THE AGES DIGITAL LIBRARY
REFERENCE

CYCLOPEDIA of BIBLICAL, THEOLOGICAL and ECCLESIASTICAL LITERATURE

Monlezun, Jean-Justin - More, Sir Thomas

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

Monlezun, Jean-Justin

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

Monmorel, Charles Le Bourg De

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

Monmouth, James, Duke of

reputed natural son of king Charles II of England, deserves a place here for the part he had in the agitation provoked by the Romish Titus Oates plot, and for his relation to the Scotch Covenanters. He was born at Rotterdam in 1649, and was brought to England by his mother, Lucy Walters, in 1656, during the Commonwealth. They were both imprisoned for a time, but finally James was intrusted to the care of a nobleman, and on the Restoration was handsomely provided for by the court. He had scarcely

completed his sixteenth year when he was married to a woman selected for him at court, and was then created duke of Monmouth. About 1670 he was put forward by lord Shaftesbury as the crown rival of the duke of York (later James II, q.v.), and during the revelations of the Titus Oates plot (1678), when the feeling against Romanists and all who favored them ran high, public opinion was so decidedly in his favor, and so indignant against the duke of York, that the latter was compelled to quit the kingdom; and a bill was brought forward by Parliament for excluding the duke of York from the succession; but Charles suddenly dissolved it, and a document was at the same time issued by the king, solemnly declaring that he had never been married to Lucy Walters. Monmouth himself was sent into Scotland in 1679 to quell the rebellion. He defeated the Covenanters at Bothwell Bridge; but his humanity to the fleeing and wounded was so conspicuous, and his recommendations to pardon the prisoners were so urgent, as to bring upon him the violent censures of the king and of Lauderdale. He thus became the idol of the English Nonconformists. The return of the duke of York and the exile of Monmouth having followed, the latter went to Holland, and allied himself with the leaders of the Nonconformist party, exiled like himself; and when he was allowed to return to London, he was received with such demonstrations of joy that Monmouth felt that he was the people's choice. In 1680 he made a semi-royal progress through the west of England, with the design, probably, of courting the Nonconformists, who were more numerous there than in any other part of the country, except London and Essex. In 1682 he traversed some of the northern counties. The king and his brother were alarmed; and Monmouth was arrested at Stafford, and bound over to keep the peace. He meanly confessed his participation in the Rye-House plot, accusing himself and others of a design to seize the king's person, and subvert his government. The king pardoned him, on his solemn promise to be a loyal subject' to the duke of York, in case the latter should survive the king. In 1684 Monmouth fled to Antwerp, and remained abroad until the death of the king, when he embarked for England, landed (June 11, 1685) at Lyme-Regis, and issued a manifesto declaring James to be a murderer and usurper, charging him with introducing popery and arbitrary power, and asserting his own legitimacy and right by blood to be king of England. He was received with great acclamations at Taunton, where he was proclaimed as king. At Frome he heard the news of the defeat of Argyle, who, at the head of the Scottish exiles, had attempted to raise an insurrection in Scotland. Money and men were now abundant; but arms were lacking, and

thousands went home for want of them. On July 5 he was persuaded, with only 2500 foot and 600 horse, to attack the king's forces, which, under the command of the earl of Feversham, were encamped at Sedgemoor, near Bridgewater. Monmouth lost ground, and, having himself set a cowardly example of flight, his troops were slaughtered like sheep. About 300 of his followers fell in the battle; but 1000 were massacred in the pursuit. Monmouth was found concealed in a ditch, and was brought to London. He made the most humiliating submissions, and obtained a personal interview with James. "He clung," says Macaulay, "in agonies of supplication round the knees of the stern uncle he had wronged, and tasted a bitterness worse than that of death, the bitterness of knowing that he had humbled himself in vain." Even his prayer for "one day more," that he might "go out of the world as a Christian ought," was brutally refused. On July 15 he was brought to the scaffold, and beheaded on Tower Hill; the executioner performing his office so unskillfully that five blows were struck before the head was severed. See Robert, *Life of Duke of Monmouth* (1844); the histories of Macaulay, Hume, and Lingard; Stoughton, *Eccles. Hist. since the Restoration;* Chambers, *Cyclop.* s.v. and the article JAMES II in this *Cyclopaedia.*

Monnard, Charles

a noted Swiss literary character, deserves our attention specially on account of his humanitarian struggles in Switzerland. He was born at Berne in 1790, and was educated first at the academy in Lausanne, and then at Paris, where he enjoyed the friendship of the truly great, though himself a youth. In 1817 he returned to Lausanne, to become professor of French literature, and quickly rose to distinction for his great erudition, and the enthusiasm with which he approached his subject. He had taken orders, expecting to enter the service of the Church, but, turned aside by this appointment, he now devoted his leisure hours to the study of ecclesiastical and civil law. That Monnard largely profited by the knowledge thus acquired was manifest shortly after, when the obnoxious law passed, May 30, 1824, depriving men of the free exercise of the dictates of their conscience, intended, of course, mainly to stay the inroads which new Protestant doctrines were making in Switzerland, particularly those of the Momiers (q.v.). Monnard came forward as a defender of religious liberty, and declared the law unconstitutional. He enjoyed at this time the intimate association of the learned Swiss divine, Alexandre Rodolphe Viniet (q.v.), and brought out for this friend the treatises *De la liberte des cultes* (1826),

and *Observations sur les sectaires* (1829). This action resulted in Monnard's suspension from his professorship and removal to Geneva, where, however, he soon found as warm friends as he had left at Lausanne, both among the learned and those seeking knowledge. Political changes finally permitted his return to Canton Vaud, and he was publicly honored, and called to fill several civic offices. After the revolution of 1845, Monnard retired altogether from political life. It was supposed by his friends that he would now enter the Church; but he, having found that much ill-feeling still existed against him among the clergy for the position he had taken in behalf of the Momiers, finally resolved to quit Switzerland, and accepted a chair in the University of Bonn, which he held until his death, January 12, 1865. See *Journal de Geneve,* January 13, 1865; *Augsburger Allgemeine Zeitung,* February 1865. (J.H.W.)

Monniotte, Jean-Francois

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

Monod, Adolphe

one of the distinguished divines of this century, was born at Copenhagen January 21, 1802. He belongs to a family to which France is indebted for an uncommonly large number of celebrated clergymen. His father, Jean Monod, who was a native of Switzerland, born about 1760, was at the time pastor of a French Protestant church; but in 1808, having received a call from a church at Paris, he removed thither with his family, and there enjoyed much distinction. He was president of the Reformed Consistory until 1834, and died in 1836. Adolphe was educated at the College Bonaparte at Paris, and after the completion of his studies there he pursued a course in theology in the University of Geneva, where he remained until

1824. In 1825 he made a journey to Italy, during which he felt drawn nearer to God, and decided to preach the Gospel to the little Protestant-congregation of Naples. There he remained until 1827. On his return he was appointed pastor of Lyons; here, however, his earnest Christian exhortations proved distasteful to a worldly congregation, and his removal was asked for and granted. Strengthened and encouraged by the spirit of the Lord, he now continued to preach, and to teach. The Church of the state was locked for him. His congregation met in a private room, which was, however, soon exchanged for a spacious chapel, where numerous people were fed with the bread of eternal life. Thirty years have passed since, and at present the Evangelical Church of Lyons is a great association, with four pastors, many evangelists, and eight chapels. The government either touched by the religious activity of Monod, or wishing to make good the wrong it had done to him appointed him professor of theology at Montauban, where he remained eleven years. During this time he held prayer-meetings every Sunday, and in the vacations travelled in Southern France to preach and to instruct. Wherever he appeared, multitudes of people followed him, attracted by the spiritual power of his orations. In 1847 the Consistory of Paris appointed him minister of the Reformed Church there, the government confirming the selection and he accepting. He labored there with remarkable success for seven years. The churches where he preached, especially the large Oratoire, were filled every Sunday by pious people. In the smaller room of the Oratoire he gave Bible-lessons every Sunday; and a great many of his hearers, surprised by his beautiful, practical remarks on the Word of God, by his great knowledge of the Scriptures, and by his spiritual experience, preferred the Bible-lessons to his greater sermons. In 1856 he was suddenly stricken down by disease; but, with his Christian resignation, he acknowledged in sickness also the voice of God to his servant — "Lo, I come quickly." The physicians pronounced his disease incurable; Monod quietly heard the announcement, and prepared himself for departure to his Master. His faith grew stronger daily; not only a full resignation to the will of God, but a great joy filled his soul even in his greatest pain. Every Sunday, in the afternoon, his friends gathered around his bed. One of them read the Scriptures, preached, and prayed; after this he himself began to speak to them, teaching them, and bearing testimony to the Word of God. Never were his words so impressive as just before his death, occurring April 6, 1856, which was Sunday, while in all the churches of Paris prayers were ascending to the

throne of God for his recovery, the Protestant Church of France fairly trembling under the great loss that was befalling it.

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

The literary works of Adolphe Monod are few, being mainly sermons. In 1830 he published three of them; which bear evidence of his great talents. In the first of these sermons he speaks with a divine power about the relation of error and sin and that of virtue and truth. In his second and third sermons he treats of the wretchedness of sin and the great mercy of God. In 1844 he published a volume of sermons, the first of which *(La credulite de l'incredule),* covering 68 pages, is considered the most excellent apologetic of modern days. Before, as after his death, many other sermons of his were published; two of these about the duties of Christian women *(Lafemme),* and five about the apostle Paul, are especially celebrated. In these Monod answers the question, often heard, "Why has the preaching of the Gospel so little success in our century in comparison with the time of

the apostles?" thus: "The Word of God is as living and powerful now as then, but our sinful example in life is the cause of the little success of our preaching. The *life* of the ancient Christians was the world-conquering power of their witness. Restore that life in the Church of Christ, and she will be able to perform wonders as of old." The apostle Paul was to him witness of this truth, which he unfolded in five sermons, entitled *Thee Work of Paul, His Christianity or his Tears, His Conversion, His Weakness, and his Example for us.* In the days of his sickness Monod gathered all his writings. Three volumes of sermons were published after his death, namely, two volumes containing those preached at Lyons and at Montauban, and a third volume containing the sermons preached at Paris. See *Christian Qu.* October 1873, page 565; *New-Englander,* July 1873, page 594; Herzog, *Real--Encylopadie.* s.v.; Hase, *Ch. Hist.* page 609; Vapereau, *Diet. des Contemporains,* s.v. (J.H.W.)

Monod, Frederic, D.D.

brother of the above, and, like him, celebrated for his great attainments as a divine, was born at Monnaz, Canton de Vaud, Switzerland, May 17, 1794. He entered the ministry in 1820, and was a pastor of the Reformed Church in Paris until 1849. In 1824 he began the publication of the *Archives du Christianisme,* a leading organ of the evangelical portion of French Protestantism, and he remained its editor while he lived. At the time of the French Revolution, in 1848, Frederic Monod was the leader of a movement which resulted in the establishment of the union of free evangelical churches. The original intention of the movement was to restore the synodical constitution of the Reformed State Church, and to readopt a rule of faith which would exclude the Rationalists. When this attempt failed, Monod, count de Gasparin, and some of their friends, left the state Church (1849) and organized independent congregations, which soon after formed the "Union of Evangelical Free Churches." *SEE FRANCE.* Monod was constantly reelected president of the different synods, and always remained one of the leading spirits of this new denomination, which, although small in comparison with the two Protestant state churches (the Lutheran and the Reformed), contains some of the best and most influential men of French Protestantism as count de Gasparin, E. de Pressense, and pastor Fisch, who attended the last general session of the Evangelical Alliance held in New York City in 1873. The hope of bringing over the majority of the French Protestants to the evangelical free churches was not realized but the existence, spirituality, and prosperity of the Free Church greatly

strengthened the evangelical party in the state Church, which has since steadily gained in influence, and appears to be at present in undisputed ascendency. (Comp. *Zeitschrift fur historische Theologie* [1851], No. III.) Monod, like all the members of the free evangelical churches, was an ardent admirer of American institutions. He, with his friends, pointed to the separation of Church and State as it exists here, and to the great amount of civil liberty which Americans are enjoying, as model institutions which the people of Europe, and especially of France, would do well to follow as much as lies in their power. The favorable opinion which he had always held 6f the United States was greatly strengthened by a journey he made through this country about 1855. After the outbreak of the American rebellion, he showed himself one of the warmest European friends of the Northern cause. He took a prominent part in all the demonstrations which the Protestant clergy made in favor of the Union, and in which they manifested a greater unanimity than the Protestant clergy of any other country in the world. Monod was himself one of the originators of the address — signed by the great majority of Protestant French ministers, and objected to by not a single one — in which Protestant France, through her clergy, recorded her opinion that "the triumph of the rebellion would throw back for a century the progress of Christian civilization and of humanity, would cause angels in heaven to weep, and would rejoice daemons in. hell; would throughout the world probably raise the hopes of the favorers of slavery and the slave-trade, quite ready to come forth at the first signal, in Asia, in Africa, and even in our refined cities of Europe; would give a sad blow to the work of evangelical missions; and what a terrible responsibility ,would it impose upon the Church which should remain mute while witnessing the accomplishment of this triumph." The address is noted for the change of opinion it wrought, not only in France, but also in England. Frederic Monod died December 30, 1863, mourned not only by his own country, but by the Protestant world, which recognised in him a zealous champion of the evangelical cause the world over. He was so busy with his pen for all humanity that he found but little time for extensive composition. Most of his writings are embodied in the *Archives* which he edited. He published, besides, a few pamphlets and several of his sermons. See *Archives du Christianisme,* January 1864; and Dr. M'Clintock in the N.Y. *Methodist,* January 30, 1864. (J.H.W.)

Monod, Jean

SEE MONOD, ADOLPHE.

Monod, Pierre

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

etc. See Rosetti, *Scriptores Pedemontii,* page 470; Richelieu, *Memoirs,* volume 10; Le Vassor, *Hist. de Louis XIII;* Botta, *Storia d' Italia.*

Monogamy

SEE MARRIAGE.

Monogram

Picture for Monogram

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

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

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

(1) For the name of *Christ.* The monogram used in the primitive Church is communicated to us by the ancient ecclesiastical writers, and also by the numerous Christian monuments of that period which are still extant. We find it generally formed by one of the two combinations of the letters XP, the P being set inside of the X, which latter is either an erect X or reversed, giving the forms K and P. The first is the form described by Eusebius *(Vita Constant.* 1:31) and Paulinus of Nola *(Poem.* 19, *de Felic. Nat.* 11:5. *Orig. Opp.* ed. Muret. page 481); the other is described by Lactantius *(De mort. persecut.* c. 44), for we can hardly make out his expression concerning the *transversa* X, the point of which is bent, to signify anything else than the +, the upright part of which is made into a P. These two forms give rise to two others, by merely turning the P the other way, thus, m and C. There are also instances of other less usual combinations. For a description of all the various forms, see, besides the special works on the monograms of Christ, Mamachi, *Orig. et antiq. Christ.* 53, 62 sq.; Miinter, *Sinnbilder,* part 5, page 3437; Didron, *Iconogr. Chret.* page 401 sq.; Letronne, *Exalm. archeol. de deux quest. sur la croix ansee Egypt. (Meni. de l'Acad. des Inscript.* volume 16, part 2, page 284); Twining, *Symbols and Emblems,* part 1, 3, 4. If we now inquire. into the further significance of these two forms of the monogram, in order to see whether it contain some further meaning of importance, we must first consider whether it is indeed always a distinctive mark of Christian monuments. Here we find that the form is exclusively used by Christians, and is the sign of the name of Christ. Yet it must be observed that it closely resembles the Egyptian hooped cross, da, the symbol of life, which is often represented in the hand of the Egyptian deities, and then, in consequence of little irregularities on both sides, the two monograms happen sometimes to be exactly alike; even the Egyptian Christians sometimes used the Egyptian sign for that of the cross (see Letronne,. *Exam. archeol.* in *Meoires de l'Acad. des Inscript.* 16:285 sq.). The other form, i, a combination of XP, is essentially of heathen origin. We find it on Greek money greatly anterior to Christ, namely, on the Attic tetradrachma (Eckhel, *Doctr. num.* 2:210), as also on the coins of Ptolemeeus, a specimen of which, with the head of Zeus Ammon on the

one side, and on the other an eagle holding the monogram ; in his claws, is to be seen in the collection of coins at Berlin (No. 428). It is also found in an inscription on a monument erected to Isis, in Egypt, in the year B.C. 137-8 (see Bockh, *Corp. Inscr. Gr.* n. 4713, b). At the same time such heathen monuments are very scarce; and where the sign is found on tombs, it may generally be taken for granted that it is there as the Christian emblem. In after-times the signification of this sign was altered, especially among the Greek writers, where we seldom find i used to designate Christ. It most generally stands for Χρυσόστομος, and in the construction Πολὺ Πολυχρόνιος; it is also used as an abbreviation for χρύσεον (see Montfaucon, *Paleogr. Gr.* page 344). On the other hand, in the Greek calendar, since the 11th century, f πάσχα is used for Χριστιανῶν πάσχα, in opposition to νομικὸν πάσχα (see Piper, *Karl's des Grossen Kalendarium u. Ostertafel,* page 130 sq.). It has long been a much controverted point to know whether this monogram were introduced only by the emperor Constantine, or whether it were in use anterior to his reign. It seems, however, pretty much established that the monuments which have been referred to in order to prove its greater antiquity are either spurious or doubtful (see Mamachi, *Orig. et antiq. Christ. c.* 1, page 54, n. 3); and the oldest monument of ascertained date which bears it is a grave-stone at Rome of the year 331, where the monogram i stands between branches of palm, and preceded by the words IN SIGNO, which recall the apparition of Constantine (Piper, *Ueber den Christlichen Bilderkreis,* pages 4, 65, with a plate, fig. 1). Yet another inscription, lately discovered in the catacombs of Melos, and containing the monogram, is considered as belonging to the 2d century (see Ross, *Inscript. Gr. ined.* fasc. 3, n. 246, b, page 8). It is further probable that, since in the early part of the 2d century the first two letters of the name of Jesus were already used in that manner, as we shall see hereafter, the same was already done also with the name of Christ; and also that, from the moment Constantine wished to adopt a general sign. he would more likely have adopted one previously in use than invented a new one. After Constantine it became very numerous in private monuments, and especially on the graves, and that in most Christian countries. In Germany we find many such inscriptions, with either the i or the f, at Treves (Hersch, *Centralmuseum,* part 3, Nos. 56, 61; Le Blant, *Inscrip. Chrit. de la Gaule,* volume 1, No. 230, 244), and at Cologne (Hersch, page 1, No. 95, 96; Le Blant, volume 1, No. 355, 359). They are also found on things deposited in the graves, as, for instance, on lamps and glass vessels, and, finally, on things used in daily life, as on stones, rings,

