibet;* Schmidt, *Forschungen im Gebiete der alteren religiisen, politischen, u. literarischen Bildungsgeschichte der Mongolen u. Tibeter* (St. Petersb. 1824); Tumerelli, *Kazan, the ancient Capital of the Tartar Khans* (Lond. 1854, 2 volumes, 12mo); Neumann, *Die Voilker des sidlichen Russlands* (Leipsic, 1847); Aboul Ghaze Bhadour Khan, *Histoire des Mogols et des Tartares* (St. Petersb. 1874), volume 2; Daniels, *Handb. d. Geogr.* 1:346 sq.; *Am. Cyclop.* s.v. *SEE TARTARY*.

Mongul, Peter

SEE MONOPHYSITES.

Monheim, Johannes

a follower of the great Desiderius Erasmus, and a noted teacher of the 16th century, was born of humble parentage at Claussen, near Elberfeld, in 1509. His father was a linen-draper, and Monheim entered his business when quite young. But his superior mental endowments soon led him into a different course; and, though not privileged with the advantages of a careful training, he yet managed to acquire a good classical education. It is said that he studied with Erasmus, but Hamelmann's assertion that Monheim studied. at Minster and Cologne deserves more credit. When but twenty-three years old, he was elected rector of the school at Essen, and four years later he received a call to Cologne as rector of the *schola metropolitanae ecclesiae Coloniensis.* Here he enjoyed intimate connections with the leaders of Erasmianism, and in a short time became so popular as a teacher that he attracted students from every direction. In 1545 he received and accepted a very flattering call from duke Wilhelm of Cleve to take the rectorship of the newly founded institute at Dusseldorf, and only five years after his inauguration in this new position Monheim wrote to a friend that his scholars outnumbered most German universities, more than 2000 young men being just then matriculated (see Frid. Reiffenbergii e Soc. Jesus Presbyteri *Hist. Societatis Jesu,* 1:89). Monheim, in opposition to other humanists, — insisted on a religious instruction, and published numerous catechisms, the best known of which is his *Catechismus in quo Christianae religionis elementa sincere simpliciterque explicantur* (Dusseldorf, 1560, with an introduction; and, edited and revised, it was recently published by Dr. Sack, Bonn, 1847). Though, outwardly at least, Monheim belonged to the Church of Rome, his catechism proves beyond doubt that he taught and believed the evangelical doctrines as set forth in the teachings of Calvin. The book was severely attacked. The theological faculty of the University of Cologne issued a *Censura et docta explicatio errorum Catechismi Johannis Monheimoii* (Cologne, 1560); and a number of other essays, partly in defence, partly in opposition to Monheim, were published. Monheim, however, himself remained quiet; but Martin Chemnitz, enraged at the open and secret attacks of the Cologne Jesuits on the learned man, edited his *Theologiae Jesuitarum praecipua capita, ex quadam nensum, guae Coloniae anno* 1560 *edita est* (Lips. 1563), which, together with his *Examen Concilii Tridentii,* so embittered pope Paul IV that he requested duke William to depose and banish “that arch-heretic” Johannes Monheim. Monheim was cited before the duke, and obliged to sign an agreement in which he promised to abstain from teaching Protestant doctrines, either openly or secretly (see *Zeitschrift d. bergischen Geschichtsvereins,* 2:255). The pope, however, was not satisfied even with this. He insisted upon an open judgment on Monheim, especially as the pardoning of a heretic was not within the duke’s jurisdiction — “nec princeps haeretico publico quicquam ignoscere potuit.” Further steps of the papal court were made unnecessary by Monheim’s sudden decease, September 9, 1564. Monheim wrote a great number of learned books, but his most valued work is the above-mentioned catechism, which Theo. Strack calls *Catechismum orthodoxum, in quo Reformatorum doctrina, quae hodie Luthero-Calvinini nomine odiose traducitur, accurate confirmatur.* Monheim lacked strength of character to take a decided position in the great struggle of the Reformation. He preferred, although thoroughly Protestant in all his views, to remain in the Church of Rome. “He belonged,” said one, “to that class of actors on the stage of life who have always appeared as the harbingers of great social men gifted with the power to discern and the hardihood to proclaim truths of which they want the courage to encounter the infallible result.” See Mohler, *Symbolik;* Seek, *Protestant. Beantwortung der Synzbolik Mohler’s.*

Moniales

SEE NUNS.