etc. (D'Agincourt, *Scult.* pl. 9, fig. 1, 24). Under Constantine the Great the monogram came to be used on public monuments. He caused it to be inscribed on the *Labarum* (q.v.), doubtless in the form i (Eusebius, *Vit. Constant.* 1:28, speaks only of the cross; but the cross seen by Constantine was this very monogram), as also on his helmet, and on the shields of his soldiers. His vision is recalled in the Labarum by the monogram in the hand of the emperor, who is crowned by victory, and by the legend HOC SIGNO VICTOR ERIS on the coins of his son Constantius, and of the contemporary Vetranius (350) and Gallus (351-354). Of his own reign there is a celebrated coin with the monogram of the Labarum, placed on and piercing a snake, with the legend APES PUBLICA (Eckhel, *Doctr. numm. 8,* page 88). Coins show it also on the helmet of Constantine, and on the shield of the emperor Majorianus (457-461). In the coins of the Eastern Roman empire, the monogram in its two principal forms is quite common until the time of Justinian I, with an interruption during the reign of the emperor Julian. Under Justinian (t 565) the sign of the cross took the place of the monogram. Soon after Constantine, in the second half of the 4th century, we find it placed on buildings. The oldest monogram of that kind of which theadate is known is an inscription of the year 377 at Sitten, in Switzerland, probably by the praetor of that place, and relating his restoration by the prsetor Pontius (Mornmiesse, *Inscript. Ielvet. Lat.* pl. 3, No. 10; Le Blant, *Inscript. Chret.* pages 496, pl. 38, No. 231; Gelpke, *Kirchengesch. d. Schweiz.* part 1, page 86 sq.). It was especially used in Church architecture. The oldest, from the time of Constantine, is to be found in the mosaic of S. Connstantia at Rome, where it is on a roll in the hand of Christ. In the Middle Ages it was especially placed on the top of the pulpit, as in the churches of S. Francesca Romana and of S. Maria Maggiore at Rome, both built in the 13th century. In the Lateran it is placed in the gable end, according to the orders given by Clement XII in 1735. This monogram, in funereal inscriptions, where it occurs at the beginning, in the middle, and at the end, may be considered in general as confessing Christ. It is sometimes used in connection with other words, but generally alone, as in an inscription at Vienna Faustina "in i" (Mai, *Sanct. vet. nov. coll.* 5:432, 433); one in the museum of the Vatican, on Gentianus, ends with the words "quia scimus te in" (Marini. *Hist. Allan.* page 37). In the images on the graves it is especially used to designate the person of Christ, particularly where there are any representations of him. Thus a lamb standing on a mountain, as represented in [6641]Revelation 14:1, pictured: on a coffin in the Vatican grottoes, bears on its head the a

(Bottari, *Scult. epitt, sacre,* volume 1, tav. 21). It is also used with the bodily representations of Christ, either simply over his head, or in the nimbus around him, or one on each side of his head, as in a lately discovered painting in the cemetery of Praetextatus (Perret, *Les Cataconmbes de Rome,* t. 1, H.L.). There is a gem of heathen origin representing the heads of Jupiter, Apollo, and Diana, with the inscription *Vivas in deo f(eliciter),* in which the head of Jupiter is surmounted by the sign i:. 'This was probably added to it in after-times by a Christian owner, either to give it a sort of Christian consecration, or, more probably, to transform the head of Jupiter into a likeness of Christ (Piper, *Mythol. u. Symb. d. christl Kunst.* 1, 1, pages 115-117). Sometimes the monogram also appears alone in carvings, and is then intended to represent the person of Christ; for instance, on glass vessels, where it is placed between two persons, to signify that Christ is with them. An especially interesting instance of that kind recurs on several coffins, where a cross is represented, with those who watched at the grave at the foot of it, and on the cross the monogram *j,* in a wreath, borne by a soaring eagle. While the lower part is indicative of the crucifixion and burial, the crowned monogram held aloof is the emblem of the crucifixion and ascension. A drawing and explanation of it are to be found in the *Evang. Kalender* for 1857, page 37, 45 sq. Finally, we find also the monogram used with a symbolical meaning. On a grave-stone of the year 355 the i is placed by the side of the figure of a person who, with the outstretched right hand, takes hold of the name (Aringhi, *Roma subterran.* lib. 2, c. 23, t. 2, page 570).

(2) For the name of *Jesus Christ* we have, first, in Greek, the monogram IC XC. This is the usual abbreviation of the two names found in the oldest MSS. of the N.T., as in the *Codex Alexandrinus* of the 5th and the *Claroonzontanus* of the 6th century, and which is retained in the Minuskel MSS. It appears also on monuments, namely, in the inscription I X, found in the catacombs of Naples, in a niche, at the place of an old well (Pellicia, *De eccles. Christ. polit.* 2:414, ed. Bonn; Bellermann, *Ueber d. iltesten christlichen Begrabnissstdtten,* page 81), and is still used in the Greek Church, namely, on the bottom of the vases used for communion (Goar, *Eucholog.* page 99). In sculptures and carvings, we find this monogram accompanying the figure of Christ; as in the Byzantine coin, first under J. Zimisces (969-975), whence it remained in use until the downfall of the Greek empire. There is yet extant a fine gold medal of the last emperor, Constantine XIV Palaeologus, on the reverse of which is the figure of

Christ standing, with the inscription IC XC (a specimen of it is to be seen in the imperial collection of coins at Vienna) (see Eckhel, *Doctr. numum.* 8:273). It is also found on ancient Greek monuments, and on the ancient doors of the church of St. Paul at Rome of the year 1070. Byzantine paintings in which it is represented are to be found in the royal gallery of Berlin (Nos. 1044,1048). The introduction of this monogram into the Latin Church is especially remarkable. The ancient church of St. Peter at Rome contained mosaics of the time of Innocent III, which represented Christ enthroned between the apostles Peter and Paul, with the inscription IC XC (see the *Evang. Kalender* for 1851, page 50). The same is found in the still extant mosaic of Philip Dusuti of 1300, in the church of S. Maria Maggiore at Rome (Valentini, *Basil. Liber.* pl. 103). There are also numerous easel pictures of Italian origin of the 14th and 15th centuries, which contain the likeness of Christ, together with this monogram, as, for instance, the crucifixion of Taddeo Gaddi, of 1334, in the royal gallery at Berlin, No. 1080, and an apparition of Christ to Magdalena after his resurrection, by Donatus Bizamanus, in the Christian Museum at the Vatican (D'Agincourt, *Peint.* pl. 92). Secondly, we have in Latin the monogram IHS XPS. The Latin Church has also a special abbreviation of both names, which we find in the oldest Latin MS. copies of the Bible; for instance, in the Greek and Latil *Codex Claromontanus.* It is occasionally preserved in the Minuskel MSS., as in the *Sacramentarium* of Gellone at Paris, in the 8th century, where the Gospel of Matthew begins with the words "Liber generationis ihu xpi" (facsimile in Silvestre, *Paleogr.* t. 3). This mode of writing gave rise to numerous researches in the French Church in the 9th century. Amalarius, from Metz, author of the book *De Offciis Ecclesiasticis,* asks, in a letter to Jeremiah, archbishop of Sens, in the year 827, to know why the name of Jesus is written with an aspirate, an H, and expresses the opinion that, according to the Greek, it should be written with IH, and C or S (D'Achery, *Spicileg.* 3:330); to which the other answers that it is not an aspirate, but a Greek H. He asked also bishop Jonas whether it were more correct to write IIC or IHS, and was answered that the latter form was preferable, the first two letters being taken from the Greek and the last from the Latin, as had been done with the name Christ, XPS. The formula IhS XPS (and IhS XIS) REX REGNANTIVM occurs on Byzantine coins, according to the example of Justinian II, from Basilius Macedo (De Saulcy, *Essai de classificat. des suites monet. Byzantine,* pl. 19, 1), down to Romanus IV Diogenes (1068-1071); and it is only there that the other monogram, IC XC, remained in use. In the West, we find the monogram

IHS XPS in use at a very early period, both in inscriptions, carvings, and paintings, as, for instance, miniatures in the Carolinian MSS., and in pictures of the Middle Ages.

(3) For the name of *Jesus* alone, we find in Greek the monogram IH. It is the first form of which we have any knowledge, and occurs as early as in the Epistle of Barnabas (q.v.), e.g., where the number 318 of the men circumcised by Abraham (resulting from a comparison between ⁻⁰¹¹⁷²³Genesis 17:23 and 14:14) is found to be a sign of the name of Jesus and of the cross, for 318 is written with Greek letters, ιητ″. This meaning was generally received, as also by the Latin Church (Coteler). This abbreviation, however. occurs but seldom on the more ancient monuments. In the West, the monogram IHS (q.v.) obtained great popularity in the Middle Ages through the preaching of Bernard of Sienna, who in divers cities, and especially at Viterbo, in 1427, was in the habit of exhibiting a tablet on which that monogram was painted in golden letters, surrounded by a halo of golden rays, and to which he directed their devotions. He was accused of innovation indeed, but succeeded in satisfying pope Martin V (Wadding, *Annal. minor. T.V.* a. 1427, page 183 sq.). This monogram, to which the cross is sometimes added, remained in use in small Latin letters, and sometimes in Gothic. Thus, in the picture of the adoration of the three kings, by Raphael, in the royal gallery at Berlin, we find at the upper edge of a golden sun, written in golden letters, which, however, must not be understood, as some have made it out, to signify *in hoc signo.* The Jesuits also appropriated that monogram to their use. On the election of the first general of the order, in 1541, which resulted in the elevation of Ignatius, the latter had headed his vote with the name IHS, and the sign his was engraved on his seal, the same with which the election of the generals since Jacob Laynez has always been sealed *(Acta Sanct.* d. 31, mens. Jul. t. 7, page 532 a). See. besides the authorities already referred to, Herzog, *Real-Encyklopddie,* 9:738 sq.; Minter, *Sinnbilder u. Kunstvorstellungen d. alten Christen* (Altona, 1825); Piper, *Mythologie u. Symbolik d. christl. Kunst,* volume 1 (1847) and 2 (1851); Withrow, *Catacombs of Rome* (N.Y. 1874) page 264 sq. *SEE CHRIST, MONOGRAM OF*.

Monoimos

an Arabian heretic of the 2d century, who appears to have been a follower of Basilides. He is mentioned by Theodoret; but the particulars of his system, which was formed of strange geometrical and arithmetical

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

Monomania

(μόνος, *single,* and , μανία, *madness)* has loosely been made to represent every form of partial insanity, but has been more rigidly defined as that mental condition in which a single faculty, or class of faculties or associations, become diseased, the mind generally remaining healthy. Slight and solitary aberrations — such as where a savage antipathy to cats coexists with a love for human kind; where there appears to be an incontrollable tendency to steal, to squander, to drink, to destroy — are of common occurrence, and are supposed to be compatible with the exercise of intelligence, and with the discharge of many of the ordinary duties of life. By a more strict limitation, the term has been confined to such affections as involve the emotions and propensities alone. It is, however, held that, notwithstanding its apparent integrity, the whole mind is involved or influenced by the presence of such morbid conditions, at least while they are predominant. It is undoubtedly difficult to point out in. what manner the belief, e.g., that a particular organ has been transmuted into glass can interfere with or render the memory, or the power of instituting comparisons, defective and untrustworthy; yet it is legitimate to receive with caution *every* manifestation of powers so constituted that they fail to detect the incongruities and absurdities with which they are associated, or, having detected the real character of these errors, are unable or unwilling to cast them out or to disregard them. There is much countenance given to this theory by facts which indicate that even trivial forms of mental obliquity are connected with an unsound organization, and that particular and rarely recognised monomanias are invariably associated with the *same*

structural alteration. The unhealthy elevation of the sentiment of cautiousness, for example, especially where it amounts to fear of death, panic, or panphobia, is a symptom of disease of the heart and large blood-vessels, while the monomania of ambition (or optimism, as it has been styled) is the concomitant of the general paralysis of the insane. It will be obvious, from the definitions previously introduced, that the species or varieties of monomania must correspond to the faculties or phases of the human mind, and to their combinations. Several great divisions, however, have been signalized, both on account of their frequency and of their influence upon the individual and upon society.

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

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

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

4. Monomania of fear.

5. Monomania of pride and ambition.

6. Kleptomania (q.v.).

7. Dipsomania, or Oinomania (q.v.). If it can. be proved that such morbid tendencies as have been here mentioned, and others still less prominent, are merely salient points of a great breadth and depth of mental disease, the plea of insanity may justifiably be employed more frequently in the consideration of criminal acts. — Chambers, s.v. Dr. Forbes Winslow, in *The Pill Mall Gazette,* holds that what is called partial insanity, or monomania, is not sufficient to prove of itself a testamentary incapacity. "I have often," he says, "witnessed among the insane the possession of delicate, just, and honorable ideas respecting their own social position, and

the pecuniary claims of those most near and dear to them." He approves the action of ecclesiastical judges in former times, who, when a will was brought before them to be contested, inquired, first, if there were prima facie evidence in the wording, arrangement, etc., of the will that its author was insane; and, next, whether the testator's lunacy were visible in the distribution of his property. If neither of these points was established, the will generally stood against unquestionable evidence of mental unsoundness or eccentricity in other things. He quotes a case where the testator left a large fortune to his housekeeper, and directed in the same will that his executors should make fiddle-strings of part of his bowels and smelling-salts of others, and that the rest of his body be vitrified into lenses for optical purposes. He did this, he said, to mark his moral aversion to funeral pomp. It appeared that he had conducted his affairs with great shrewdness and ability. See Esquirol, *La Monomanie; Bayle, Maladies du Cerveau;* Stephens, *Criminal Law of England,* page 92.

Monophysites

(Greek, Μονοφυσῖται, from μόνος,, *single,* and φύσις, *nature*) is the name of a Christian sect which took form under that name in the year 451, when the Eutychian heresy was condemned by the orthodox Eastern Church in the Council of Chalcedon. But though the name of the Monophysites first occurs in the acts of the Council of Chalcedon' Monophysitism must be regarded as of much older date, and is to be traced to *Eutychianism* (q.v.), from which it sprang, though by no means identical with it. Eutyches not only attributed but one nature to Christ after his incarnation, but held that Christ's body, being the body of God, was not identical with the human body. The Monophysites, in distinction, held that the two natures were so united that, although the "one Christ" was partly human and partly divine, his two natures became by their union only one nature (Μόνηφύσις). This modification of the Eutychian doctrine was taught by Dioscorus, the successor of St. Cyril as patriarch of Alexandria. He presided at the Council of Ephesus (A.D. 449), which considered the opinion of Eutyches, and from the murderous violence shown by his Egyptian partisans was called "Latrocinium," or "Robber Synod." Under the influence of Dioscorus, who wished to gain a victory over the patriarchs of Antioch and Constantinople, the chief opponents of Eutyches, the assembled bishops were persuaded to give their decision in favor of Eutyches, the key-note to that decision being struck by the passionate exclamation of Dioscorus: "Will you endure that two natures should be

spoken of after the incarnation" (Mansi, *Concil.* 6:583). "Partly thus terrified, partly ignorant, partly, perhaps, persuaded," says Neale, "the assembled fathers set their hands to the acquittal of Eutyches, and thus the Monophysite heresy was born in the Church" *(Patriarchate of Alexandria,* 1:295). The decision so given was not, however, accepted by the patriarchs of Antioch and of Constantinople, nor by the bishop of Rome, and another council was called by the new emperor Marcian in the following year, which assembled first at Nicsea, but eventually at Chalcedon, whence its name. This council condemned the doctrine of the Eutychians and Monophysites, and it was stated "that Christ was really divine and really human; in his divinity co-eternal, and in all points similar to the Father; in his humanity, son of the Virgin Mary, born like all others, and like unto us men in all things except sin; that after his incarnation his person contained two natures unmixed (ἀσυγκύτως) and unaltered (ἀτρέπτως), yet at the same time completely (ἀδιαιρέτως) and intimately *(ἀκωρίσως)* united." The adherents of the Alexandrian school saw themselves overpowered and withdrew from the council, and thus "started those violent and complicated Monophysite controversies which convulsed the Oriental Church, from patriarchs and emperors down to monks and peasants, for more than a hundred years, and which have left their mark even to our day." Dioscorus himself was deposed from the patriarchate, and a certain Proterius placed in his stead. The people, however, sympathized with the persecuted, and the Monophysites increased very rapidly. They spread especially in Palestine, mainly through the agency of the monk Theodosius, who was instrumental in the expulsion of the patriarch Juvenal from Jerusalem, and got himself appointed in his place. The conflict between the two parties was only quelled by force of arms. Egypt, and in particular Alexandria, proved, however, the greatest strongholds of Monophysite views, and constant troubles were there the result. The patriarch Proterius was frequently annoyed by his opponents, and public quarrels were a common occurrence. Finally, in the heat of passion, a few Monophysite partisans attacked the house of Proterius, and, driving him from it, followed him to the church, and there stabbed him to death, and disposed of his body in a most cruel manner. In Proterius's place was put a Monophysite, the presbyter Timotheus Elurus, and henceforth there ruled in Alexandria an unbroken succession of Monophysite patriarchs. Under Elurus's rule all who accepted the decisions of the Council of Chalcedon were excommunicated, especially pope Leo. But complaint being made against Elurus to the emperor, he was banished to Gangra in 460. In many respects

the rule of Elurus was a profitable one to the Church, and had fanatics only stood aside the best results would have been assured. He was conciliatory in his nature, as may be seen from his acts. He evidently intended to draw his flock back into the orthodox fold. Thus Dioscorus had followed Eutyches in denying Christ's human nature to be of the same kind as that of ordinary men; but when Timothy was on a visit to Constantinople, and Eutychian monks desired to join his communion, he took the opportunity of disclaiming this part of their belief, and declared the conviction of himself and his followers to be that the Saviour became consubstantial with men according to his human nature, as he had ever been consubstantial with the Father according to his divine nature. In this particular the Monophysite followers of Timothy, who were hence called "Timotheans," as the opposite party were called "Dioscorians," returned to the creed of St. Cyril, which his deacon and successor Dioscorus had forsaken.

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

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

insisted on an unvarnished rejection of the Council of Chalcedon, separated from the others to form a Monophysite society of their own, which received the name of Ἀκέφαλοι. *SEE ACEPHALT*. The dyophysites also split into two parties, one of which accepted the Henotikon, while the other rejected it. At the head of the latter party stood Felix II of Rome, who excommunicated Acacius (484); thus this attempt at conciliation resulted only in making four parties instead of two, and in creating a schism between the Latin and the Greek churches which lasted thirty-five years (484-519). Zeno's successor, Anastasius, adhered strictly to the Henotikon, and even inclined somewhat to Monophysitism. In 513 Severus; one of the principal men among the Acephali, became patriarch of Antioch. His attempt to introduce the formula θεὸς σταυρωθεὶς δἰ ἡμᾶς in the churches of Constantinople created fresh troubles; the patriarch Macedonius, who opposed the innovation, was deposed, and the disorders which followed were hard to repress, But in consequence of the revolt of the general Vitalianus (514), the orthodox party were finally restored to the possession of their rights, and in 519 the unity with Rome was fully established. The partisans of the Henotikon were taken off the church lists, and all the Monophysite bishops deposed. Most of these withdrew to Egypt. Here they were soon divided among themselves. Julian, formerly bishop of Halicarnassus, affirmed that the body of our Lord was rendered incorruptible in consequence of the divine nature being blended with it. *SEE APHTHARTODOCETE*. Others maintained that it was corruptible. *SEE AGNOETE* and *SEE PHTHARTODOCETAE*. The leader of the last named was Severus, the deposed patriarch of Antioch, who maintained the corruptibility of Christ's human nature, or its identity with that of ordinary pain — suffering, weak, and mortal manhood. This theology eventually became that of the Monophysites at large, hence he deserves special attention in this connection. With him Monophysitism receded another step from Eutychianism; and although it was still maintained that Christ, after his incarnation, was of one nature only, the doctrine came to be held in such a way as not to be extremely divergent from the Church. For "in the theology of Severus, the qualities of human nature were all retained in Christ after the incarnation, although the nature was in him so amalgamated with the divine Being that it could not be said to possess any being or identity of its own. Thus the Monophysite conception of Christ's person settled into that of a Theandric, or composite nature, analogous to that composite action of his person which later divines have called a Theandric operation *(θεανδρικὴ ἐνέργεια)*. Yet belief in such a

composite nature is inconsistent with the Nicene Creed, which asserts that Jesus Christ is 'of one substance with the Father,' and since the Father is not of such a composite nature, to declare the Son to be so is to declare him to be of a different substance from him." Thus the intellectual form which Severus gave to Monophysitism cannot escape from the charge of heresy any more than that earlier form of opinion which was condemned at Chalcedon. The instability of opinion, when disassociated from the safeguard of the Nicene Creed, was also strikingly illustrated in the case of this later monophysite school as it had been in the earlier. Severus himself "held views respecting the soul of the united natures of Christ which were not logically consistent with the theology respecting their oneness, and thus it was only one step forward for Themistius, his deacon, to invent the tenet of the Agnoetae, that the human soul of Christ was like ours in everything, even in the want of omniscience or ignorance." When, again, Severus maintained that the divine and the human wills in the united natures were also so united that there could be no volition of the one nature one way and of the other nature in the other direction, he was preparing the way for that development of his opinion which was made by the *Monothelites* (q.v.), who maintained that "there was only one will in Christ, as well as only one nature." After the death of Severus, his followers divided — the men of wealth and the clergy choosing as successor to Timothy a certain Theodosius, and the monks and lower classes choosing Gaianus, the leader of the *Aphthiartodocetce, whose* party took the name of the *Gaianites SEE GAIANITE*; the latter, viewing the body of Christ as created (κτιστόν), were also called *Ktistolatrce* (comp. Dorner, 2:159 sq.; and Ebrard, *Kirchen- u. Dogmengesch.* 1:268 sq.). This division, and the energy of the emperor Justinian in supporting the orthodox cause, finally led to a revival of the orthodox patriarchate in the person of Paul (A.D. 539), and for a hundred years there were two lines in the patriarchate — one monophysite, the other orthodox. Many other sects arose also, such as the Tritheists, the Philoponists, the Conists, the Damianists. Indeed, the 6th century was an age of as great turbulence in the Church on account of monophysitism as any that preceded. Justinian was even moved to call a council, which, convening at Constantinople in A.D. 553, constituted the fifth ecumenical council, the result of whose deliberations was a partial victory for the Alexandrian monophysite doctrine, so far as it could be reconciled with the definitions of Chalcedon. But, notwithstanding the concessions of the fifth cecumenical council, the Monophysites remained separated from the orthodox Church, refusing to acknowledge in any manner the dyophysite

Council of Chalcedon. Another effort of Justinian to gain them, by sanctioning the Aphthartodocetic doctrine of the incorruptibleness of Christ's body (564), threatened to involve the Church in fresh troubles; but his death soon afterwards, in 565, put an end to these fruitless and despotic plans of union. His successor, Justin II, in 565 issued an edict of toleration, which exhorted all Christians to glorify the Lord, without contending about persons and syllables. Since that time the history of the Monophysites has been distinct from that of the Catholic Church. A numerous body of Monophysites of Alexandria seceded from the communion of the patriarch of that city appointed by the emperor, and chose another spiritual chief; and thus they continue to the present day, under the name of *Copts.* The Ethiopian or Abyssinian Church was always in connection with them. The Christians in Armenia and Georgia, among whom also monophysitism had early gained acceptance, openly declared themselves in favor of this doctrine; and thus the *Armenian* and *Georgian* churches continue at this time, separated from the other monophysite churches merely by peculiar customs. In Syria and Mesopotamia the Monophysites had nearly become extinct, in consequence of persecution and the want of ministers, when Jacob Baradaeus, an obscure monk, was the instrument of reviving them: after him the Syrian Monophysites are called *Jacobites* (q.v.). An attempt to reconcile the Monophysites with the orthodox party in the 7th century led to a modified form of the doctrine, and a new sect, the *Monothelites,* who attempted to compromise between the two factions by the hypothesis that after the union of the divine and human natures in Christ, though there continued to be two distinct natures, yet there was but one will. The only effect of this was to increase the controversy. *SEE MONOTHELITES*. Monophysitism still continued to be held in some parts of the East, and even by the *Maronites* (q.v.) until their final reconciliation with the' Church of Rome in 1182, when it was renounced by them. The doctrine that Jesus Christ possesses only one simple nature, being not truly man, but the divine Spirit in a human body, has recently been revived by Henry Ward Beecher in his *Life of Christ,* and is also maintained by the Swedenborgians. *SEE NEW JERUSALEM CHURCH*. The union of the divine and human natures in Christ is maintained by Dr. Hovey *(God With Us).* See the *Acta,* in Mansi, volume 7-9; Mai, *Scriptorum veterum nova collectio e Vaticanis codicibus edita* (volume 7); Gieseler, *Commentat. qua Monophysitarum veterum varice de Christi persona opiniones inprimis ex ipsorum effatis recens editis, illustrantur* (1835-1838); Assemani, *De Monophys.* (in *Bibl. Or.* volume 2); Le Quien, *Oriens Christianus in IV patriarchatus digestus*

(Par. 1740); Renaudot, *Hist. Patriarcharum Alex. Jacobitarum* (Par. 1743); Makrizii, *Hist. Coptorum Christ.,* Arab. et Lat. ed. Wetzer (Solisbaci, 1828); Walch, *Ketzerhistorie,* vol. 6:7, 8); Baur, *Tritatslehre,* 2:37-96; Dorner, *Lehre v. d. Person Christi* (2d ed.). volume 2, part 1; Hefele, *Conciliengeschichte,* 2:545 sq.; Gfrorer, *Allg. Kirchengesch.* vol. 2, part 2; Schrockh, *Kirchengesch.* 18:433-636; Neander, *Ch. Hist.* 2:524 sq.; and his *Dogma,* 1:337; Ebrard, *Handbuch der Kirchen- u. Dogmengesch.* 1:263 sq.; Schaff, *Ch. Hist.* 3:143-145; Neale, *Hist. East. Church* (patriarchate of Alexandria), 1:278 sq.; 2:3 sq.; Stanley, *Lect. East. Ch.* page 92 sq.; Hagenbach, *Hist. Doctrines,* 1:277 sq.; Milman, *Hist. Latin Christianity,* page 312 sq.; *Princeton Review, 38:*567 sq.; *Princeton Repository,* (January 1867), art. 3. Compare also Cureton's edition of the *Eccles. Hist. of John, Bishop of Ephesus* (Oxf. 1853), part 3. *SEE CHRISTOLOGY*; *SEE INCARNATION*.

Monotheism

(from μόνος, *one,* and θεός, *God)* is the belief in and worship of one only God, in opposition to polytheism, which acknowledges a plurality of gods. All the different mythologies have, among the host of gods with which they people heaven and earth, some, superior or supreme deity, more or less defined, but in every case distinguished above the others; and in the history of all the different nations where polytheism has obtained we may trace a period when the idea of one God was more or less prevalent. The most ancient traditions concur with the testimony of sacred Scripture in representing this as the primary and uncorrupted religion of mankind. M. Renan, in his *Histoire Generale et Systeme compare des Langues Semitiques* (Par. 1858, 2d ed.), and *Nouvelles Considerations sur le caractere general des Peuples Semitiques et en particulier sur leur tendance au Monotheisme* (Par. 1859), takes the ground that the Shemitic nations of the world are the propagators of the doctrine of the unity of God — indeed, that "of all the races of mankind, the Shemitic race alone was endowed with the instinct of monotheism... a *religious instinct* analogous to the instinct which led each race to the formation of its own language" (page 73). Max Miller, however, takes exception to this position, and insists upon it that the primitive intuition of God was in itself neither monotheistic nor polytheistic, but consisted solely in that simplest article of faith — that *God is God.* "This must have been the faith of the ancestors of mankind previously to any division of race or confusion of tongues... It is too often forgotten by those who believe that a polytheistic worship was

the most natural unfolding of religious life, that polytheism must everywhere have been preceded by a more or less conscious theism. In no language does the plural exist before the singular. No human mind could have conceived the idea of gods without having previously conceived the idea of a god... There are, however, in reality two kinds of oneness which, when we enter into metaphysical discussions, must be carefully distinguished, and which for practical purposes are well kept separate by the definite and indefinite articles... If an expression had been given to that primitive intuition of the Deity, which is the mainspring of all later religion, it would have been, 'There is a God,' but not yet 'There is but one God.' The latter form of faith, the belief in one God, is properly called monotheism, whereas the term *henotheism* would best express the faith in a single God" *(Chips,* 1:348-50). This kind of monotheism, according to Miller, "forms the birthright of every human being... In some form or other, the feeling of dependence on a higher power breaks through in all the religions of the world, and explains to us the meaning of St. Paul, 'that God, though in times past he suffered all nations to walk in their own ways, nevertheless left not himself without witness, in that he did good, and gave us rain from heaven and fruitful seasons, filling our hearts with food and gladness.' This primitive intuition of God, and this ineradicable feeling of dependence on God, could only have been the result of a primitive revelation, in the truest sense of that word" (pages 346-8, see also pages 363, 374; comp. Gould, *Origin of Religious Belief,* 1:267277). In this respect Judaism, Christianity, and Mohammedanism agree.

"Two facts," says Gould, "arrest our attention... the prevalence of monotheism, and the tendency of civilization towards it. Monotheism is at present the creed of a large section of the human race. The Christian, the Jew, and the Mohammedan hold the unity of the great cause with varying distinctness, according to their powers of abstraction" *(Origin of Religious Belief,* 1:238). But in regard to the Trinity they seriously differ, the Mohammedan and the Jew rejecting with vehemence the least approach to a trinitarian conception of the Deity. "The monotheism of the Mohammedan," says J.F. Clarke, "is that which makes of God pure will; that is, which exaggerates personality (since personality is in will), making the divine One an infinite Free Will or an infinite I. But will divorced from reason and love is wilfulness, or a purely arbitrary will. The monotheism of the Jews differed from this in that it combined with the idea of will the idea of justice. God not only does what he chooses, but he chooses to do only

what is right. Righteousness is an attribute of God, with which the Jewish books are saturated. Both of these systems leave God outside of the world; *above* all as its Creator and Ruler, *above* all as its Judge; but not *through* all and *in* all. The idea of an infinite love must be added and made supreme, in order to give us a Being who is not only above all, but also through all and in all. This is the Christian monotheism... Mohammed teaches a God above us; Moses teaches a God above us, and yet with us; Jesus teaches God above us, God with us, and God in us" *(Ten Great Religions,* pages 481-83). See *Jahrb. deutsch. Theol.* (1860), 4:669; *Brit. Quar. Rev.* (April 1873), art. 2; *Lond. Quar. Rev.* volume 127. *SEE UNITY OF GOD*.

Gould holds to a gradual development of monotheism. Recognising a Jewish, Mohammedan, and Christian monotheism. he traces first the development of the Jewish, which, under Moses, received "its final and complete form as a system, and embraced four leading doctrines:

(1) the absolute being of God;
(2) the absolute unity of his being;
(3) the difference in kind of matter from God;
(4) the subjection of matter to God"

(1:262; comp. *SEE MOSAISM*). The Mohammedan's monotheism he recognises as "the offspring of Jewish monotheism." Yet has the pure deism proved inferior to the Jewish, for "as a working system it annihilates morality. Before the almighty power of God the creature is nothing. Man, ox, ass, are on a level; and if the notion be humbling to him, he may recover a little self-respect when he remembers that the archangels are in no better plight. Between man and God is a profound and wide abyss, and no bridge spans it. Too far above man to sympathize in any way with him, God can yet crush him with his jealousy. If man attempt to attribute to himself anything that is of God, and appear to encroach on his all. engrossing majesty by ever so little, the wrath of God is kindled and man is levelled with the dust" (1:265). "It is," says Palgrave, "his singular satisfaction to let created beings continually feel that they are nothing else than his slaves, tools, and contemptible tools also, that thus they may the better acknowledge his superiority, and know his power to be above their power, his cunning above their cunning, his will above their will, his pride above their pride; or, rather, that there is no power, cunning, will, or pride save his own. But he himself, in his inaccessible height, neither loving aught save his own and self-measured decree, without son, companion, or

counsellor, is no less barren for himself than for his creatures, and his own barrenness and lone egoism in himself is the cause and rule of his indifferent and unregarding despotism around" *(Arabia,* 1:366). *SEE POLYTHEISM*.

Christian monotheism Gould excludes from comparison with the Jewish and Mohammedan, because "its doctrine of the Trinity and the incarnation remove it from the class to which which Mosaism and Islamism... belong" (1:277). *SEE GOD*; *SEE TRINITY*. See besides Gould, Clarke, Max Miller, and Renan; Hagenbach, *Hist. of Doctrines,* 1:330; Christlieb, *Modern Doubt and Christian Belief* (N.Y. 1875, 8vo), lect. 3 and 4; Lewes, *Hist. Philos.* volume 2 (see Index); Liddon, *Divinity of Christ,* pages 67, 76, 95, 270, 307; and the literature appended to the article THEISM *SEE THEISM* .

Monothelism

(from μόνος, *single,* and θέλημα, *will),* the doctrine of a Christian sect, maintains that Christ, though possessed of two natures, was yet subject only to *one* will; the human will being merged in the divine, or absorbed by it. The doctrine was given shape in an attempt on the part of the emperor Heraclius to unite the different factions of the Catholic Church, and to bring back to the fold the *Eutychians* and the *Monophysites.* There was near the beginning of the 7th century much controversy in the Eastern Church respecting the two wills in Christ, kindred to that concerning his nature. The Monophysites were at that time a most powerful sect, and the movement, especially in Egypt, threatened to assume a political character. In this difficulty the emperor Heraclius, hoping to reconcile the two parties, adopted the doctrine that there was in Jesus the Christ, after the union of the two natures, only *one* divine human energy and *one* will *(*μόνον θέλημα*);* and when, in the course of a campaign against Persia, Heraclius passed through Armenia and Syria, he came to an understanding with the Monophysite leaders of the Severians and Jacobites, and induced Sergius (q.v.), the orthodox patriarch of Constantinople, to give his assent to the doctrine of ἕν θέλημα καὶ μία ἐνέργεια, or of an ἐνέργεια θεανδρική. Monothelism, it will be perceived, then, is nothing more nor less than a modification of Eutychianism (q.v.). It consisted in maintaining that, although Christ has two natures, yet these natures possessed or are acted on by but a single will, the divine will superseding or supplying the place of a human will. It will be observed also that in this way the

controversy was removed from the province of pure metaphysics into the moral and practical sphere; and although the assertion of an independent nature without independent action was a *contradictio in adjecto* it was yet hoped that the doctrine might be adopted by the Monophysites. The author of this doctrine was probably Sergius himself; he was, at least, its most active propagandist. The progress of the doctrine was materially forwarded by the relation which, at the instance of Sergius, and under his representations, pope Honorius (q.v.) was induced to maintain regarding the question. The Monophysite Cyrus, whom the emperor had promoted from the episcopate of Phasis to the patriarchate of Alexandria, promptly called a synod (A.D. 633), which by the seventh canon of its decrees solemnly approved of the monothelite doctrine (in the words τὸν αὐτὸν ἕνα Χριστὸν καὶ υἱὸν ἐνεργοῦντα τὰ θεοπρεπῆ καὶ ἀνθρώπινα μιᾷ θεανδρικῇ ἐνεργείᾳ, Mansi, *Concil.* 11:565), thereby hoping to effect permanently a union between the different parties (Mansi, *Concil.* 11:564 sq.; *Letters of Cyrus,* ibid. 561). As Cyrus was the principal mover in this attempt, he has been generally esteemed the founder of the Monothelites. The work of the council certainly proved salutary, at least for a time. By bringing the doctrine of the Council of Chalcedon nearer to the Eutychian system, numbers of the Eutychians, who were dispersed throughout Egypt, Armenia, and other remote provinces, returned to the bosom of the Church. The only dissenting leader proved a certain Sophronius, a monk of Palestine, who from the first opposed the decree of the Alexandrian Synod with violence and when elevated to the vacant patriarchate of Jerusalem (635) was thus afforded ecclesiastical position and power, and now came forward to contest the question, notwithstanding that the patriarch of Constantinople approved of the Alexandrian decision, and the pope at Rome offered no remonstrance. Sophronius (q.v.) endeavored to show that this doctrine was inadmissible, since the doctrine of two natures set forth by the Synod of Chalcedon (q.v.) necessarily implied that of two wills (see Sophronii *Epistola Synodica* which is given in Mansi, 11:461). He finally summoned a council, and condemned monothelism as a branch of the Eutychian heresy. In order to terminate, if possible, the commotions to which this division was giving rise, the emperor Heraclius in 638 issued an edict, Ἔκθεσις (so named because it contained an exposition of the faith), in which he confirmed the agreement made by the patriarchs for the preservation of ecclesiastical union, and in which all controversies upon the question whether in Christ there was a double operation were prohibited, though the doctrine of a