Monica, St.

the mother of at. Augustine, “counted,” says Schaff, “among the most noble and pious women who adorn the temple of Church history,” was born, according to tradition, of Christian parents, in Africa, about the year 332. Having attained to the age of womanhood she was married to Patrice of Tagaste, a heathen of Numidia, by whom she had two sons and one daughter. She was instrumental in the conversion of her husband a year before his death, after having spent with him years in hardship and sore trial. He was of violent temperament, and unfaithful to her in conjugal duties, yet she met all his shortcomings by a Christian spirit of forgiveness and love. and thus at last conquered in the name of her Saviour, whom she adored and faithfully followed. “Her highest aim,” says Schaff, “ was to win him over to the faith — not so much by words as by a truly humble and godly conversation, and the most conscientious discharge of her household duties” *(Life of St. Augustine*, page 10). The same earnestness which she displayed for the conversion of her husband she manifested also for the spiritual safety of her children. She was especially anxious for her son Augustine, who in his youth was given to dissipation, having inherited from his father strong sensual passions, and who had embraced the Manichaean heresy, which she feared would ultimately ruin his spiritual life. For thirty years she therefore uninterruptedly prayed for his conversion. “A son of so many prayers and tears,” says Schaff, “could not be lost, and the faithful mother, who travailed with him in spirit with greater pain than her body had in bringing him into the world (Augustine, *Confess.* 9, c. 8), was permitted, for the encouragement of future mothers, to receive, shortly before her death, an answer to her prayers and expectations, and was able to leave this world with joy without revisiting her earthly home.” Augustine had embraced Christianity at Milan, whither he had gone in 384. Hither his mother followed him, and together they worshipped under the ministration of St. Ambrose. In the spring of 387, shortly after his baptism, they had quitted Rome to return to Africa, and it was on this homeward journey that Monica died, in Ostia, at the mouth of the Tiber, in 387, in the arms of her son, after enjoying with him a glorious conversation that soared above the confines of space and time, and was a foretaste of the eternal Sabbath-rest of the saints. She regretted not to die, aye, not even in a foreign land, because she was not far from God, who would raise her up at the last day. “Bury my body anywhere,” was her last request, “and trouble not yourselves for it: only this one thing I ask, that you remember me at the altar of my God, wherever you may be.” Augustine, in his *Confessions,* has erected to Monica the noblest monument, and it can never perish. The Roman Catholic Church keeps May 4 in commemoration of her. Pope Martin V gives an account of the translation of her remains to Rome in 1430. See St. Augustine, *Confessions;* Godescard, *Vie des Saints;* Braune, *Monica u. Augustinus* (1846); Petet, *Histoire de Sainte-Monique* (1848); Schaff, *Life and Labors of St. Augustine* (N.Y. 1854), chapters 1, 4, 8; Mrs. Jamieson, *Legends* (see Index); Schaff, *Ch. Hist.* 3:991, 992; Neander, *Ch. Hist.* 2:227. *SEE AUGUSTINE*. (J.H.W.)

Moniglia, Tommaso-Vincenzo

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

Monism

SEE MONADS.

Monita Secreta Societatis Jesu

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

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

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

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

At Strasburg, in 1713, Henri de St. Ignace, under the pseudonym of "Liberius Candidus," a Flemish divine of the Carmelite order, published his *Tuba Magra,* addressed to the pope and all potentates, on the "necessity of reforming the Society of Jesus." In the appendix the *Monita Secreta* is reproduced in full. In proof of its authenticity, he gives these three reasons: "1. Common fame. 2. The character of the document wholly Jesuitical. 3. Its exact conformity with their practices. Besides, its having been found in the Jesuit colleges." The Jesuit, Alphonso Huylenbrock, published his "Vindications" of the society in the following year. De Ignace could not be shaken from his belief in the authenticity of the book, and issued a second edition in 1714, in which he says that "nothing, or next to nothing, is contained therein that the Jesuits have not reduced to practice." A third edition of the *Tuba Magna* was published in 1717, and a fourth in 1760. In 1717 the *Monita* was published by John Schipper, at Amsterdam, from a copy purchased at Antwerp, with the significant title of *Machiavelli Muus Jesuiticus.* This was followed; in 1723, by an edition in Latin and English, published at London by John Walthoe, Jui., and dedicated to Sir Robert Walpole. A second edition was issued in 1749. Another edition in French (probably a reprint of the Paderborn edition of 1661) was issued at Cologne in 1727.

After the suppression of the. order in 1773, several MSS. of the work were found in Jesuitic haunts, particularly in their colleges. A MS. was even found in Rome which was printed in 1782 under the title *Monita Secreta Patrum Societatis Jesu, "nunc primum* typis expressa." Evidently its editor had never heard of a published copy of the *Monita.* It contains numerous errors, such as are very likely to creep into a MS. The New York Union Theological Seminary possesses a copy of this printed edition. The early restoration of the order to power, in 1814, prevented the unearthing of copies direct from Jesuitichands.