unity of will was inculcated. A considerable number of the Eastern bishops declared their assent to the *Ecthesis,* and above all Pyrrhus, who succeeded Sergius in the see of Constantinople. A similar acceptance was obtained from the metropolis of the Eastern Church; but at Rome the *Ecthesis* was differently received. John IV assembled a council, in which that exposition was condemned. *SEE ECTHESIS*. Neither was the monothelite system maintained in the Eastern Church any longer than during the life of Heraclius. In 648 the emperor Constans II issued the Τὺπος, i.e. an edict, by which the *Ecthesis* was suppressed, and the contending parties were prohibited from resuming their discussions on the doctrine in question (see Mansi, 10:992,1029 sq.; Neander, *Church Hist.* [Torrey] 3:186-192). Pope Honorius, as we have seen, appeared in favor of the union, and was probably himself inclined to monophysitism; but his successors, Severinus and John 4, thought and felt differently. The latter condemned the doctrine of the Monothelites, and Theodore excommunicated Paul, patriarch of Constantinople, till the doctrine of *two* wills and *two* energies was at last adopted at the first synod of the Lateran, held under Martin I, bishop of Rome, in the year 649 (see Mansi, 10:863 sq.). "Si quis secundum scelerosos haereticos cum una voluntate et una operatione, quae ab haereticis impiis confitetur, et duas voluntates, pariterque et operationes, hoc est, divinam et humanam, quae in ipso Christo Deo in unitate salvantur, et a sanctis patribus orthodoxe in ipso praedicantur, denegat et respuit, condemnatus sit" (see Gieseler, c. 1, § 128, note 11; Munscher v. Colla, 2:78 sq.). The emperor was so indignant at this daring of Martin that he had him secured, carried to Constantinople, there treated for a time as a criminal, and then banished him to the Crimea, where he died in 655, to be numbered among the martyrs of the Western and the confessors of the Eastern Church. His great intellectual supporter at the council had been a Greek abbot named Maximus, and he, too, underwent a long persecution, being scourged, having his tongue cut out, and at last dying a death little short of martyrdom just as he had reached his place of exile, A.D. 662. The final and authoritative condemnation of the monothelite dogma took place at the sixth general council, held at Constantinople in the year 680, where it was decided that there are in Christ "two natural wills and two natural operations, without division, without conversion or change, with nothing like antagonism, and nothing like confusion, but at the same time the human will of Christ could not come into collision with his divine will, but is in all things subject to it." An anathema was also pronounced on Theodore, Sergius, Honorius, and all who had maintained the heresy, this

anathema being confirmed by Leo II, who wrote to the emperor respecting his own predecessor in the see of Rome: "Anathematizamus... necnon et Honorium qui hanc apostolicam ecclesiam non apostolicae traditionis doctrina lustravit, sed profana proditione immaculatam subvertere conatus est" (Mansi, *Concil.* 11:631-637, 731). This anathema of pope Honorius was repeated by his successors for three centuries. *SEE HONORIUS*; *SEE INFALLIBILITY*. The council (also called the First Trullan) was summoned by Constantinus Pogonatus. The decision of the synod was based upon the epistle of Agatho, the Roman bishop, which was itself founded upon the canons of the above-mentioned Lateran synod (Agathonis *Ep. ad Imperatores,* in Mansi, 11:233 sq.). Baur says of this controversy *(Dogmengesch.* page 211): "Its elements on the side of the Monothelites were the unity of the person or subject, from whose one will (the divine will of the incarnate Logos) all must proceed, since two wills also presuppose two personal subjects (the chief argument of bishop Theodore of Cara, in Mansi, 11:567); on the side of the Dyothelites, the point was the fact of two natures, since two natures cannot be conceived without two natural wills, and two natural modes of operation. How far now two wills can be without two persons willing was the point from which they slipped away by mere supposition." See Combefis, *Hist. hoer. Monothelit.* (Paris, 1648); Hagenbach, *Hist. of Doctrines,* 1:229, 241, 282; Schaff, *Church Hist.* 3:752, 782; Neander, *Church Hist.* 3:186 sq.; Gieseler, *Church Hist.* c. 1, § 128; Baur, *Dogmengesch.* 1:211; and his *Trinitatslehre,* volume 2; Ebrard, *Kirchen- u. Dogmengesch.* 1:279 sq.; Trench, *Hulsean Lect.* page 200; Gregory, *Hist. of the Christ. Church,* 1:379; Dorner, *Doct. of the Person of Christ,* volume 2, part 1; Neale, *Hist. East. Church* (patriarchate of Alexandria), 2:60 sq., 76 sq.; Stanley, *East. Church,* pages 94, 110; Knapp, *Christian Theology,* page 366; Milnan, *Hist. of Latin Christianity,* 2:266 sq.; Walch, *Ketzerhistorie,* 9:3-666; Gfrorer, *Kirchengesch.* volume 3, part 1, page 36 sq.; Dollinger, *Kirchengesch.* 1:170 sq.; Schrockh, *Kirchengesch.* 20:386 sq.; *Westminster Rev.* April 1871, page 247. *SEE MONOPHYSITES*. (J.H.W.)

Monothelites

(Μονοθελῆται), an ancient heretical sect which is first spoken of in the writings of St. John of Damascus, in the middle of the 8th century, but which may be traced back to Severus, the deposed patriarch of Antioch, who flourished in the first half of the 7th century. He founded *Monophysitism* (q.v.). In some fragments of his writings which have come

down to us, Severus remarks that Christ's words, "Not my will, but thine, be done" (⟨ᴅᴅᴅ⟩Luke 22:42), do not prove the existence of a will distinct from the divine will, nor that there was any struggle or resistance on the part of the Saviour's soul, as if he had a human fear of death or a human unwillingness to die; but that the words are so set down by way of accommodation, and for Christian instruction (Mai, *Coll. Nov.* 7:288). The distinct formulation of monothelism is attributed, however, to Theodore, bishop of Cara, in Arabia. Although not a Monophysite, Theodore taught that all the acts of Christ proceeded from one principle, originating in the Word, and operating through the human soul and body. Hence, though the Logos and the manhood were distinct natures, they were both acted upon by one and the same *iv6pyeta;* and there being one activity, there was one will, by which it was moved, that will being divine. *(*Αὐτοῦ γὰρ τὸ θέλημα ἔν ἐστι, καὶ τοῦτο θεϊκόν; Mansi, *Concil.* 11:568.) Athanasius, the Monophysite patriarch of Antioch, was a zealous convert to the opinion of Theodore, and laid it before the emperor Heraclius as offering a basis for such a compromise between his sect and the Church as might enable them to reunite in one communion. The emperor most enthusiastically espoused the plan, and thus became the promoter of the monothelite dogma, and really, the founder of the Monothelites. This emperor, Heraclius I, was born about A.D. 575, and was a son of Heraclius, governor of Africa. By the violent death of the tyrant Phocas in 610, Heraclius, who had served in the army with credit, obtained the imperial power, and soon afterwards married Eudoxia. In the early part of his reign the empire was ravaged by pestilence and the barbarian armies of Chosroes, king of Persia. In 622 he led an army against Persia, defeated Chosroes at Tauris, and fought several successful campaigns, in which he displayed great military talents and personal courage. In the course of his campaigns against Persia he passed through Armenia and Syria, and came to a peaceful understanding with the Monophysite leaders of the Severians and the Jacobites, who at this time had become a powerful and dangerous political party. Hoping to reconcile them, he, in connection with Sergius, patriarch of Constantinople, proposed to them the curious doctrine of monothelism, which satisfied the Monophysites, without apparently disturbing the decision of the Council of Chalcedon. Having made peace with Persia in 628, he returned to Constantinople, and abandoned himself to inglorious ease, sensual vices, and the subtleties of monotheism, of which he was the chief supporter, ignoring the victorious progress of the Mussulman arms, until the very subversion of his empire was threatened. In

639, finally, he made an energetic attempt to establish monothelism by issuing his Ἔκθησις, with what result may be seen in the article MONOTHELISM *SEE MONOTHELISM* . Heraclius died in 641. His character is a puzzle, and presents surprising contradictions. Protected and nurtured by imperial approbation, the Monothelites became a very considerable sect. The decisions of the sixth Council of Constantinople determined that their opinions were not consistent with the purity of the Christian faith, and monothelism was formally condemned; and though its advocates were sometimes the objects of royal favor, yet they were in general condemned and depressed. In 711, when Philippicus Bardanes was Greek emperor, they became once more influential and powerful. He convened a new council at Constantinople, which reversed the decisions of the sixth council, and adopted monothelism as an orthodox doctrine. Some few bishops resisted, but were driven from the council. Two years later Anastasius II reinstituted dyothelism, and the same bishops who had two years before vetoed dyothelism now changed their mind, and adopted it as the only true exposition of faith! Thus persecuted, the Monothelites retired to the neighborhood of Mount Lebanon. After the Crusades (1291), and especially after 1596, they began to gradually go over to the Roman Church, although retaining the communion under both kinds, their Syriac missal, the marriage of priests, and their traditional fast-days, with some saints of their own, especially St. Maron. *SEE MARONITES*. The Monothelites have often been bitterly persecuted, but our concern for the cruelties they suffered cannot but be lessened by the consideration of the persecutions which in the day of their power they were tempted to commit against their orthodox brethren. See, besides the references in the article MONOTHELISM, Blunt, *Dict. of Heresies and Sects,* s.v.; Schaff, *Church Hist. 3:*752 sq.; Gregory, *Hist. of the Christ. Church,* 1:397; Mosheim, *Ecclesiastical History,* 2:36; Robinson, *Palestine,* 3:744; Walch, *Geschichte der Ketzereien,* 9:475; Baumgarten, *Geschichte der Religionspartheien,* page 617.

Monrad, Ditler Gothard

a Danish prelate of note, was born at Copenhagen November 24, 111. In 1836 he passed his theological examinations, and was two years later honored by the title of D.D. In 1846 he was called to the pastorate of Vester Ulsler, in the diocese of Laaland. Having taken a prominent position in the national party, he was made chaplain March 24, 1848, but occupied the position only until the following November, when he retired, together

with most of his colleagues. He continued to take an active part in political affairs until 1850, when he was created bishop of Laaland-Falster, and later figured as a cabinet officer until 1864. After the unsuccessful termination of the war against Prussia he migrated to New Zealand, where he died in 1874. He published valuable papers on the *Organization of Schools in many large Protestant Cities* (1844), besides which he issued mainly "Political Pamphlets" (1839-42). See Vapereau, *Dictionnaire Universel des Contemporains,* s.v.

Monro, Alexander, D.D.

an English prelate, was born in 1648, in the County of Ross. After having taught philosophy in the University of Aberdeen, he was principal of that of Edinburgh (1686), and had just been appointed bishop of the Orkney Islands when, refusing to take the oath of allegiance to William III, he lost that dignity. He was appointed in 1688 bishop of Argyle, but it is doubtful whether he ever were instituted. He died in 1713. Bishop Monro is the author of *XII Sermons* (London, 1673, 8vo): — *Letter to Sir Robert Howard,* occasioned by the *Two-fold Vindication of the Presbyterians,* etc. (1696, 8vo). He was also the author of one of the four letters published as *An Account of the Present Persecution of the Church of Scotland* (1690, 4to, 68 pages). See *Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors,* volume 2, s.v.

Monroe, Andrew

a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, called the patriarch of Missouri Methodism, was born in Hampshire County, Virginia, October 29, 1792; was converted and joined the Church when but a youth. In March 1815, he was licensed to preach, and sent to labor on the Fairfield Circuit. In the following year he was admitted on trial to the Ohio Conference. In 1824 he was transferred to Missouri, and stationed at St. Louis; he returned the next year, and was then placed over the St. Louis District, which embraced the entire state. He was a member of eleven General Conferences, and took an active part in the establishment of the Church, South. He died in Mexico, Mo., November 18, 1871. His several appointments were: 1816, Jefferson Circuit; 1817, Franklin Circuit; 1818, Fountain Head Circuit; 1819, Bowling Green. In the Kentucky Conference: 1820, Hopkinsville; 1821 and 1822, Maysville; 1823, presiding elder of Augusta District. In the Missouri Conference: 1824 and 1825, St. Louis

Station; 1826 and 1827, presiding elder of Missouri District; 1828 and 1829, St. Louis Station; 1830, St. Louis District; 1831, left, by request, without an appointment; 1832 to 1835, presiding elder of St. Louis District; 1836 and 1837, Missouri District; 1838, Columbia District; 1839 and 1840, agent of St. Charles College; 1841 and 1842, St. Charles Station, and agent of the college; 1843, presiding elder of St. Charles District; 1844 and 1845, presiding elder of St. Charles District, and agent of the college; 1846 to 1849, presiding elder of Columbia District; 1850 and 1851, Fayette Circuit; 1852 and 1853, presiding elder of Hannibal District; 1854, transferred to the St. Louis Conference, and appointed superintendent of Kansas Mission District; 1855, transferred back to the Missouri Conference, and appointed presiding elder of Fayette District; 1856 to 1859, presiding elder of St. Charles District; 1860, agent of Central College; 1861 and 1862, Fayette Circuit; 1863 and 1864, Brunswick District; 1865, Fayette District; 1866 and 1867, Conference missionary; 1869 to 1870, St. Charles District; 1871, Conference missionary. It is not within the scope of this sketch to enter into any exhaustive analysis of a life so protracted, aims so single and sublime, purposes so pertinaciously adhered to through a long, eventful course. His name is historic: scarcely a book of Methodist annals has appeared within half a century past that does not contain it. See McFerrin, *Hist. of Meth. in Tenn.* 2:473; *Minutes of Conference of Meth. Episc. Ch., South* (1872); Elliott, *Hist. of the Meth. Episc. Ch. in the South-west,* page 74 and sq.

Monroe, Jonathan

an American Methodist minister, was born in Annapolis, Maryland, June 11, 1801; joined the Baltimore Conference, and was appointed to Alleghany Circuit in 1825; in 1826, to Concord; in 1827 he was ordained deacon by bishop Soule, and appointed to Shamoken; in 1828, to Lewistown; in 1829 he was ordained elder by bishop M'Kendree, and appointed to Concord; in 1830, to Gettysburg; in 1831, to Shrewsbury; in 1833, to Patapsco; in 1835, to Calvert; in 1837, to Lewistown; in 1839, to Warrior's Mark; in 1841, to Huntingdon; in 1843, to Bedford; in 1845, to Westminster; in 1847, to Liberty; in 1849, to Montgomery; in 1850, to Gettysburg; in 1852, to Mechanicsburg; in 1854, to Mercersburg; in 1856, to East Hartford; in 1858, to Great Falls; in 1859, to Hereford; in 1861, to Westminster; in 1863, to Emmitsburg; and in 1864 he became supernumerary, and retired to Westminster, Carroll County, Md., where he died, December 4, 1869. His Christian virtues, uniform piety, and devotion

to his calling demonstrated the power of divine grace in his life, and endeared him to all who knew him. See *Minutes of Baltimore Conference for* 1870.

Monroe, Samuel Yorke, D.D.

an eminent minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born at Mount Holly, New Jersey, July 1, 1816. He enjoyed the advantages of a thorough English training, and after his conversion, which occurred in 1833, decided to devote himself to the work of the Christian ministry. He labored for several years as a local preacher; was admitted on trial into the New Jersey Conference in 1843, and quickly rose to distinction among his brethren. His first appointment does not appear in the minutes. In 1844 he travelled the Sweedsborough Circuit. At the Conference held in Mount Holly in 1845 he was admitted into full connection, and stationed at Salem, N.J. He was returned to the same appointment in 1846. In 1847-48 he preached in Paterson; in 1849-50, in Newark; in 1851, at Princeton. He was next successively stationed at Newark, New Brunswick, Camden, Trenton, and Trinity Church, Newark (located in Newark Conference, to which he had been transferred). He served as presiding elder several years, first in the Bridgeton District, after he had preached at Camden; and in the Camden District after he had labored in Trenton. He was a member of the General Conference in 1856,1860, and 1864, at which last time he was prominently named for the episcopacy. He was by this body then elected a member of the General Missionary Committee, and shortly afterwards was appointed by the bishops of the Church as recording secretary of the newly organized society for "Church extension." Upon this work he entered with his usual vigor and zeal, and was meeting with success beyond the highest expectation of the friends of the enterprise. On Sunday, the 27th of January 1867, he had preached in St. Paul's Methodist Episcopal Church in New York City, for the cause of "Church extension," and was on his way from Camden, New Jersey, to New York, with the intention of occupying one of the city pulpits for the same object, when he was lost overboard a train, no one has ever found how, and was killed in the fall, February 9, 1867, as was declared by the verdict of a coroner's jury. Few men labored more earnestly for the Church than did Dr. Monroe. After his appointment to the secretaryship, besides attending to an extensive correspondence, he visited and addressed some fifty Conferences upon the subject of "Church extension;" preached once or twice nearly every Sabbath; organized his work almost over the whole Church; and raised and disbursed about

$60,000 during the first year of the society's existence. During this period his labors were undoubtedly excessive; and, in the opinion of those who had the best opportunity for knowing, were beginning sensibly to impair his health and vigor. "Dr. Monroe," say the *Newark Conference Minutes* of 1867, "was in many respects a remarkable man. As a Christian, he was conscientious, without being morbidly sensitive; fervent in spirit, without being boisterous or fanatical; faithful, without being severe or censorious; and spiritual and pure in heart, without a profession of extraordinary religious attainments... His success in winning souls to Christ proved that wherever he labored God was with him. As a preacher he was able, evangelical, and edifying; and as a pastor diligent, sympathetic, and faithful. But that which distinguished him more than anything else was his remarkably clear perception of the relations of things, his rapid mental comparisons and inductions, and his consequent seemingly intuitive and almost infallible judgment. In this respect he had probably no superiors, if, indeed, he had many equals, in our Church. Remarkably free from prejudice and selfishness, and ever cool and conscientious, and with a mind that could grasp a question, view it in all its relations, and at once deduce the appropriate conclusion, he was an eminently wise and safe counsellor in everything pertaining to the kingdom of God." The *N.Y. Methodist* (February 16, 1867), commenting on his death, says: "Dr. Monroe was one of the leading representatives of the American Methodist Church... As secretary of the Church Extension Society, he displayed his characteristic good sense, rare executive ability, laboriousness, and eminent pulpit power. In all these elements of character he excelled." See also *Ladies' Repository,* March, 1868; Appleton's *Annual,* 1867; *N.Y. Christian Advocate,* February 8, 1872 *(MS. Sermons of the late Dr. Monroe).* (J.H.W.)