II. *Defenders of its Authenticity; recent Editors, etc.* As far back as the 17th century, after the authenticity of the *Monita* had been a. matter of dispute for more than a hundred years, we find that astute Lutheran theologian Dr. Johann Gerhard, whose familiarity with polemic divinity was perfectly marvellous, make mention of Schoppe's *Anatomia* in his great work *Confessio Catholica* (Frankfort and Leipsic, 1679), and refer to the *Monita Secreta* as a work of *undoubted authenticity.* This opinion has been generally quoted and endorsed by ecclesiastical historians, especially of the Protestant Church, with only one exception (Gieseler, *Kirchengesch.* volume 3, part 2, page 656 sq.). In 1831, after "careful investigation," an edition was published at Princeton, N.J., by the learned Dr. W.C. Brownlee, under the auspices of the "American Protestant Society," containing the original, an English translation based upon that of Walthoe (1723), and a "Historical Sketch." Dr. Hodge, in reviewing the case in the *Biblical Repository* (4:138), takes occasion to say that the authenticity of the work has never been disproved. "Attempts," he says, "have been made to cry down this work as a forgery... We cannot imagine that these doubts can be seriously entertained by those who peruse the historical essay which is prefixed to it. Facts and authorities are there adduced which we cannot help thinking ought to satisfy every mind, not only of the authenticity of the work, but also of the entire justice of the representations which it gives of the society whose official instructions it professes to exhibit." In 1843, shortly after an edition of the *Monita* had been issued by Seeley, Mr. Edward Dalton, the secretary of the "Protestant Association of Great Britain," took occasion thus to comment on it in his *The Jesuits; their Principles and Acts:* "If we weigh well the evidence which has been handed down to us by historians; if we peruse the writings of the Jesuits themselves, and maturely consider the doctrines therein promulgated, and their practical tendency, we can scarcely fail to be convinced of the authenticity of the *Secreta Monita.*” In 1844 an edition was again published in the United States, this time under the auspices of the “American and Foreign Christian Union.” It then became the subject of considerable agitation, several Protestant writers of note taking the ground that the work had not a real basis in Jesuitism, and had been proved spurious. In consequence, the learned professor Henry M. Baird, of the New York University, contributed the following additional testimony: “In proof of the authenticity of the ‘Secret Instructions,’ we have the testimony of a gentleman who as a historical investigator has scarcely a peer — certainly no superior. I refer to M. Louis Prosper Gachard, the ‘archivistegeneral’ of the kingdom of Belgium, to whose rare sagacity, profound erudition, and indefatigable industry our own distinguished historians, Prescott and Motley, pay such frequent and deserved compliments; the. latter, in the preface to his *Dutch Republic,* remarking: ‘It is unnecessary to add that all the publications of M. Gachard — particularly the invaluable correspondence of Philip II and of William the Silent, as well as the “Archives et Correspondance” of the Orange Nassau family, edited by the learned and distinguished Groen van Prinsterer — have been my constant guides through the tortuous labyrinth of Spanish and Netherland politics.’ In M. *Gachard’s Analectes Belgiques,* a volume from which Mr. Prescott draws much of the material of the first chapter of his *Philip the Second,* I find a short article devoted to ‘The Secret Instructions of the Jesuits’ (page 63). ‘When the *Monita Secreta Societatis Jesu* were published, a few years since,’ says M. Gachard, ‘many persons disputed the authenticity of this book; others boldly maintained that it had been forged, with the design of injuring the society by ascribing to it principles which it did not possess. *Here are facts that will dissipate all uncertainty in this respect:* At the suppression of the order in the Low Countries in 1773, there were discovered in one of its houses, in the College of Ruremonde (everywhere else they had been carefully destroyed at the first tidings of the bull fulminated by Clement XIV), the most important and most secret-papers, such as the correspondence of the general with the provincial fathers, and the directions of which the latter alone could have had cognizance. Among these papers were the *Monita Secreta.* A translation of them was made, *by order of the government,* by the “substitut procureur-general” of Brabant, De Berg. It still exists in the archives of the kingdom, and *I can vouch that it differs in nothing substantially* (quant au *fond) from that which has been rendered public.’*”

In 1869 the Reverend Dr. Edwin F. Hatfield ably reviewed the case of the "Secret Instructions" in the *New York Observer*, and since that time but little has been advanced either pro or con. Prof. Schem, well known for his ecclesiastical learning, and himself educated at the Jesuitical college in Rome, but now a Protestant in theology, in the article JESUITS *SEE JESUITS* in *this Cyclopaedia* took ground against the authenticity of the *Monita*, and, as he is entitled to a hearing, we did not there dissent from his article. Our own judgment, however, is to accept the *Moanita* as a Jesuitical production, containing the instructions of the order. In the article "Jesuits" in the *Encyclop. Britannica*, Dr. Isaac Taylor, its author, states that thee *Monita* is "believed to be a spurious production," but he by no means anywhere indicates that he himself believed it spurious; on the contrary, it is more than likely that he held it to be genuine.

Monition

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

Monitoire or Monitory

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

Monk

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

(7) We find also a large number of other classes of monks and ascetics, which are worthy of remark only as furnishing a proof of the high esteem in which a monastic life was held in the early Church.: Such are: i. Σπουδαῖοι *(studios!),* a sect of ascetics who practiced uncommon austerities (Euseb. *Hist. Eccl.* lib. 6, c. 11; Epiphan. *Expos. Fid.* c. 22). ii. Ἐκλεκτοί, or ἐκλεκτῶν ἐκλεκτότεροι, the elect, or elect of the elect (Clem. Alex. *Quis Dives Salv.* n. 36). iii. Ἀκοίμητοι, *insomnes,* the sleepless, or the watchers; a term applied especially to the members of a monastery *(*στούδιον*)* near Constantinople (Niceph. *Hist. Eccl.* lib. 15:c.