Monroe, William

a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born in Alleghany County, Indiana, September 8, 1783. He was converted when but a youth; was licensed to preach in 1809, and entered the Baltimore Conference in 1810. He was ordained deacon by bishop M'Kendree, and elder by bishop Asbury. His active ministerial life extended over a period of thirty-three years, during which time he labored on some of the most difficult circuits in the Baltimore Conference. Mr. Monroe was a man of Christian virtues and great piety, and his true devotion to Methodism has endeared him to the whole Church. His appointments were Lyttleton Circuit, Huntington Circuit, Greenville Circuit, Randolph Circuit, Georgetown, D.C., Redstone

Circuit, East Wheeling, Monongahela, Rockingham Circuit, Virginia; Alleghany,Virginia; Ebenezer, Washington, D.C.; Chambersburg; Winchester, Virginia; Stafford, Virginia; Rockingham, Virginia; Staunton, Virginia; Berkeley, Virginia; Jefferson; Berkeley, Virginia; South Branch; and Hillsborough. After this for two years (1837 and 1838) he was supernumerary. In 1839-40 he was stationed at Boonsborough, and in 1841 at Codorus Mission. In 1844 he was again supernumerary; in 1843-44, Mercersburg; and in 1845, Greencastle. This year closed his active service, and in 1846 he asked for and obtained a superannuated relation, which he sustained until removed to the Church triumphant. He died in Washington County, Maryland, May 29, 1871. See *General Minutes of the M.E. Church,* 1872, page 17.

Monseigneur

(my lord), a French title, once applied to saints, and subsequently to princes, nobles, certain high dignitaries of the Church, and other titled personages, is now only given to prelates. The Italian *monsignore* has a similar signification.

Monsignore

SEE MONSEIGNEUR.

Monster

SEE SEA-MONSTER.

Monstrance

SEE MONSTRANTIA.

Monstrantia

Picture for Monsrtantia

(MONSTRUM, OSTENSORIUM) is a vessel used for the preserving of relics, and particularly for the consecrated host *(sanctissimumn, vensersabile, eucharistia),* and in which they are presented to the adoration of the people. When, in the 13th century, the doctrine of transubstantiation was established by the Church, the elevation of the host followed, as also its special exhibition, for instance, in the procession of Corpus-Christi Day (q.v.). For that purpose the host (q.v.) was placed on a curved surface

(lunula), and introduced in a transparent vessel *(monstrantia, in qua sub vitro crystallino cruor inclusus* [Du Fresne, *Glossar.* s.h.v.]). This case *(phylacterium, arcula)* is enlarged by the addition of rays, forming an image of the sun, or the like, and provided with a stand. It is placed on the altar. Thus the monstrantia becomes a movable shrine for the sacrament *(taberncaculum gestatoriumn),* generally made of costly material, and richly decorated. "At first," says Walcott *(Sacred Archaeology,* page 390), "it took the shape of an ordinary reliquary, but at length was made like a tower of crystal, of cylindrical form, and mounted on a foot like that of a chalice, and covered by a spire-like canopy, with flying buttresses. Inside the cylinder was a crescent held by an angel, in which the host was set: in some cases the cylinder was replaced by a quarterfoil, or was surrounded by a foliage like a jesse-tree, and at a later date by the sun, a luminous disk, with rays alternately straight and wavy, set upon a stand. Upon the vessel itself the Doom was often represented, and relics were placed in it. The monstrance did not become common till the 15th, and is probably not earlier than the 14th century. It bore different forms: (1) a little tower, jewelled, and having apertures of glass or crystal; (2) the figure of a saint, or the Holy Lamb, with St. John the Baptist pointing to it; (3) a cross; (4) a crystal lantern, or tube, mounted on a pedestal of precious metal, and covered with a canopy in the 15th century; (5) a sun, with rays, containing in the centre a kind of pyx (this is found as early as the 16th century)." The ecclesiastical laws now regulate its construction. The statutes of the archbishopric of Prague of 1605, tit. 18, command, for instance, "Monstrantia ad exponendam vel in processionibus deferendam hostiam magnam, si non ex auro, aut argento, saltern ex aurichalco bene aurato refulgeat, et velo vel peplo congruo ornata sit." The monstrantia is a sacred vessel, and not to be touched by an unconsecrated person; hence any one who stole it was to be burned to death. The high altar is always provided with a monstrantia, and often the side altars also. All evangelical churches have rejected the prayer *De venerabile* of the Romish Church, and Luther declared, "It is insulting and dishonoring to the holy sacrament to carry it about, and to make it an instrument of idle idolatry." See also Herzog, *Real-Encyklopadie,* 9:757.

Montagioli, Cassiodoro

a learned Italian ecclesiastic, was born at Modena February 5, 1698; entered the Benedictine Order in 1717, and successively filled several prominent offices in the order. He gave himself largely to the study of

philosophy. His principal works are, *Esercizi di celesti affetti, tratti dal libro de' Salmi* (Rome, 1742): — *Trattato practico della carita Cristiana in quanto e amor verso Dio* (Bologna, 1751, and Venice, 1761): — *Enchiridio evangelico* (Mod. 1755): — *Maniera facile di meditare con frutto le massime Cristiane* (Bologna, 1759, 2 volumes): — *Detti pratiche e ricordi di S. Andrea Avellino* (Venice, 1771): — *Parabole del figliuol di Dio* (Plaisance, 1772): — *Il divino sermone nel monte* (Rome, 1779).

Montagnuoli, Giovanni Domenico

an Italian theologian, was born at Batignano (territory of Sienna) in the first half of the 17th century. As a Dominican monk, he was distinguished for his austere piety, as well as for his attachment to the doctrine of St. Thomas. He was the author of *Defensiones philosophicae angelicae Thomisticce* (Venice, 1609, fol.). This work, enlarged and revised, appeared again under the same title at Naples in 1610). See Echard et Quetif, *Script. Ord. Prcedicat.* 2:337.

Montagu, Walter

a Roman Catholic divine of note, was born at London in 1604. He was the son of Sir Henry Montagu, who afterwards became earl of Manchester. After being educated at Sidney College, Cambridge, he travelled abroad, and became a convert to Romanism. though opposed by his nearest friends. On returning to his native land, he attracted the attention and secured the favor of his queen, who appointed him her confessor. She also honored him by sending him on a confidential mission to Rome, where he met with a gracious reception by pope Urban VIII. The breaking out of the Civil War clouded his prosperity, and in 1643 he was imprisoned in the Tower, where he remained confined for several years. As soon as he was released he retired into France, where he became abbot of the Benedictine monastery at Nanteuil. He afterwards obtained the rich abbey of St. Martin's, near Pontoise, where he remained until the Restoration, when the queen-mother of England appointed him master of St. Catharine's Hospital, a position occupied by him till his death at Paris in 1677. As an author, the chief works of his pen are, *The Shepherd's Paradise,* a pastoral comedy possessing some merit, though ridiculed severely by Sir John Suckling in his "Sessions of the Poets": — *Miscellanea Spiritualia,* published in two parts (1648-54), a series of religious essays or tracts: — a *Letter* from Paris to his father, in which he justifies the Church of Rome, and states his

personal reasons for changing his belief. This letter was printed with lord Falkland's *Discourse on Infallibility* (1651). He also made an English translation of Bossuet's *Exposition of the Doctrines of the Catholic Church* (1672). (H.W.T.)

Montague, Richard, D.D.

SEE MOUNTAGU.

Montaigne, Michel, Seigneur de

a distinguished French moralist, remarkable for his deep insight into the principles of our common nature, was born February 28, 1533, and was a younger son of a nobleman, whose estate, from which the family name arose, was situated in the province of Perigord, near the river Dordogne. His father, an eccentric, blunt, feudal baron, placed him under the care of a German tutor who did not speak French, and the intercourse between tutor and pupil was carried on entirely in Latin; and even his parents made it a rule to address him in that language, of which they knew a sufficient number of words for common purposes. The attendants were enjoined to follow the same practice. "They all became Latinized," says Montaigne himself; "and even the villagers in the neighborhood learned words in that language, some of which took root in the country, and became of common use among the people." Thus, without the aid of scholastic teaching, Montaigne 'spoke Latin long before he could speak French, which he was afterwards obliged to learn like a foreign language. He studied Greek in the same manner, by way of pastime more than as a task. He was sent to the college of Guienne, at Bordeaux; and at the age of thirteen he completed his college education. He then studied law, and in 1554 he was made "conseiller," or judge, in the Parliament of Bordeaux. He repaired several times to court, and enjoyed the favor of Henri II, by whom, or, as some say, by Charles IX, he was made a gentleman of the king's chamber and a knight of the Order of St. Michael. When he was thirty-three years of age Montaigne married, to please his friends rather as he says, than himself, for he was not inclined to a married life. He, however, always lived on good terms with his wife, by whom he had a daughter. He managed his own estate, on which he generally resided, and from which he derived an income of about 6000 livres. In 1569 Montaigne translated into French a Latin work of Raymond de Sebonde or Sebon, a Spanish divine, on *Natural Theology,* at the request of his then recently deceased father, who

had feared for his son's apostasy to Protestantism (comp. Fisher, *Hist. Ref.* page 6, note 2). France was at that time desolated by civil and religious war, and Montaigne, disapproving of the conduct of the court towards the Protestants, and yet being by education a Roman Catholic, and by principle and disposition loyal to the king, was glad to live in retirement, and take no part in public affairs except by exhorting both parties to moderation and mutual charity. By this conduct he became, as might be expected, obnoxious to both sides. The massacre of St. Bartholomew plunged him into a deep melancholy, for he detested cruelty and the shedding of blood. It was about this dismal epoch of 1572 that he began to write his *Essais,* which were published in March, 1580, and met with great success. (See below.) With a view to restoring his health, which was not good, Montaigne undertook a journey to Germany, Switzerland, and lastly to Italy. At Rome he was well received by several cardinals and other persons of distinction, and was introduced to pope Gregory XIII, and received the freedom of the city of Rome by a bull of the pope, an honor of which he appears to have been very proud. Montaigne was delighted with Rome; he there found himself at home among those scenes and monuments which were connected with his earliest studies and the first impressions of his boyish years. He wrote a journal of his tour, evidently not intended for publication; but the manuscript, when discovered after nearly two centuries in an old chest in the chateau of his family, was published (in 1774) under the title of *Journal du Voyage de Michel de Montaigne en Italie, par la Suisse et l'Allemagne, en* 1580-81. It is one of the earliest descriptions 'of Italy written in a modern language. While he was abroad he was elected mayor of Bordeaux by the votes of the citizens, an honor which he would have declined had not the king, Henri III, insisted upon his accepting the office. At the expiration of two years Montaigne was re-elected for an equal period. On his retiring from office he returned to his patrimonial estate. The war of the League was then raging in the country, and Montaigne had some difficulty in saving his family and property from the violence of the contending factions. At this time the plague also broke out in his neighborhood (in 1586), and obliged him to leave his residence and wander about various parts of the country. He was at Paris in 1588, busy with a new edition of the *Essais.* It appears from De Thou's account that about this time Montaigne was employed in negotiations with a view to conclude a peace between Henri of Navarre, afterwards Henri IV, and the duke of Guise. At Paris he became acquainted with Mademoiselle de Gournay, a young lady who had conceived a kind of sentimental affection

for him from reading his book. Attended by her mother she visited him, and introduced herself to him, and from that time he called her his "fille d'alliance," or adopted daughter, a title which she retained for the rest of her life, as she never married. Montaigne was then fifty-five years of age. This attachment, which, though warm and reciprocal, has every appearance of having been of a purely Platonic nature, is one of the remarkable incidents of Montaigne's life. At the time of his death, Mademoiselle Gournay and her mother crossed one half of France, notwithstanding the civil troubles and the insecurity of the roads, to repair to Montaigne's residence and mingle their tears with those of his widow and daughter. On his return from Paris in the latter part of 1588, Montaigne stopped at Blois with De Thou, Pasquier, and other friends. The States-General were then assembled in that city, in which the duke de Guise and his brother the cardinal were treacherously murdered, on the 23d and 24th of December of that year. Montaigne had long foreseen that the civil dissensions could only terminate with the death of one of the great party leaders. He had also said to De Thou that Henri of Navarre was inclined to adopt the Roman Catholic faith, but that he was afraid of being forsaken by his party; and that, on the other side, Guise himself would not have been averse to embracing the Protestant religion, if he could thereby have promoted his ambitious views. After the catastrophe Montaigne returned to his chateau. In the following year he became acquainted with Pierre Charron, a theological writer of considerable reputation, and formed an intimate friendship with him. Charron, in his book *De la Sagesse,* borrowed many ideas from Montaigne's *Essais.* Montaigne by his will empowered Charron to assume the coat of arms of his family, as he himself had no male issue. Montaigne's health was in a declining state for a, considerable time before his death; he was afflicted with the gravel and the colic, and he obstinately refused to consult medical men, of whom he had generally an indifferent opinion. In September 1592, he fell ill of a malignant quinsy, which kept him speechless for three days, during which he had recourse to his pen to signify his last wishes. He invited several gentlemen of the neighborhood, in order that he might take leave of them, and when they were all assembled in his room, a priest said mass, and at the elevation of the host, Montaigne,. while half raised up in his bed, with his hands joined together as in prayer, expired, September 13, 1592. His body was buried at Bordeaux in the church of the Feuillants. The character of Montaigne is amply delineated in his *Essais.* They contain much that an advanced Christianity can hardly approve, yet, notwithstanding these inconsistencies,

it is impossible to avoid admiring the continued benignity and pensive gayety which distinguished his temper. The amiableness of his private life is attested by the fact that, under the five monarchs who during his time successively swayed the sceptre of a kingdom torn with fanatical divisions, his person and property were always respected by both parties; and few at an advanced age can say, like him, that they are yet untainted with a quarrel or a lawsuit.

Montaigne's *Essais* have been the subject of much conflicting criticism. If we reflect upon the age and the intellectual condition of the country in which the author lived, we must consider them a very extraordinary production, not so much on account of the learning contained in the work, although that is very considerable, as for the clear good-sense, philosophical spirit, and frank, liberal tone which pervades their pages, as well as for the attractive simplicity of the language. Literature was then at a very low ebb in France, the language was hardly formed, the country was disturbed by feudal turbulence, ignorant fanaticism, deadly intolerance, and civil factions, and yet in the midst of all this a country gentleman, living in a remote province, himself belonging to the then rude, fierce, feudal aristocracy, composed a work full of moral maxims and precepts, conceived in the spirit of the ancient philosophers of Greece and Rome, and founded on a system of natural ethics, on the beauty of virtue and of justice, and on the lessons of history; and this book was read with avidity amid the turmoil of factions, the din of civil war, and the cries of persecution and murder. *"The Essais* of Montaigne," says Hallam, "make in several respects an epoch in literature, less on account of their real importance than of their influence on the taste and opinions of Europe... No prose writer of the 16th century has been so generally read, nor, probably, given so much delight. Whatever may be our estimate of Montaigne as a philosopher a name which he was far from arrogating — there will be but one opinion of the felicity and brightness of his genius" *(Introduction to the Literature of Europe,* 2:29). "The author of these *Essais,"* says Leo Joubert, "is certainly the most independent spirit that ever existed-independent without revolt, and detached from the systems of others without having any system of his own... We recognise in his *Essais* a nature well endowed, not heroic, perhaps, but generous, exquisitely sensible, not aspiring to the sublime, capable of devotion, and incapable of a base act-in fine, a model of what we may call average virtue" *(la vertu moyenne) (Nouvelle Biographie Generale,* s.v.). Sprightly humor,

independence, *naivete,* and originality are the characteristics of his mind; and his style is admired for its graceful simplicity. His works are highly seasoned with his own individuality, and afford much insight into his character. "The *Essais,*" says Emerson, "are an entertaining soliloquy on every random topic that came into the author's head — treating everything without ceremony, yet with masculine sense. There have been men with deeper insight, but, one would say, never a man with such abundance of thoughts: he is never dull, never insincere, and has the genius to make the reader care for all that he cares for... This book of Montaigne the world has endorsed by translating it into all tongues and printing seventy-five editions of it in Europe — and that, too, a circulation somewhat chosen, namely, among courtiers, soldiers, princes, men of the world, and men of wit and generosity" *(Representative Men).* John Morley, the eminent English writer and most recent biographer of Jean Jacques Rousseau (Lond. 1873, 2 volumes, 8vo), frequently turns aside to pay a tribute to Montaigne, and acknowledges that the author of *Enile* had read Montaigne's *Essais* "with that profit and increase which attends the dropping of the good ideas of other men into fertile minds" (2:198; comp. 1:144).

The morality of the *Essais* has been called — and not unreasonably, though not correctly in the expression — a pagan morality: it is not founded on the faith and the hopes of Christianity, and its principles are in many respects widely different from those of the Gospel. Montaigne was a sceptic, but not a determined infidel; his philosophy is in a great measure that of Seneca and other ancient writers, whose books were the first that were put into his hands when a child. Accordingly Pascal, Nicole, and other Christian moralists, while they do justice to Montaigne's talents, and the many good sentiments contained in his work, are very severe upon his ethics, taken as a system. "Ancient scepticism," says Ueberweg, "was revived, and, in part, in a peculiar manner further developed by Montaigne. The scepticism of this clever man of the world was more or less directed to doctrines of Christianity, but was generally brought in the end, by whether sincere or merely prudent-recognition of the necessity of a revelation, on account of the weakness of human reason, into harmony with theology" *(Hist. Philos.* [N.Y. 1874, 2 volumes, 8vo] 2:14; comp. Fisher, *Hist. Ref.* [N.Y. 1873, 8vo] page 251). One of the ablest of moralists of our own time, Prof. Vinet, has given, we think, a very fair analysis of the spirit of Montaigne's ethics *(Essais de Philosophie Morale Reeligieuse suivis de quelques*

Essais de Critique Litteraire, Paris, 1828). In the fifty-fourth chapter of the first book of the *Essais,* Montaigne, after distinguishing two sorts of ignorance, the one which precedes all instruction, and the other which follows partial instruction, goes on to say that "men of simple minds, devoid of curiosity and of learning, are Christians through reverence and obedience; that minds of middle growth and moderate capacities are most prone to doubt and error; but that higher intellects, more clear-sighted, and better grounded in science, form a superior class of believers, who, through long and religious investigations, arrive at the fountain of light of the Scriptures, and feel the mysterious and divine meaning of our ecclesiastical doctrines. And we see some who reach this last stage through the second, with marvellous fruit and confirmation, and who, having attained the extreme boundary of Christian intelligence, enjoy their success with modesty and thanksgiving; unlike those men of another stamp, who, in order to clear themselves of the suspicions arising from their past errors, become violent, indiscreet, unjust, and throw discredit on the cause they pretend to serve." A few lines farther on Montaigne modestly places himself in the second class, namely, of those who, disdaining the first state of uninformed simplicity, have not yet attained the third and last exalted stage, "and who," he says, "are thereby rendered inept, importunate, and troublesome to society. But I, for my part, endeavor, as much as I can, to fall back upon my first and natural condition, from which I have idly attempted to depart." In his chapter on prayers (book 1:56) he recommends the use of the Lord's Prayer in terms evidently sincere; and in the journal of his travels, which was not intended for publication, he manifested Christian sentiments in several places. Montaigne has been censured for several licentious and some cynical passages in his *Essais.* This licentiousness, however, appears to be rather in the expressions than in the meaning of the author. He spoke plainly of things which are not alluded to in a more refined state of society, but he did so evidently without bad intentions, and only followed the common usage of his time. Montaigne combats earnestly the malignant feelings frequent in man-injustice, oppression, inhumanity, uncharitableness. His chapters on pedantry, on the education of children, and on the administration of justice, are remarkably good. He also throws much light on the state of manners and society in France in his time. The *Essais* have gone through very many editions, and been translated into most European languages: the edition of Paris (1725, 3 volumes, 4to) was perhaps the most complete until the appearance of the recent edition, *Avec les notes de tous les commentateurs*

choisies et completees par M.J.V. Le Clerc, et une nouvelle etude sur Montaigne pars Prevost-Paradol (Paris, 1865). Cotton's, the best and oldest English translation, is somewhat coarse, though characteristic. It has frequently been revised, and in the form given it by the learned Hazlitt is pronounced a superior work. Very recently an edition of the *Complete Works of Montaigne,* ctc., was brought out at London (1873). Vernier published in 1810 *Notices et Observations pour faciliter la Lecture des Essais de Montaigne* (Paris, 2 volumes, 8vo). It is a useful commentary. Meusnier de Querlon published his journal under the title *Journal du Voyage de Michel de Montaigne* (Rome, 1774, 4to). Extracts from the *Essais* have at various times been published, as *Pensees de Montaigne, propres aà former l'esprit et les maeurs,* par Artaud (Paris, 1700, 12mo); *L'Esprit de Montaigne, ou les maximes, pensees, jugements, et reflexions de cet auteur redigees par ordre de matieres,* par Pesselier (Berlin [Paris], 1753, 2 volumes, 12mo); *Christianisme de Montaigne, ou pensees de ce grand homme sur la religion,* par M. l'Abbe L. (Labouderie) (Paris, 1819, 8vo). See De Thou, *historia sui temporis;* E. Pasquier, *Lettres;* La Croix du Maine, *Bibliotheque Francaise;* J. Bouhier, *Memoires sur la vie et les ouvrages de Montaigne, avec une comparaison d'Epictete et de Montaigne* (by B. Pascal); Talbert, *Eloge de Mich. de Montaigne* (Paris, 1775, 12mo) ; Dom Devienne, *Eloge historique de Mich. de Montaigne* (Paris, 1775, 12mo); La Dixmerie, *Eloge analytique et historique de Montaigne* (Paris, 1781, 8vo); Mme. de Bourdie-Viot, *Eloge de Montaigne* (Paris, 1800, 8vo); Jay, *Eloge de Montaigne* (1812, 8vo); Droz, *Eloge de Michel Montaigne* (1812, 8vo); Villemain, *Eloge de Montaigne (Journal des Savans,* July and October, 1855); Payen, *Notice bibliographique sur Montaigne* (new ed. Paris, 1856, 8vo); *Documents inedits ou peu connus sur Montaigne* (1847, 8vo); *Nouveaux documents* (1850, 8vo); *Documents inedits* (1855, 8vo); *Recherches sur Montaigne* (1856, 8vo); Grun, *La vie publique de Michel Montaigne* (Paris, 1855, 8vo); Vinet, *Essai de Philosophie morale;* Emerson, *Representative Men;* Sainte Beuve, *Port-Royal; Causeries du lundi,* volume 4; Clement, *Revue Contemporaine,* August 31, 1855; Bayle St. John, *Montaigne, the Essayist* (Lond. 1858); De Laschamps, *M. de Montaigne* (2d ed. Paris, 1860, 12mo); Brinbenet, *Les Essais de Montaigne dans leurs rapports avec la legislation moderne* (Orleans, 1864, 8vo); Mrs. Shelley, *Lives of the most eminent French Writers;* Tennemann, *Geschichte der Philosophie,* 9:443; Church, in *Oxford Essays* (1857); Morell, *History of Modern Philosophy,* page 199; Lewes, *History of Philosophy* (see Index in volume 2); the

Histories of France by Michelet and Martin; *English Cyclopaedia;* Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Generale,* 36:55-71; *Retrospective Review,* volume 2 (1820); *Quart. Rev.* (Lond.) October 1856; *Westm. Rev.* July 1838.

Montaigu, Guillaume de

a French ecclesiastic, was born in the latter part of the 12th century. He was at first prior of Clairvaux, subsequently abbot of LaFerte, then of Citeaux. Gregory IX employed him in a very important negotiation. In 1229 he was sent to reconcile the kings of France and England, who were on the point of going to war. Montaigu first went to the king of France, calmed his resentment, and afterwards was similarly successful with the king of England, and consequently the impending war did not take place. Different letters of Gregory IX, published in the *Annales des Citeaux,* inform us that the court of Rome intrusted to Guillaume's sagacity the regulation of many other affairs of less general interest. In 1239, as he was proceeding to the Council of Rome, he fell into the hands of Frederick II, was taken captive, and loaded with chains. Towards the close of his life Montaigu abdicated the government of Citeaux, withdrew to the monastery of Clairvaux, and there died in the garb of a simple monk, May 19, 1246. See *Annales Cistercienses,* volume 4, passim; *Hist. Litter. de la France,* 18:358; *Gallics Christiana,* volume 4, col. 995. — Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Gezerale,* 36:72.

Montaigu, Pierre Guerin de

thirteenth grandmaster of the Knights Hospitallers of St. John of Jerusalem, was born at Montaigu-en-Combraille, near Riom, in Auvergne, France, about 1168. He was elevated to the grand-mastery in 1208, after having successively filled all the lower offices. His devotion and valor distinguished him everywhere during the second crusade (1186); but he refused to take part in the third (1188), though he had himself encouraged pope Gregory XIV to preach it, because this movement was headed by the German emperor Frederick Barbarossa, then under the major excommunication. Guerin de Montaigu died in 1230 in Palestine. See Bosio and Baudouin, *Hist. de l'ordre de Jerusalem;* Naberat, *Privileges de l'ordre de Jerusalem.*

Montaigut, Gilles-Ayceltn De

a French prelate, was born at Glaine-Montaigut, near Billom (Auvergne), about 1252; appointed provost of the cathedral of Clermont in 1285, and shortly after canon of Narbonne. He was finally chosen archbishop of that city by a part of the chapter, in 1287. Ordained priest, March 17, 1291, by Simon de Beaulieu, archbishop of Bourges, he subsequently started for Rome, and cardinal Gerard Bianchi, bishop of Sabine, consecrated him at Viterbo in the following May. He is found in the number of counsellors of state present at the Louvre in 1296, when the chancellor, Pierre Flotte, read the letters by which Guy, count of Flanders, revoked the powers of his ambassadors commissioned to negotiate a peace with Philip the Fair. Gilles, in the name of the latter prince, signed, June, 1299, the truce concluded with the king of England at Montreuil, October 24, 1301, he was one of the assembly convoked at Senlis to judge Bernard Saisset, bishop of Pamiers, legate of the pope, and one of his suffragans. Called to Rome by this affair, Gilles was ordered by the king not to repair to that city, and he obeyed his royal master. He was one of the five prelates of the council at the Louvre, March 12, 1303, held against Boniface VIII, and labored for the election of Bertrand de Goth (Clement V), his friend. He was also the first of the French bishops appointed to proceed against the Templars. February 27, 1309, he was made keeper of the seals; and after having presided over a diocesan synod at Narbonne, and in 1310 over a council at Beziers, he exchanged his bishopric, May 5, 1311, for that of Rouen. Present at the council-general of Vienna, he was there persuaded that it was useless to allow the Templars to attempt to vindicate themselves. On his return to Rouen, he there presided at a provincial council, October, 1313; held two others at Rouen in 1315, and one at Pontoise, November 17, 1317. Montaigut died at Paric June 23, 1318. By his testament, December 13, 1314, he constituted his nephew, Albert Aycelin de Montaigut, bishop of Clermont, his heir, on the condition of maintaining in the houses belonging to him in Paris as many poor scholars as the number of times the sum of ten pounds should be contained in the annual revenue of these houses. Such was the origin of the College of Montaigut, on the site of which the Library of Saint Genevieve now stands. See *Gallia Chrsistiana,* volumes 6 and 12; Du Chesne, *Histoires des Chanceliers de Fraince; France Pontificale.*

Montalembert, Charles Forbes Rene, Comte de

one of the brightest lights in the history of modern France, noted for his attainments in ecclesiastical as well as secular learning, distinguished as statesman, orator, and writer, was born, of French extraction, at London, March 10, 1810. He was the descendant of one of the oldest noble families of France. One of his ancestors played an important part in the reign of Francis I. His own father served in the army of Conde, but quitted France during the Revolution, and, marrying a Scottish lady, entered the English service, and fought in Egypt and Spain against Napoleon, returning only to his native country after the restoration of the Bourbons in 1814. Charles was left in Britain in charge of his grandfather on his mother's side, an old gentleman who had evinced his interest in the child when yet only a one-year-old babe by dedicating to him a great work *(Oriental Memoirs,* 42 volumes, 4to), by which the name of Forbes was to live for ages to come. Mr. James Forbes watched over his young charge with the fondest affection, training and educating the boy himself, until, at the age of eight, it was thought best to place him at school in Fulham. Charles remained there, however, only one year, for, his grandfather dying in 1819, he was sent for by his parents, who were then residing in Paris, and leading a most fashionable and gay life. This was hardly a proper sphere for a boy who had been accustomed to spend much of his time in reading and study in the well-filled library of his grandpa's retreat at Hanmore, near Harrow, or in intellectual conversations with his accomplished ancestor, for whom, if we may believe Mrs. Oliphant, Montalembert's biographer, this boy, with his early and precocious intelligence, had become a "companion." The count, his father, who had but recently returned from Stuttgard, where he had represented his country as minister plenipotentiary, was too much absorbed by political movements and intrigues to give any time to Charles, and his mother was still too young and too gay to assume parental cares and duties, sure to interfere with the exciting stir and bustle of her life, to which she had hitherto been left free by Charles's stay with his grandpa; hence the boy was largely left to his instructors or to himself. That he did not waste his opportunities is apparent from his diary, which he always kept. The life of mere amusement by which he saw himself surrounded had no attraction for his early developed sense of duty, and he marks the irksome demands frequently by a record of a "day lost, like so many others." His principal instructor at this time was Prof. Gobert, of the College Henri IV. In 1824 abbe Nicolle, head of the College of Sainte-Barbe, was brought into

contact with the precocious young student, and finally, in 1826, induced his parents to place him under a regular course of study. It was while in this school, engaged in close mental application, that the great thought which never after ceased to animate him, which became, in fact, the motto of all his labors — "God and freedom" first took shape. "He was seventeen," says Mrs. Oliphant, "when he wrote in his commonplace-book 'God and liberty — these are the two principal motive powers of my existence. To reconcile these two perfections shall be the aim of my life.'" "We call especial attention to this phenomenon," says a recent reviewer of Mrs. Oliphant's work, "for it is the best answer to the imputations so frequently levelled at his consistency. His probable liability to them even then dawned upon him: 'What shall I do? What will become of me? How shall I reconcile my ardent patriotism with religion?' He would neither have found nor feared any difficulty of the kind, if he had meant religion in the broad sense of the term. He was clearly speculating on the difficulty of reconciling love of country with ardent, uncompromising devotion to the Catholic Church. In August 1828, he records a fixed determination to write a great work on the politics and philosophy of Christianity, and, with a view to its completion, to waste no more time on the politics or history of his own time. Three notes of admiration in red ink are set against this entry in the original journal. He attended the debates in the Chamber of Peers, and found them *d'une mediocrite effrayante.* In fact, his thoughts, his plans, his subjects of interest were those of a matured intellect, of a formed man, who felt 'cabin'd, cribb'd, confined' within the walls of a lectureroom." Yet he quitted Sainte-Barbe in the following year (1829) with great regret, for he knew that before him lay much more of frivolous gayety than delightful interchange of heart and mind. Far, then, from looking forward with fervent expectations of enjoyment to his approaching introduction to society, he foresaw no gratification in mingling undistinguished in the crowd: "I can imagine Pitt or Fox coming out of the House of Commons, where they had struck their adversaries dumb by their eloquence, and enjoying a dinner-party. I can imagine Grattan amusing himself, after fifty years of glory, playing hide-and-seek with children. But for an obscure and unknown individual, lost in the crowd of other men, or at the best numbered only among the *elegants* who feel themselves obliged to wander every evening into three or four houses where they are half stifled under pretence of enjoying themselves, I see neither pleasure nor honor in it. I see only a culpable loss of time, and mortal weariness." In this mood he started to join his father, then French ambassador at Stockholm, *via* Belgium and

Holland, lingering on the way to see everything worth seeing, and duly
recording his impressions as they arose. Received at once into the gay
circles of the Swedish capital, he was with difficulty induced to lay aside
his stiffness and reserve; his manner naturally enough gave offence to the
light-hearted and haply frivolous companions who were forced upon him;
he was voted a prig; and it was not till some time that his really gentle and
unassuming nature began to be recognized. But if Charles was formal on
the surface at this time, in the consciousness of the grandeur of his youthful
aims, he was yet sharply observant, as he always was, and his journal
contains " an extremely lively sketch" of the Swedish court and its
surroundings. He studied also carefully the institutions of Sweden, as may
be seen from the article he published on the subject shortly after. He
besides devoted himself to the study of philosophy, and by advice of
Cousin spent much time in the reading of Kant, whom he found "terribly
difficult," as he himself tells us, and not by any means a congenial study —
a fact not to be wondered at, for Montalembert's mind, with all its noble
and powerful impulses, had no affinity for philosophic studies. He was
throughout life impatient of sifting principles to their last results, and
holding them upon his mind in pure rational abstraction. "Metaphysics,"
says his biographer, "were never much to his taste, and he was wont to
arrive at conviction by a shorter road than argument. Truths divine did not
come to him sounded by the tongue of a theologian; they came by insight,
by intuition, by inspiration; and they went forth from him with the lightning
flash of genius, in spontaneous and irresistible bursts." His genius was
poetic, rhetorical, but in no degree philosophical. Hence the speeches of
the great Irish orators, Grattan and O'Connell, and the eloquence of Burke,
were far more attractive than even "the great Schelling," of whom he
speaks at this time "as being so ill understood in France." But yet foremost
among all his thoughts came forth the great objects to which he had
consecrated himself — religion and freedom. Roman Catholicism was now,
and always to him, religion, and this Catholicism, in order to triumph, he
saw clearly, "must have liberty as its ally and tributary." Every effort of his
own, and those of his friends whom he believed fitted to take a part in this
great work, he endeavored to make serviceable in this direction. In this
spirit he wrote to his friend Rio, the future historian of Christian art, whom
he numbered thus early among his most devoted associates: "Do not, I
beseech you, abandon yourself to that political discouragement which
Burke justly calls the most fatal of all maladies. Do not despair of the cause
which you have adopted, or give up sound principles, because a generation

without faith and without soul seem to dishonor them by pretended attachment." By a like spirit he was enthusiastically inspired for Roman Catholic Ireland, and resolved to make a journey to that country in order to fit himself properly as historian of the Gleeen Isle; this, however, was prevented by the sudden illness of a sister, who died at Besanon, October 29, 1829, in his arms but a few hours after he had reached her. He had been passionately attached to her, and this sudden removal threw him into a deep melancholic state. He was now more than ever interested in religious subjects, and was even inclined to take holy orders. But he finally forsook this plan, thought of studying law, and, under a passing impulse, even of joining the army of Algiers, a folly to which in after-life he thus pleasantly alluded: "Je suis le premier de mon sang qui n'ai guerroye qu'avec la plume." He had no real military ardor, and the pen in his hand proved a far more trenchant weapon than the sword.