23; Baron. *Annal.* a. 459), iv. Βοσκοί, i.e., the grazers; so called because they professed to subsist on roots and herbs, like cattle (Sozomen, *Hist. Eccl.* lib. 6, c. 33; Evagr. *Hist. Eccl.* lib. 1, c. 21). v. ῾Ησυχασταί, *quiescentes,* or *quietistce,* quietists, monks who lived by themselves in perpetual silence (Justin. *Novell.* 5, c. 3; Suicer. *Thesaur. Eccl.* s.v. ἡσυχαστής*)*. vi. Ἀποταξάμενοι, *renunciantes,* renouncers; so called from their formal renunciation of the world and secular enjoyments (Pallad. *Hist. Laus.* c. 15). vii. *Culdai,* Colidei, Keldei, Keiedei, certain ancient monks in Scotland and the Hebrides, supposed to have been so called as *cultores Dei,* worshippers of God, because they were wholly occupied in preaching the Gospel. Some suppose that they were priests; others regarded them as canons regular; others; again, that they constituted a secret society, and were the forerunners of the modern Freemasons. 8. *Apostolici,* apostolicals, monks in England and Ireland, before the arrival of the Benedictines, with Augustine, at the latter end of the 6th century.

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

Among the remarkable institutions of Christianity which have prevailed in the Roman Catholic and the Greek Church, there is none that makes a more conspicuous figure than the institution of monachism or monkery; and, if traced to its origin, it will be found strikingly to exemplify the truth of the maxim that, as some of the largest and loftiest trees spring from very small seeds, so the most extensive and wonderful effects sometimes arise from very inconsiderable causes. In times of persecution during the first ages of the Church, while "the heathen raged, and the rulers took counsel together against the Lord, and against his anointed," many pious Christians, male and female, married and unmarried, justly accounting that no human felicity ought to come in competition with their fidelity to Christ, and diffident of their own ability to persevere in resisting the temptations with which they were incessantly harassed by their persecutors, took the resolution to abandon their professions and worldly prospects, and, while the storm lasted, to retire to unfrequented places far from the haunts of men (the married with or without their wives, as agreed between them), that they might enjoy in quietness their faith and hope, and, exempt from the temptations to apostasy, employ themselves principally in the worship and service of their Maker. The cause was reasonable and the motive praiseworthy, but the reasonableness arose solely from the circumstances. When the latter were changed the former vanished, and the motive could no longer be the same. When there was not the same danger in society, there was not the same occasion to seek security in solitude. .Accordingly, when persecution ceased, and the profession of Christianity was rendered perfectly safe, many returned without blame from their retirement and resumed their stations in society. Some, indeed, familiarized by time to a solitary life, at length preferred, through habit, what they had originally adopted through necessity. *SEE ASCETICS*; *SEE HERMITS*. They did not, however, waste their time in idleness: they supported themselves by their labor, and gave the surplus in charity. But they never thought of flattering themselves by vows or engagements, because by so doing they must have exposed their souls to new temptations and perhaps greater dangers. It was, therefore, a very different thing from that system of monkery which afterwards became so prevalent, though in all probability it constituted the first step towards it.

Egypt, the fruitful parent of superstition, afforded the first. example, strictly speaking, of the monastic life. The first and most noted of the solitaries was Paul, a native of Thebes, who, in the time of Athanasius, distributed his patrimony, deserted his family and house, and took up his residence among the tombs and in a ruined tower. After a long and painful novitiate, he at length advanced three days' journey into the desert, to the eastward of the Nile, where, discovering a lonely spot which possessed the advantages of shade and water, he fixed his last abode. His example and his lessons infected others, whose curiosity pursued him to the desert; and before he quitted life, which was prolonged to the term of one hundred and five years, he beheld a numerous progeny imitating his original. The prolific colonies of monks multiplied with rapid increase on the sands of Lybia, upon the rocks of Thebais, and the cities of the Nile. But there were no bodies or communities of men embracing this life, nor any monasteries built, until Pachomius, who flourished in the peaceable reign of Constantine, caused some to be erected, *SEE MONASTERY*. Once the custom established, they soon multiplied, and even to the present day the traveller may explore the ruins of fifty monasteries which were planted to the south of Alexandria by the disciples of Pachomius. Inflamed by this example, a Syrian youth, whose name was Hilarion, fixed his dreary abode on a sandy beach, between the sea and a morass, about seven miles from Gaza. The austere penance in which he persisted for forty-eight years diffused a similar enthusiasm, and innumerable monasteries were soon distributed over all Palestine. Not long after, Eustathius, bishop of Sebastia, brought monks into Armenia, Paphlagonia, and Pontus. While Macarius, the Egyptian, peopled the deserts of Scethis with monks, Gregory, the apostle of Armenia, did the like in that country. But St. Basil is generally considered as the great father and patriarch of the Eastern monks. It was he who reduced the monastic life to a fixed state of uniformity; who united the anchorets and coenobites, and obliged them to engage themselves by solemn vows. It was St. Basil who prescribed rules for the government and direction of the monasteries, to which most of the disciples of Anthony, Pachomius, Macarius, and the other ancient fathers of the deserts submitted; and to this day all the Greeks, Nestorians, Melchites, Georgians, Mingrelians, and Armenians follow the rule of St. Basil. In the West, Athanasius (about A.D. 340) taught the anchorets of Italy to live in societies; and a little later Martin of Tours, "a soldier, a hermit, a bishop, and a saint," established the monasteries of Gaul, and the progress of monkery is said not to have been less rapid or less universal than that of Christianity itself. Every province, and at last every city of the empire, was filled with their increasing multitudes. The disciples of Pachomius spread themselves wherever Christianity found a foothold. The Cpuncil of Saragossa, in Spain (A.D. 380), in condemning the practice of clergymen who affected to wear the monastical habits, affords proof that there were monks in that kingdom in the 4th century, before St. Donatus went thither out of Africa, with seventy disciples, and founded the Monastery of Sirbita. Augustine, sent into England by Gregory the Great, in the year 596, to preach the faith, at that time introduced the monastic state into British territory, and it made so great a progress there that, within the space of two hundred years, there were thirty kings and queens who preferred the religious habit to their crowns, and founded stately monasteries, where they ended their days in retirement and solitude. The monastery of Bangor, in Flintshire, a few miles south of Wrexham, contained above two thousand monks, and from thence a numerous colony was dispersed among the barbarians of Ireland, where St. Patrick is regarded as the founder of monasticism; and so readily did the monasteries multiply there that it was called “the Island of Saints.” Iona, also, one of the western isles of Scotland, which was planted by the Irish monks, diffused over all northern regions a ray of science and superstition.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

By their special addiction to an ascetic life, indicating superior sanctity and virtue, the monastics secured great favor with the multitude, and speedily acquired for themselves such popularity and influence that the clergy could not but find in them either powerful allies or formidable rivals. When they began to form large and regular establishments, it was needful that some members of their body should be ordained, in order to secure the regular performance of divine worship; and at length, not only was it usual for many members of a monastery to be in holy orders, but it came to be regarded as an advantage for the clergy to possess the additional character of monastics. From the 4th century, in the West, at the request of the people or their abbot, the monks very frequently took orders; and in the East at the instance of the bishops, the archimandrites being sometimes elevated to the episcopate, or acting as bishops' deputies at councils, and their monks ranking after priests and deacons, they frequently went to study in the cloister. It was not until the 6th century that the coenobites left the desert for the suburbs of cities and towns, but as early as the close of that century they were known as monastics, having come to be distinguished from the populace, and, endowed with much opulence and many honorable privileges, found themselves in a condition to claim an eminent station among the pillars and supporters of the Christian community. The fame of their piety and sanctity was so great that bishops and presbyters were often chosen out of their order; and the passion for erecting edifices and convents, in which the monks and holy virgins might serve God in the most commodious manner, was at that time carried beyond all bounds. “So much was the world infatuated by the sanctimonious appearance of the recluses that men thought they could not more effectually purchase heaven to themselves than by beggaring their offspring, and giving all they had to erect or endow monasteries; that is, to supply with all the luxuries of life those who were bound to live in abstinence, and to enrich those who had solemnly sworn that they would be forever poor, and who professed to consider riches as the greatest impediment in the road to heaven. Large monasteries, both commodious and magnificent, more resembling the palaces of princes than the rude cells which the primitive monks chose for their abode, were erected and endowed. Legacies and bequests from time to time flowed in upon them. Mistaken piety often contributed to the evil, but oftener superstitious profligacy. Oppression herself commonly judged that to devote her wealth at last, when it could be kept no longer, to a religious house, was full atonement for all the injustice and extortion by which it had been amassed. But what set in a stronger light the pitiable brutishness to which the people were reduced by the reigning superstition, was that men of rank and eminence, who had shown no partiality to anything monastical during their lives, gave express orders, when in the immediate view of death, that their friends should dress them out in monkish vestments, that in these they might die and be buried, thinking that the sanctity of their garb would prove a protection against a condemnatory sentence of the omniscient Judge” (Cramp, *Text-book of Popery,* page 323). Nevertheless, although many monastics greatly distinguished themselves, and established such a popular interest in monasticism as to cause eminent ecclesiastics to adopt the monastic life, yet it was not the custom to place monks, as such, on an equal footing with the clergy. They, indeed, were not then reckoned as *sieculares*, but were distinguished by the name of *religiosi* or *regulares* (canonici), and they were first regarded as part of the clerical body in the