In this restless state, utterly unable to make a choice for life, he wrote an article on Sweden, and presented it to the learned Protestant Guizot for publication in the *Revue Frangaise,* of which Guizot was editor. Though exception was taken to parts, and much erased that the young would-be *litterateur* thought his best, the article was printed, and at once established his fame as a good writer and careful observer. His literary friendships rapidly multiplied, and he counted among his most intimate associates Lamartine, Sainte-Beuve, and Victor Hugo, "then the poet of all sweet and virtuous things," cherishing the hope of "a universal religious restoration and rebirth of the world." He now also became a contributor to the *Correspondant,* a well-known Roman Catholic periodical, for which he continued to write all his life. But, restless as he was, he could not give up the plan of writing on Ireland, and at length, in the end of July, on the very eve of the Revolution, he set out for that country. The news of the re-overthrow of the Bourbons met him at London, and he went back to Paris; not to stay, however, for his father insisted upon his quitting the scene, and he resumed his journey. We cannot touch upon his Irish visit in detail, but we must at least allude to his call at Maynooth, for the scene he there beheld had no doubt a wonderful influence on his life-work. He himself describes a most striking scene of suffering and devotion which he enjoyed at a mass celebrated there, "the men kneeling in the mud, all uncovered, though the rain fell in torrents, and the mud quivered beneath them." No wonder that such a scene deepened his ardent devotion to Romanism, and confirmed in him the hitherto half-resolved purpose to give himself to the

service of the Church and of Freedom! Mrs. Oliphant may well think that it was this visit to Ireland that decided the future of Montalembert. He had seen the Island of the Saints, the island in which liberty was making common cause with faith, in which the standard of patriotism was waved from the altar by the priest. In the Irish Church, then, the twin ideals of his young enthusiasm seemed to him united, sitting like "a dethroned queen" among her people, the guardian of their faith and of their rights, and all the more glorious in her rags and poverty to his dazzled vision. Here was an object worthy of all his ardor and labor. Here religion was the emblem, not of successful power, but of patient suffering. Here she was plainly on the side of the people. He returned to France, burning with eagerness to give a like noble place to the Church of his own country, that there also the Church might be the guardian of the people's faith and of their rights. Not only the peculiar condition of the country — the July Revolution had just ended favored his project, but Lamennais had long dreamed of just such a work as Montalembert proposed, and, being brought in contact with him and his pupil Lacordaire, the three men together launched a paper, *L'Avenir,* by which to give circulation to their opinions. *SEE LACORDAIRE*; *SEE LAMENNAS*. And why should they not? France was in one of its fits of " Liberal" ecstasy. The charter — the free institutions it guaranteed, the self-government which it held out to the hopes of the nation — was the popular idol. But in the midst of this impetuous rush towards political freedom the Church remained in bondage." Why should this be so? Why should the Church not be free as well as the State, with right to appoint her own bishops, and educate her own children as she wished? These were questions that demanded agitating, and for it *L'Avenir* came into existence. The first number of the paper appeared October 15, 1830. In a little more than three months the country was ablaze because of the severe attacks made upon the government by the triumvirate of *L'Avenir.* January 31, 1831, two of its editors were in criminal courts answering to charges of bitterly assailing the king for exercising his constitutional right in clerical appointments. This time they were lucky enough to secure acquittal. But, instead of profiting by their experience, they only drew from it encouragement to continue in their course, and, not content with the limited influence of *L'Avenir,* attempted a fresh and original enterprise. They formed a society called *Agence de la liberte religieuse,* which publicly announced that, *attendu que la liberte se praend et ne se donne pas,* three of their members would open a school, free and gratuitous, at Paris, for Catholic education, independent as well of the

university as of all other state influence, by way of testing the right. The school was opened on May 1, 1831, after due notice to the prefect of police, by three members of the society, Lacordaire, M. de Coux, and Montalembert himself, who succinctly relates what followed: "The abbe Lacordaire delivered a short and energetic inaugurative discourse. We formed each a class for twenty children. The next day a commissary came to summon us to decamp. He first addressed the children: 'In the name of the law, I summon you to depart.' Lacordaire immediately rejoined: 'In the name of your parents, whose authority I have, I order you to remain.' The children cried out unanimously, 'We will remain.' Whereupon the police turned out pupils and masters, with the exception of Lacordaire, who protested that the schoolroom hired by him was his domicile, and that he would pass the night in it unless he was dragged out by force. 'Leave me,' he said to us, seating himself on a mattress he had brought there; 'I remain here alone with the law and my right.' He did not give way till the police laid hands upon him; after which the seals were affixed, and a prosecution was forthwith commenced against the schoolmasters."

Montalembert's father having died soon after the commencement of these proceedings, he was entitled, by successorship in the peerage, to trial before the Chamber of Peers; and before them he appeared on September 19, 1831, and there made the event memorable by his first speech, one of the most brilliant upon record, and a clear foreshadowing, not alone of the eloquence, but of the bold and uncompromising earnestness in the cause of his Church and of the common interests of religious liberty which constantly characterized his later career. After a touching allusion to his great bereavement, and an exposition of the reasons which induced him to claim the judgment of his peers, he said: "It is sufficiently well known that the career on which I have entered is not of a nature to satisfy an ambition which seeks political honors and places. *The powers of the present age, both in government and in opposition, are, by the grace of Heaven, equally hostile to Catholics.* There is another ambition, not less devouring, perhaps not less culpable, which aspires to reputation, and which is content to buy that at any price; that, too, I disavow like the other. No one can be more conscious than I am of the disadvantages with which a precocious publicity surrounds youth, and none can fear them more. But there is still in the world something which is called faith; it is not dead in all minds. It is to this that I have early given my heart and my life. My life — a man's life — is always, and especially today, a poor thing enough; but this poor thing,

consecrated to a great and holy cause, may grow with it; and when a man has made to such a cause the sacrifice of his future, I believe that he ought to shrink from none of its consequences, none of its dangers. It is in the strength of this conviction that I appear today for the first time in an assembly of men. I know too well that at my age one has neither antecedents nor experience; but at my age, as at every other, one has duties and hopes. I have determined, for my part, to be faithful to both." He thus, on the most solemn occasion of his life, deliberately took his stand upon the principles to which he persistently adhered to his dying day; and the nobility of thought, the moral courage, the spirit of self-sacrifice which actuated him are beyond cavil or dispute, whatever may be thought of the prudence or wisdom of his course. It must be borne in mind all the time that, inasmuch as in the infidel reaction following the great Revolution Roman Catholic France had been allowed to sink into a withering and hopeless secularism, nipping its youthful national life at the root, and yielding a stunted harvest of many evils (the end of which is not even yet), the effort of Montalembert and his colleagues to vindicate a place for religion in the national life and government to proclaim that society without God is a soulless and corrupting mass, never far from anarchy was a manifestation of an enthusiasm such as all France could not but pronounce both noble and true, and therefore it is not surprising that the result of the trial was a simple fine of 100 francs. But then came also the question what step to take next. The circulation of *L 'Avenir* had not reached 3000; instead of being self-supporting, it had proved a drain on the scanty resources of the society, which, having to sustain also the expense of prosecutions and propagandism, broke down. As the little band had contrived to place themselves very much in the position of Ishmael, and the clergy, headed by the episcopacy, were among the fellest of their foes, further appeals to an enlightened public were voted nugatory, and they formed the extraordinary step of submitting the crucial questions in dispute to the pope. The great lawsuit was not to be at Paris, but at Rome. His holiness was to decide whether *L'Avenir* was or was not entitled to the support of the Roman Catholic world, and the journal was to be suspended till his sovereign will and pleasure should be made known. The suggestion came from Lacordaire: "We will carry our protest, if necessary, to the City of the Apostles, to the steps of the Confessional of St. Peter, and we shall see who will stop the pilgrims of the God of Liberty." No one thought of stopping them; the nore's the pity, for this expedition was a blunder of the first magnitude, conceived in utter ignorance or forgetfulness of that

traditional policy of Rome which lord Macaulay deems a main cause of her durability and strength. "She thoroughly understood, what no other Church has ever understood, how to deal with enthusiasts. In some sects, particularly in infant sects, enthusiasm is suffered to be rampant; in other sects, particularly in sects long established and richly endowed, it is regarded with aversion. The Catholic Church neither submits to enthusiasm nor proscribes it, but uses it." She used Ignatius Loyola and St. Teresa; she would have used John Bunyan, John Wesley, Joanna Southcott, Selina, countess of Huntingdon, and Mrs. Fry. The founders of *L'Avenir* were just the sort of enthusiasts she wanted, so long as they could be kept within bounds. But they had proved uncontrollable. If the pope and his advisers had been equally confident that the Church of Rome owed no more to absolute power than the primitive Church of Christ, or would rise the higher if cut free from its temporalities, they would have wished nothing better than the support of an organ like *L'Avenir.* But they would have been unaccountably wanting in the sagacity for which Macaulay gives them credit "had they not penetrated to the fallacy of such arguments at a glance, and drawn a widely different moral from the history. They could not shut their eyes to the fact that spiritual supremacy attained its loftiest pitch in the Dark Ages, and has everywhere declined in proportion to the spread of knowledge." The three apostles of the new era, which they hoped to inaugurate with the direct approval of an *infallible* guide, knocked at the gate of the Vatican, were admitted into the presence of "his holiness," but completely failed in their mission. *SEE LACORDAIRBE*; *SEE LAMENNAIS*. The very Church they wished to serve — to whose cause they had consecrated, with such touching earnestness, all their gifts — repudiated their aid. The court of Rome understood its own mission better than they did. It admitted "their good intentions," but at the same time silenced them as inspired by a zeal without discretion in the treatment of "supremely delicate questions!" Indeed, this was but the only consistent course for Rome to take. It could not suffer severely orthodox followers to profess to hold upon essential points the doctrines of advanced modern liberalism without seeing them in direct antagonism with the teaching and practice of the Church in all ages; hence the encyclical of pope Gregory XVI, declaring the conviction of the writers of *L'Avenir* "abominable," and fulminating anathema against the most sacred liberties, declaring that freedom of conscience is a mortal pest." This was anything but a flattering and brilliant solution, yet the triumvirate meekly submitted. Outwardly all three were equally actuated by that sense of duty which — Roman

Catholics are wont to place as highest — of bowing reverentially and unqualifiedly before the wisdom of the papal incumbent, as "the voice of God in the flesh;" but in the inner camp there was a terrible struggle. To Montalembert the whole case was a matter of but little moment after all- certainly of much less moment than to the other two. True, his faith was not less sincere or ardent than theirs, but he was as yet merely a young writer; the other two were priests — Lamennais a preacher whose fame had already reached through the whole Catholic world, and had brought him back many distinctions. In vain did Lacordaire offer to submit quietly, and argue that they should act consistently, as there was only one alternative from the first — "Either we should not have come, or we should submit and hold our tongues." Montalembert and Lacordaire forever after acted on this plan, and held their peace; but Lamennais's submission was hollow and formal, and it wanted only (as was afterwards apparent) an opportunity to be disdainfully ignored. *SEE LAMENNAIS*. We as Protestants, unaccustomed to such "Catholic" submission, find it, of course, difficult even to conjecture by what process of reasoning these men contrived to reconcile absolute submission to the Romish Church with the defence of that which she has again and again emphatically denounced and condemned. "The conduct of Lamennais," as the *Brit. and For. Ev. Rev.* (October 1863, page 726) has well said, "was at least more consistent than that of his two disciples. They, proclaiming themselves the faithful and obedient followers of an infallible Church — which says to its disciples, 'I am the truth; it is in me, in me alone; to seek it elsewhere is heresy and rebellion' — accepted a part of her doctrine and rejected a part. He, finding that his attempt to reconcile the Church with the tendencies of the age, to unite Republicanism and Romanism, was condemned by Rome herself, and that he must choose between the two, broke with Rome, and proclaimed himself ready to combat and to suffer for what he deemed, however erroneously, the cause of justice and humanity. He broke with a Church which had lost the germs of life and progress, and sought elsewhere the means of regenerating mankind, while they professed implicit submission. But his schism was at least logical and consistent; their submission partial and absurd. He and the Church were thenceforward in direct antagonism; while they, its submissive sons, for the rest of their lives went on endeavoring to carry out the plan which Lamennais had traced in the columns of *L'Avenir,* which Rome had emphatically condemned, and which its author had abandoned as impracticable. He gave up Rome because he found her claims inconsistent with those of humanity; they attempted to

save her in spite of herself — to reconcile her with the wants and aspirations of the age — to put new cloth into old garments, new wine into old bottles. Yet we cannot but believe that both master and disciples were sincere and disinterested in their conduct: the former in his schism, the latter in their submission." No one certainly can be believed to know anything of either Lacordaire or Montalembert who would suppose for a moment that these men were influenced by any mere personal considerations. No men probably ever acted under a higher sense of duty, only they never thought of duty in the case apart from the pope. When they saw what the result was likely to be, they quietly and without struggle bowed the knee. "The position," says a writer in *Blackwood* (November 1872, page 603), "is intelligible, but hardly great or magnanimous. Submission may be heroic in a grave practical crisis which admits of no argument, but it is hardly so in questions of truth and right, which have roused the conscience as well as the judgment to vigorous action. We confess to following Lamennais in his disdainful retirement with far more interest than we contemplate the 'Catholic submission' of his colleagues. Duty loses its higher heroism when it loses individuality, and passes into blind selfsurrender." Lamennais's publication of *Paroles d'un Croyant* caused Lacordaire to step forward in defence of the papacy, and this left Montalembert, who had stood by Lamennais through good and evil report, no alternative but to concur with Lacordaire in separating from him. Hereafter the three men stand apart, Lamennais the propagator of a socialist theory, Lacordaire the exponent of papal Christianity, and Montalembert the student of mediaeval institutions.

His journalistic career being cut short by papal disapproval, and himself unable to enter political life for lack of age (the peerage begins at twenty-five), Montalembert now went abroad to travel, mainly in Germany, to study the preservation of Roman Catholicism as well as monuments of its history in that country. It was during one of his frequent tours of inspection of mediaeval buildings and monuments that he was inspired with the conception of his first sustained and eminently successful effort in literature, the history of St. Elizabeth *(Hist. de Ste. Elisabeth de Hongrie* [1836]; transl. into English by Mary Hackett and Mrs. J. Sadlier, N.Y. 1854). The opening sentences of the introduction to this work are so characteristic that we quote them here: "On the 19th of November, 1833, a traveller arrived at Marbourg, a town in the electorate of Hesse, situated upon the beautiful banks of the Lahn. He paused to examine the church,

which was celebrated at once for its pure and perfect beauty, and because it was the first in Germany where the pointed arch prevailed over the round in the great renovation of art in the 13th century. This church bears the name of St. Elizabeth, and it was on St. Elizabeth's day that he found himself within its walls. In the church itself (which, like the country, is now devoted to the Lutheran worship) there was no trace of any special solemnity, except that in honor of the day, and, contrary to Protestant custom, it was open, and children were at play in it among the tombs. The stranger roamed through its vast, desolate, and devastated aisles, which are still young in their elegance and airy lightness. He saw placed against a pillar the statue of a young woman in the dress of a widow, with a gentle and resigned countenance, holding in one hand the model of a church, and with the other giving alms to a lame man... The lady is there depicted, fairer than in all the other representations, stretched on her bed of death amid weeping priests and nuns; and, lastly, bishops exhume a coffin, on which an emperor lays his crown. The traveller was told that these were events in the life of St. Elizabeth, queen of that country, who died on that day six hundred years ago in that very town of Marbourg, and lay buried in that very church." After his first visit to the church, Montalembert with great difficulty sought out a copy of a "Life of St. Elizabeth," of which he possessed himself as a prize; and though he found it "the cold, lifeless composition of a Protestant," the sympathetic chord was struck, and he set about the study of her career with hourly increasing eagerness, consulting traditions, visiting every place that she had hallowed by her presence, and ransacking all the books, chronicles, and manuscripts in which mention was made of her, or which threw light on her contemporaries or her age. He spent his days and his nights in the preparation of the work, and it need not surprise us, therefore, that the book established his fame as an author. What is really most valuable and most characteristic in the book is that which elucidates her age, especially the Introduction (135 pages royal 8vo), in which he seeks to prove that the 13th century, in which she flourished, has been shamefully calumniated; that it was not merely the age in which the papacy attained its culminating point of pride and power, but the age in which Christian literature and art — that is to say, what he deems the best and purest literature and art — approached nearer to perfection than they have ever approached since or are likely to approach again. This clearly manifests that though his historic insight was fine, minute, and picturesque, he yet lacked depth of historic judgment, and strength and range of sympathy. Here as everywhere *fact,* with its complex

variety of association and breadth of human interest, was not so attractive
to him as sentiment, and the curious personation with which it can invest
the most obvious realities. With all its beauty and grace of outline and
charm of portraiture, Montalembert's life of St. Elizabeth does not gainsay
this judgment.

On his return from Germany, Montalembert married, in the celebrated
Flemish family De Merode, a sister of the now greatly renowned
Monsignore de Merode, and selected for his wedding-trip an excursion into
Switzerland and Italy. He then settled at Paris, and having succeeded to the
peerage in 1835, he now fully entered upon his distinguished political
career. Though not entitled to the right of voting until thirty, Montalembert
was yet entitled to a seat, and in consequence to a participation in the
debates, and in these he took a lively part, distinguishing himself very
rapidly as an orator of no common rank, as well as a man of principle. He
broke ground as a debater in September, 1835, in behalf of the liberty of
the press, followed by other speeches, all of a liberal tendency. But his
great aim at this time was the successful issue of. the work which he had
intended to bring about by the *Avenir* — viz. liberty of the Church;
struggling mainly in behalf of an educational system free from the state and
in alliance with the Church. In its behalf he dared to say anything which he
felt to be the truth. "He could," says Sainte-Beuve, "utter with all freedom
the most passionate pleadings for that liberty which was only the excess of
his youth. He could develop without interruption those absolute theories
which from another mouth would have made the Chamber shiver; but
which pleased them from his. He could even give free course to his
mordant and incisive wit, and make personal attacks with impunity upon
potentates and ministers... His bitterness — and he was sometimes bitter
— from him seemed almost amenity, the harshness of the meaning being
disguised by the elegance of his manner and his perfect good grace." "It
was a sight full of interest," says another, "to see this ardent, enthusiastic,
impetuous young man rise in the midst of the Chamber of Peers, composed
almost entirely of the relics of past conditions of society — men grown
gray in public business, conversant with politics, and among whom
experience had destroyed enthusiasm — and disturb with the accents of an
impassioned voice the decent calm, the elegant reserve, and the polite
conventionalities of their habitual discussions, as he vindicated the rights
and interests of that religion which was said to have no partisans but old
men, and no life but in the past." Montalembert did not, indeed, shine by

lofty sustained imagery, like Burke and Grattan, the objects of his early admiration; nor by polished rhetoric, flights of fancy, or strokes of humor, like Canning. His strength lay in earnestness, ready command of energetic language, elevation of thought and tone, rapidity, boldness, conviction, passion, heart. His vehemence, his *vis vivida,* as power: when he warmed to his subject, he carried all before him with a rush. He had all, or almost all, that is comprised in the *action* of Demosthenes.