10th century; but even then a distinction was carefully made between *clerici smoculares,* i.e., parish priests and all who were charged with the cure of souls, and *clerici regulares,* i.e., those belonging to monastic orders; and the former vehemently protested against the right of the latter to interfere with their own peculiar duties. In fact, no complete amalgamation of the two bodies ever took place; and all monasteries continued to include a certain number of lay brethren, or *conversi,* who, without discharging strictly spiritual functions, formed, as in the ancient Church, a middle order between the clergy and the laity. In the 9th century there existed ‘also the *nonachi scculares,* who were members of religious fraternities, living under a certain rule and presidency, but without submitting to the confinement of a cloister. They were the forerunners of the religious fraternities which arose in France, Italy, and Germany, and greatly multiplied and extended during the 15th and 16th centuries. The’ members of these fraternities formed a class between the laity and clergy. However, their licentiousness, even in the 6th century, became a proverb; and they are said to have excited the most dreadful tumults and sedition in various places.

The monastic orders, as we have already indicated, were at first under the immediate jurisdiction of the bishops, but they were exempted from them by the Roman pontiff about the end of the 7th century (Boniface IV); and the monks, in turn, devoted themselves wholly to advancing the interests and to maintaining the dignity of the bishop of Rome. “The partiality of the popes for monastic orders,” says Cramp, “ is easily accounted for. They constitute a peculiar and distinct body, so estranged from society that they can give undivided attention and solicitude to any object that is presented to their notice. That object has uniformly been the aggrandizement of the Church-that is, the See of Rome. Incorporated by pontifical authority, exempted to a degree from episcopal jurisdiction, and endowed with many privileges and favors from which the rest of the faithful are excluded, they are bound in gratitude to make the pope’s interest their own. History records that they have ever been ready to come forward in. support of the most glaring enormities of the papal system, and that to their indefatigable diligence and adroit management the triumphant progress of that system was mainly indebted. They formed a sort of local militia, stationed in every country in Europe, always prepared to uphold the cause to which they had attached themselves, by aggression, defence, or imposture, as the case might require” *(Text-book of Popery,* page 359). The immunity which the monks thus obtained was a fruitful source of licentiousness and disorder, and largely occasioned the vices with which they were afterwards so justly charged. In the 8th century the monastic discipline was extremely relaxed, and all efforts to restore it were ineffectual. Nevertheless, this kind of institution was in the highest esteem; and nothing could equal, the veneration that was paid about the close of the 9th century to such as devoted themselves to the gloom and indolence of a convent. This veneration caused several kings and emperors to call monks to their courts, and to employ them in civil affairs of the greatest moment. -Their reformation was attempted by Louis the Meek, but the effect was of short duration. In the 11th century they were exempted by the popes from the authority established; but this caused such laxity that in the Council of Lateran, in 1215, a decree was passed, by the advice of Innocent III, to prevent any new monastic institutions; and several were entirely suppressed in the 15th and 16th centuries, it appears, from the testimony of the best writers, that the monks were generally lazy, illiterate, profligate, and licentious epicures, whose views in life were confined to opulence, idleness, and pleasure. “Whenever a general council was assembled,” says Cramp, “the irregularities or usurpations of the monastic orders commonly occupied a large share of the proceedings. Canon after canon was issued, and still the interposition of ecclesiastical authority was constantly required. An abstract of the decree passed on this subject in the twenty-fifth session of the Council of Trent will place before the reader the then existing condition of that portion of the Roman Catholic Church. It was enacted that care should be taken to procure strict observance of the rules of the respective professions; that no regular should be allowed to possess any private property, but should surrender everything to his superior; that all monasteries, even those of the mendicants (the Capuchins and friars minor Observantines excepted at their own request), should be permitted to hold estates and other wealth; that no monk should be suffered to undertake any office whatever without his superior’s consent, nor quit the convent without a written permission; that nunneries should be carefully closed, and egress be absolutely forbidden the nuns, under any pretense whatsoever, without episcopal license, on pain of excommunication-magistrates being enjoined under the same penalty to aid the bishop, if necessary, by employing force, and the latter being urged to their duty by the fear of the judgment of God and the eternal curse; that monastics should confess and receive the eucharist at least once a month; that if any public scandal should arise out of their conduct, they should be judged and punished by the superior, or, in case of his failure, by the bishop; that no renunciation of property or pecuniary engagement should be valid unless made within two months of taking the vows of religious profession; that immediately after the novitiate, the novices should either be dismissed or take the vow, and that if they were dismissed, nothing should be received from them but a reasonable payment for their board, lodging, and clothing during the novitiate; that no females should take the veil without previous examination by the bishop; that whoever compelled females to enter convents against their will, from avaricious or other motives, or, on the other hand, hindered such as were desirous of the monastic life, should be excommunicated; that if any monk or nun pretended that they had taken the vows under the influence of force or fear, or before the age appointed by law, they should not be heard, except within five years after their profession — if they laid aside the habit of their own accord, they should not be permitted to make the complaint, but be compelled to return to the monastery, and be punished as apostates, being in the mean time deprived of all the privileges of their order. Finally, with regard to the general reformation of the corruptions and abuses which existed in convents, the council lamented the great difficulty of applying any effectual remedy, but hoped that the supreme pontiff would piously and prudently provide for the exigencies of the case as far as the times would bear" *(Textbook of Popery,* page 359). However, the Reformation had a manifest influence in restraining these excesses, and in rendering monastics more circumspect and cautious in their external conduct. *SEE MONASTERY* and *SEE MONASTICISM*; also *SEE MONKS, EASTERN*.

Monk, George, Duke of Albemarle

a noted British general of the days of the Commonwealth, celebrated for the services he rendered, first to the Protectorate and afterwards to the crown, causing the restoration of king Charles, was born in the parish of Merton, Devonshire, December 6, 1608. He devoted himself early to military life, and had acquired some experience in the wars on the Continent when the war broke out (1638) between Charles and the Scotch. Monk enlisted in the English service, and was made lieutenant-colonel. In 1641 he served against the Irish rebels; and in the following year, upon the outbreak of the war between Charles and Parliament, he obtained a full colonelcy. He was very popular with his soldiers, and to the last remained their idol. For a while his loyalty to the king was questioned; but he soon regained the confidence of the throne, and was suffered to take the field. He rapidly acquired reputation as an able officer; but was made prisoner at Nantwich in January, 1644, l y the Roundheads, and confined in the Tower of London more than a year. While himself immured, matters outside turned very much against the king, who was finally taken prisoner, thus terminating the civil war. Efforts were now made by Parliament to secure Monk's services. His known ability and favor with the soldiers made him a desirable acquisition. Clarendon insists upon it that Monk was bought by Parliament (7:382); but there is no proof for such an assertion, though his final acts in the scene of Restoration would point that way. In all probability Monk felt the king's cause lost, and was thus persuaded to serve Parliament. The silence which he ever after preserved would confirm such a *belief.* This seems reasonable also when it is considered that originally Monk must have been in sympathy with the people's cause, for he was suspected by the Royalists. Most likely, too, Monk was influenced by the condition of affairs. He liked to be with the winning side, and, though he had come to be an admirer of the splendor and attraction of court, he would yet fain resign all these rather than serve the minority. He finally in 1647 consented to take a commission in the Parliamentarian army. He first commanded for his new masters in Ireland, where he distinguished himself greatly. He afterwards acted as lieutenant-general under Cromwell in Scotland, where he aided much in gaining the victory of Dunbar. Cromwell finally left him with 6,000 men to complete the subjugation of Scotland, a work which Monk effectually performed. He was next employed as an admiral of the Commonwealth's fleet, and he shared in the perils and the glories of the desperate struggle with the Dutch navy, which Blake so successfully conducted. After being rewarded with many honors at the hand of Cromwell and the Parliament, Monk was sent back to his command in Scotland, where fresh troubles had broken out. He was at this time in a very embarrassing position, and yet he discharged himself of his task with satisfaction to all. His own soldiers were the most restless and fanatical of the army. Besides, he had to contend with lord Middleton, with whom the Royalists had risen in the Highlands, and the people generally, who were discontented and ready for rebellion. His vigilance, activity, and good sense in this position were remarkable. "The country," writes Guizot, "submitted; the army did not quit it till it had, by means of a certain number of garrisons, secured the payment of taxes, which the Highlanders had hitherto thought they could refuse with impunity; and order was established in those sanctuaries of plunder with such effect that the owner of a strayed horse, it is said, recovered it in the country by means of a crier” (page 80). He was also instrumental in bringing about the union which was established under the Protectorate between England and Scotland; and thus likewise strengthened the Cromwellian efforts. Indeed, it is generally conceded that Monk was always attached to Cromwell from the moment he openly espoused’ the popular cause, and was never suspected of disloyalty while the Protector lived. This is manifest also from Monk’s prompt action when importuned by Charles for his cause. The king sent Monk a letter expressive of confidence, and, instead of reply, Monk turned the letter over to Cromwell. In 1655 Monk was made one of the commissioners for the government of Scotland, and he largely, if not wholly, controlled the action of the council of state. That in this position also he pleased Cromwell is evident from the way in which he was remembered in the Protector’s last hour. Cromwell on his death-bed is said to have recommended him to his son and successor, who as soon as installed likewise received Monk’s support. But Richard’s failure turned Monk away. Monk soon discovered the weakness of the new ruler, and determined to follow that policy by which he would both connect himself with the strongest party, and also lay that under the greatest possible obligation to him. He temporized for some months; listening to the advances of all sides, and saying little in return. He had, no doubt; made up his mind that the Royalist cause was the strongest, and that Richard was not fitted to give stability to the government; and though when circumstances compelled him to act he declared for the Parliament against the army and decided upon marching to London, there were many, even at the time when he thus declared himself, who altogether discredited his sincerity, and believed him to be at heart a Royalist, seeking to restore the king as soon as it might be done with safety; and there is reason to suppose that he even then was determined to promote the Restoration. We give Mr. Hallam’s opinion on this point: “I incline, upon the whole, to believe that Monk, not accustomed to respect the Rump Parliament, and incapable, both by his temperament and by the course of his life, of any enthusiasm for the name of liberty, had satisfied himself as to the expediency of the king’s restoration from the time that the Cromwells had sunk below his power to assist them; though his projects were still subservient to his own security, which he was resolved not to forfeit by any premature declaration or unsuccessful enterprise” *(Const. Hist.* 2:384). When Monk arrived in London he was lodged in the apartments of the prince of Wales. He addressed the Parliament, was invited to occupy his place there, was made a member of the council of state, and charged with the executive power. With his usual address, he continued to use the power of his army as a means of awing Parliament, and the assertion of duty owed to the Parliament as a means of controlling his army. At length in 1660 the “Rump” became so unpopular, and the cries for a free Parliament so loud, that the city of London refused the payment of taxes. Monk obeyed an order from the Parliament to march into the city and subdue it; but his subservience to them did not last long. He sent them a harsh letter, ordering them immediately to fill up the vacant seats, fixing a time for their dissolution, and the 6th of May for the election of a new and free Parliament. The restored members appointed him general of the forces of England, Scotland, and Ireland; and the Republicans, as a last resource, listened to his continued protestations against the king, the House of Lords, and the bishops, and allied themselves to him. Every day his personal power increased; he was. offered the Protectorate, which he declined; continuing the line of conduct he had always followed — “that is to say, steadfast in varying his language according to the individual — he gave no handle to any definite opinions with respect to himself.” The expectation of the Restoration daily increased, and some indications in the conduct of Monk, who was gradually dismissing persons and removing objects that might prove obnoxious to the king, showed plainly that the event was not far distant. Moreover, the Presbyterians were in constant communication with Monk, and this of itself speaks volumes. They were in favor of Charles’s restoration, and in Monk they found a ready helper. He was warmly attached to them, and thus may have been easily persuaded to throw his influence in favor of the exiled king. That he preferred Presbyterianism to the Episcopal Church he had not feared to declare in one of his speeches in Parliament, when, after repeated declarations in favor of a republic, he yet dared to speak for Presbyterianism. Said he, “As to a government in the Church, moderate, not rigid, Presbyterianism appears at present to be the most indifferent and acceptable way to the Church’s settlement” *(Parl. Hist.* 3:1580). At length the farce was brought to a close, and Monk openly declared for the king. It was on the 19th of March when the royal requests for his assistance came, and to royal promises of high reward he yielded, agreed to the king’s return, and directed the manner in which he wished it to be brought about. The king, by Monk’s advice, went from Brussels to Breda, and on the 1st of May sent letters to the new Parliament drawn up as, Monk desired, and the king was immediately acknowledged and proclaimed. On the 23d of May, Monk received him on the beach at Dover, was embraced by him, and addressed with great affection. Monk obtained many offices and titles, of which the principal was the duke of Albemarle. As such he changed again to be an Episcopalian, after he had in turn worshipped as Independent and Presbyterian, and by this change forever set at rest all hopes for the disestablishment of the Episcopal Church. The failure of the Independent and Presbyterian cause may thus be truly laid to Monk, and he therefore figures in no inconsiderable way in the ecclesiastical as well as political history of England, and even of Great Britain. From this time forth but little influence remained to him except as he wielded it through the king. He went to sea again in 1666, against his old enemies the Dutch, and maintained his reputation for courage and conduct. He died in 1670. "Monk," says one of his biographers, "had strong nerves, strong common-sense, cold heart, an accommodating conscience, a careful tongue, an unchanging countenance, and an imperturbable temper. He showed considerable skill in civil government as well as in military affairs. He had shrewdness enough to see what was best for the nation's interest; and, if it also promoted his own, he had ability and vigor enough to bring it to pass. He was never unsettled by enthusiasm in determining his ends, and he was never checked by principle in choosing his means." M. Guizot would hardly concede all this. He acknowledges that Monk " was a man capable of great things," but confesses that "he had no greatness of soul." It certainly was not to England's interest to restore Charles, but he only brought him back because he was disappointed in Richard Cromwell, and dared not himself assume the reins of the government. See Clarendon, *Hist. Rebellion and Civil Wars of England,* 7:373 sq.; Skinner, *Life of Monk;* Guizot, *Memoirs of Monk,* ably edited by the late lord Wharncliffe; Maseres's *Tracts;* Pepys and Evelyn, *Memoirs;* Stoughton, *Eccles. Hist. Church of England* (Restoration), 1:44 sq.; Hallam, *Const. Hist.* pages 393-406; Macaulay, *Hist. of England,* 1:143-146, 296; Stephen, *Hist. of the Church of Scotland,* 2:350, 370, 376, 380; *State Papers of Charles II* (Lond. 1866); *Retrospective Review,* volumr 13 (1826). (J.H.W.)

Monk, James Henry, D.D.

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

Monkey-god

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

Monks, Eastern

Picture for Monks, Eastern

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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