But as an author also Montalembert was now greatly adding to his fame. He devoted a large share of his time to study, and as a result published a work on "Mediaeval Art" *(Du Vandalisme et du Catholicisme dans les iarts* [1840]) and a "Life of St. Anselm" *(Saint Anselme, fragmenet de l'introduction a l'histoie de St. Bernard* [1844]). In 1843 he began to develop an unusually great activity in the debates in the Chamber of Peers, and he delivered some masterly speeches on such general questions as the liberty of the Church, instruction and education, the theory and constitution of the monastic orders, and the affairs of Poland, in which he always took a deep interest. Towards the close of the same year, while staying at Madeira for the sake of his health, he published *Du Devoir des Catholiques dans la Question de la Liberte d'Enseignement.* This was followed by his celebrated *Letter to the Cambridge Camden Society,* designed to disprove the attempts made by that society to identify the Reformed Church of England with that of the Middle Ages and of continental Europe. In 1847 he delivered his celebrated speech on the affairs of Switzerland, in which he distinctly foretold the revolution which broke out among the continental nations in the year following; and his brilliant *Discours sur les afaires de Rome,* delivered shortly after the popular outbreak, was received with a triple salvo of applause by an audience which sympathized but coldly with his views. After the revolution of February 1848, the department of Doubs, in which he held property, elected him its representative to the National Assembly, from which he passed into the Legislative Assembly, where he uniformly acted true to his professions as the exponent of the views and interests of the Roman Catholic Church. He worked hard as a member of the commission which, under many difficulties and compromises, prepared the new law of education known as the "Loi Falloux" (and which he might be excused from thinking ought to have been the "Loi Montalembert"); but his influence was even at this time due in the main to his powers as an orator. Like many other men of the oratorical temperament, he was not fitted for parliamentary diplomacy and intrigue, or the many acts behind the

scenes by which political power is often acquired and maintained. It is thus that the estrangement of the extreme section of the clerical party from him after the passage of the educational law is to be accounted for. He called this settlement of the question the " Concordat d'Enseignement," and believed himself a valuable servant of Rome. But the Ultramontanes designated it as a base compromise of the best interests of the Church. The very paper which he had been mainly instrumental in raising up — *L' Univers* — denounced him and all who had been instrumental in passing the law in most virulent language. Thus is it evermore in the Church of Rome. Her most devoted members, if happily they do the bidding of the Ultramontanes, are applauded, and they who, while seeking earnestly to serve the Church, should yet fail to accomplish all that is demanded, are condemned and ignored. *SEE MAYNOOTH*.

Although Montalembert lost the support of those upon whom he had reason to lean, he now found, as every honest man is sure to find, support from all classes, and he enjoyed further successes. Yet none of these elated or even satisfied him. He had dedicated himself to the interests of the Church, and failing to gain that support from the source to which he believed himself entitled, he finally in 1852 determined to close his political life. He was not superseded in the Legislature until 1857, yet his political activity may be said to have closed in 1852. And now that he was free to consider the past and the part he had played, the bitter truth broke upon him that he had been acting for Romanism against liberty, and for the remainder of his life he determined to struggle manfully to repair or atone for his mistake. That he failed utterly it will not be necessary to state here. But even in his failure there is yet apparent the striving for truth and right, as we shall see presently. At the outset of his political career under the republic he had avowed democratic sentiments, and voted against Napoleon's admission to the Assembly; but when the Bonapartists turned defenders of Rome, Montalembert's sympathy was enlisted, and he for some time favored the Imperialists. After the confiscation of the Orleans property he ignored the Bonapartists, and it was therefore no small mark of distinction which he received at this time from the Academy by election to its membership. In 1854 he was engaged in the publication of *L'Avenirpolitique de l'Angleterre* (transl. in 1856), which aims to show that the future prospects of England would be improved by a resumption of intercourse with Rome; and this leading idea he pursues through an infinity of digressions and speculations, interspersed with various particulars of

English life as exhibited in its schools, its journalism, and its political institutions. He was bitterly assailed on both sides of the Channel, especially for what he said about the churches; and in a letter dated La Roche-en-Breny, January 3, 1856, he wrote, "This act has been, and deserves to be, looked upon as an act of foolhardiness. I have to contend both in Europe and America with the whole weight of *religious* prejudice against Protestant England, and of *political* prejudice against English freedom or English ambition." What turned out an act of still greater foolhardiness was an article in the *Correspondant* of October, 1858 (published separately in England), entitled *Un Debat sur l'Inde au Parlement Anglais,* which he made the vehicle of such exasperating allusions to the Imperial *regime* that it provoked a prosecution. In brilliant and enthusiastically admiring pictures he drew the social and political institutions of Britain, for the purpose mainly of covertly contrasting them with. the condition of his own native land. He was defended by Berryer, and gave his own evidence as to the exact meaning of the inculpated passages, which no English judge or jury could have held libellous, but he was found guilty, and the sentence on *him* was six months' imprisonment with a fine of 3000 francs: one month's imprisonment and a fine of 1000 francs on the publisher. The sentence, after being confirmed on appeal, was gladly remitted by the emperor; so that the prosecution proved a signal triumph to Montalembert in all respects, and had the singular advantage of presenting him for the last time before the world in the attitude which above all he would have probably most desired of an advocate for the freedom of the press.

The remainder of this noble man's life was entirely devoted to literary labors. He had for twenty years earnestly inquired into the mediaeval institutions and characters, and in 1860 brought out the first two volumes of *Les Moines d'Occident depuis Saint Benoit jusquz a Saint Bernard* (transl. into English by Mrs. Oliphant, Edinb. 1861 and sq.). The whole Western world, Protestant as well as Roman Catholic, was attracted, and everybody who claimed a place for culture read what were a decade's studies — the mature conclusions of this brilliant Frenchman. Especially in England, where Montalembert had always been well known and much admired, the work was universally spoken of and freely commented upon by the press. (See *Blackwood's Magazine,* June 1861.) The *British and Foreign Evangelical Review,* in July 1868, reviewing the first five volumes, observes, " However mistaken we may think this gifted son and servant of

the Church of Rome as to the importance of the object to which he has consecrated so large a portion of his life, it is impossible to withhold our admiration, either from the earnestness of spirit which prompted him to make the sacrifice, or from the fine conception and vigorous execution displayed in his attempt to teach the world what it owes to the monks, what it has gained by their existence, what it has lost by their overthrow... He would disclaim — indeed, he does expressly disclaim — the work of the panegyrist; he even admits and deplores the errors and follies and abuses which the system has developed in the course of ages" (pages 450, 454, 476; compare *British Quarterly Review,* July 1868, pages 202, 203). *SEE MONASTICISM*. Montalembert lived to bring out three more volumes of this work, making five in all, but did not complete it. Though, as we have seen, Protestants cannot in every particular endorse it, they have yet gladly assigned it a most important place in ecclesiastical literature. Of course Roman Catholics regard it as a chef-d'ceuvre in all respects, and greatly lament that the author did not live to complete it. " This great monument of history, this great work interrupted by death," says M. Coclin, "is gigantic as an uncompleted cathedral." It is certainly a vast conception, a durable, if unfinished, monument of energy, zeal, literary skill, research, learning, eloquence, and (we must add) credulity. The most remarkable result of Montalembert's labors in this direction he reaped in his own household. "One day," says Mr. Coclin, "his charming and beloved child entered that library which all his friends know so well, and said to him, 'I am fond of everything around me. I love pleasure, wit, society and its amusements; I love my family, my studies, my companions, my youth, my country, but I love God better than all, and I desire to give myself to him.' And when he said to her, ' My child, is there something that grieves you?' she went to the bookshelves and sought out one of the volumes in which he had narrated the history of the monks of the West. 'It is you,' she answered, ' who have taught me that withered hearts and weary souls are not the things which we ought to offer to God.'" After describing the agony inflicted on both mother and father by this event, Montalembert. exclaims, "How many others have undergone this agony, and gazed with a look of distraction on the last worldly appearance of a dearly beloved daughter or sister." Yet it never once occurred to this warm-hearted, noble-minded man that a system which inflicts such agony on so many innocent sufferers, which condemns to the chill gloom of a cloister what is meant for love and light — which runs counter to the whole course of nature — may be wrong.

In 1862 Montalembert published a sketch of the life of Lacordaire (q.v.), which abounds, like all his other productions, in loyal expressions to the Church of his birth as well as of his choice. His motto was still, 'Tout pour l'eglise et par l'eglise" (comp. *Brit. and For. Ev. Rev.* October 1863, page 722 sq.). In the same year he gave yet more emphatic expression to his devotion to Romanism in his oration before the Roman Catholic Congress held at Mechlin, and afterwards published in a separate form under the title of *L'Eglise Libre dans l'Etat Libre* (Paris, 1863, 8vo). As in the Chamber of Peers and in the Assembly, so also at this time count Montalembert's orations proved highly interesting, both on account of the eloquence of style and nobleness of sentiment, as well as because they contain so strong an advocacy of the principles of religious toleration. Yet it was not inappropriately said by a Protestant journal in 1864 that in these discourses he appeared not as the exponent of the doctrines of the Church of Rome, but rather as an opponent and impugner of her teaching and authority. No doubt this was not his intention; quite the contrary. Yet in these speeches we Protestants can only see that "he praises what she condemns. He affirms what she denies. He claims as a right for every man what she refuses to accord to any. He, a devout Roman Catholic, defends doctrines which the head of the Church denounces as 'fatal,' and as 'works of Satan;' and, so far at least as these doctrines are concerned, distinctly and unequivocally despises and denies the authority Of the Church. In short, in these speeches count Montalembert has shown himself a good Protestant" *(Brit. and For. Ev. Rev.* April 1864, page 337).

The foolhardy move of 1869 to establish the infallibility dogma was the first occasion on which Montalembert rose in direct antagonism to the papacy. He clearly saw that the Jesuits were scheming the plot, and he boldly descended into the lists, and dealt vigorous sword-thrusts all around. Perhaps in his whole long and illustrious career Montalembert never committed a more courageous act, nor ever clothed lofty and noble thoughts in nobler and loftier language, than he did in his letter of February 28, 1870, addressed to a friend in England, and published in the London *Times,* March 7, 1870, in which he declared himself against the. absolute tendency in the Church; yes, he even boldly and uncompromisingly declared that he "gloried" in counting as his colleagues in the Academie Francaise two such great and good champions of truth as the bishop of Orleans and father Gratry, and he denounced the Jesuit intrigues at Rome as "idolatrous," quoting in support of the word "idol," as applied to the

pope, a most remarkable letter written to him seventeen years ago by the (then) archbishop of Paris, Mgr. Sibour. "Nothing," said a correspondent of the N.Y. *Nation,* under date from Paris, March 11, 1870, "so strong, so decided, or so eloquent has yet appeared on this terrible Roman question as this letter of count Montalembert. It will be read wherever the French tongue is spoken, and it will support and console all right-thinking, high-minded Catholics but the obloquy that will be cast upon M. de Montalembert by the Ultramontanes is indescribable. He perceives the bare truth when he says that the Litany of Abuse will be lavished upon him. It will be so unlimitedly, and it will require all the genuineness of his faith and all the chivalry of his nature to bear what will be his inevitable fate." Of course such an act was enough to eclipse all the services of a lifetime. He had dared to act in harmony with the avowed opinions of his youth; he had supported the demands of the German Catholics, and he was to bear forever the sorrow of such a self-willed act, and it is most painful to reflect that not even his spirit was suffered to pass away in peace; that his dying hours were troubled by an imperative call to choose his side in a wantonly provoked schism. He died March 15, 1870, just sixteen days after writing his memorable letter on papal infallibility. In reply to a visitor who ventured to catechise him on his death-bed, he is reported to have given in his unconditional adhesion to what confessedly he did not understand. "And God does not ask me to understand. He asks me to submit my will and intelligence, and *I will do so."* This concession even failed to satisfy Rome. The atonement was not sufficient for the crime he had committed; and the highest tribute of ecclesiastical respect which the Church accords to a faithful son was denied to his memory; to the memory of him who had devoted his whole life to her cause, who had dared impossibilities for her sake, who had given up to her what was meant for mankind, and thereby abdicated that place among practical statesmen and legislators which, apart from her blighting influence, his birth, his personal gifts, his high and rare quality of intellect, his eloquence, his elevation of purpose, his nobility of mind and character, must have won for him (comp. Italian correspondence of the N.Y. *Tribune,* under date of March 25, 1870). No wonder that we are told by the *Tribune* correspondent that ' the feelings awakened in society were very strong both among the clergy and the laity, one of the former, a bishop, saying, 'I would have gone to Paris to attend a service,' and another, speaking of prohibition, observed, 'Ce n'est pas un crime, mais c'est une faute.'" And well might the *Tribune* editorial add that "count de Montalembert filled too large a space in the esteem and admiration of his

co-religionists, and of the political and literary world, not to be accorded a special chapter of remembrance."

Montalembert was a man whom title, gifts, accomplishments, fortune, united to make illustrious. The opposite in many respects of his great contemporary, Sainte-Beuve, who preceded him but a little while to the tomb, he laid down his life, with all its brilliancy and all its latter suffering, upon the altar of his faith. "We are dying of the same disease," Sainte-Beuve is said to have remarked; "only I trace it to nature while Montalembert will ascribe it to Providence." The man was not shallow who saw in life religion and in death Providence; and it will not be difficult to say which of the two great men has left the most earnest example. Well has it been said that "a braver or more chivalrous spirit never passed from earth. He was a veritable '*miles Christi*' — *Chevalier de l'Eglise* as he liked to describe his monastic heroes. He was much besides — a picturesque historian, an eloquent orator, a keen and in many respects enlightened politician; but his religious chivalry was the essence of his nature. No monk of old ever consecrated himself with a more cordial devotion to the service of God and the Church. No knight ever fought more gallantly for the cause dear to his heart. Shall we say, in the view especially of his last words on the doctrine of infallibility — which he struggled against to the last, and yet was prepared to accept when once proclaimed — no hero of the cloister ever offered as the sacrifice and service of his faith higher powers or a more entire — only too entire! — self-submission?" *(Blackwood's,* November 1872, page 609). On one thing the whole world, irrespective of religious difference of opinion, can unite in praise of Montalembert. "He was the very personification of candor. He had not a shadow of bigotry; he hated intolerance; he shuddered at persecution; he had none of the arrogance or unbending hardness of the dogmatist; he was singularly indulgent to what he deemed error; the utmost he would accept from the temporal power, from the state, was a fair field and no favor; the Church, he uniformly maintained, far from having any natural affinity with despotism, could only blossom and bear fruit in an atmosphere of freedom; while liberty, rational liberty, was never safer than under the protecting shadow of her branches 'Nusquam Libertas gratior exstat Quam sub rege pio.' If he waved the consecrated banner of St. Peter with the one hand, he carried *La Charte,* the emblem and guarantee of constitutional government, in the other; and his life and character would be well worth studying if no higher or more useful moral could be drawn from them than that it is

possible to reconcile a dogmatic, damnatory, exclusive system of belief with generosity, liberality, Christian charity, patriotism and philanthropy" *(Lond. Qu. Rev.* April 1873, pages 219, 220).

Among publications of his not yet mentioned deserve to be alluded to his *Des Interets catholiques au dix-neuvieme siecle* (Paris, 1852, 8vo), which gives a rapid and brilliant, though one-sided, review of Catholicism throughout the whole of Europe in that day as compared with what it was some fifty years previous, maintaining that upon the whole the progress made is deep, sound, and likely to be lasting: in the same work he expresses himself strongly on the political changes that had taken place in France, and on the language of the French press in their regard, and thus this publication largely resembles the *Political Future of England* spoken of above. It was translated and published in English in 1855. He also republished two articles from the *Correspondant — Pie IX et Lord Palmerston* and *La Paix et la Pairie,* and a review of the memoirs of the duke de St. Simon. He was a frequent contributor to the *Revue des deux Mondes* and the *Encyclopedie Catholique.*

See Sainte-Beuve, *Causeries du lundi,* volume 1; Nettement, *Histoire de la litterature Franqaise;* De Lomenie, *M. de Montalembert, par un Homme de Rien* (Paris, 1841); Mrs. Oliphant, *Memoir of Count de Montalembert,* etc. (Edinb. and Lond. 1872, 2 volumes, 8vo); Duke d'Aumale's *Eloge sur Montalembert,* read in the Academy on April 4, 1873, and the periodicals quoted and referred to; *Lond. Qu. Rev.* April 1856, July 1861; *Edinb. Rev.* October 1861; *North Brit. Rev.* August 1861; *Blackwood's Magazine,* April 1870; also *Le Temps* (Paris), March 15, 1870; *Le Journal des Debats,* March 15, 1870. The *catalogue raisonne* of Montalembert's published writings, including his pamphlets and contributions to reviews, in the *Revue Bibliographique Universelle,* fills five closely printed pages of small type.

Montalto, Elias

a Jewish savant, was born in Portugal in the second half of the 16th century, and, professing Christianity, went under the name of *Felipe* or *Filotheo.* About 1598 he went to Italy, where his medical skill and fame attracted the attention of Concino Concini, who caused his appointment as principal physician to Mary de Medici, queen of Henry IV of France, and this obtained for him the free exercise of his religion. He was subsequently physician and counsellor to Louis XIII, and died at Paris in 1616. The

queen caused his body to be embalmed, and it was conveyed into Holland by some of his Jewish relations whom he had about him. Montalto not only wrote some esteemed medical works, but also a theologico-apologetical book in the Portuguese language, wherein he defends Judaism against Christianity — his *Livro Fayto,* 2:388 sq. He also wrote a tract on Isaiah 53, and on Daniel, which are still in MS. See First, *Bibl. Jud.* 2:388 sq.; De Rossi, *Dizionario* (Germ. transl.), page 233; Cassel, *Leiffcaden fur jud. Gesch. u. Literatur* (Berlin, 1872), page 100; Basnage, *Histoire des Juifs* (Engl. transl.), page 676; Lindo, *Hist. of the Jews in Spain,* etc., page 362 sq.; Gratz, *Gesch. d. Jumden,* 9:521, 524; 10:10; Kayserling, *Gesch. d. Juden in Portugal* (Leipsic, 1867), page 274 sq., 283, 308; *Sephardim,* pages 176, 201; his essay, "Drei Controversisten," in Frankel's *Monatsschrist,* 1858, page 323 sq.; Zunz, *Die Monatstage des Kalenderjahres* (Berlin, 1872), page 9; Geiger, *Ud. Zeitschriftfur Wissenschaft u. Leben,* 1867, page 184 sq.; 1868, page 158 sq. (B.P.)

Montani, Giovanni-Giuseppe

an Italian theologian, was born at Pesaro about 1685. He was descended from a noble family; joined the Society of Jesus at Rome, and taught in the schools of that order moral theology with so much success that persons came from distant parts to consult him. He revised and corrected a work of P. Pelizzari, made many additions to it, which he drew mostly from the decrees of the sacred congregation and from the bulls of Benedict XIV, and published it under the title *Tractatus de Monialibus* (Rome, 1755, 4to; 2d ed. Venice, 1761). He died in 1760. See Richard et Giraud, *Bibliotheque Sacree.*

Montanism.

SEE MONTANISTS,

Montanists

a Christian sect, is now generally believed to have arisen in Asia Minor, about the middle of the 2d century after Christ. But little if anything is known of their earliest history. It is apparent, however, that as a sect they embodied all the ascetic and rigoristic elements of the Church of the 2d century.

As Christianity had gradually become settled in humanity, "its supernatural principle being naturalized on earth," prophecy and miraculous manifestations were believed to be past. The Montanists, however, came forward to declare a continuance of the miraculous gifts of the apostolic Church, and proclaimed that the age of the Holy Ghost and the millennial reign had been established in the village of Pepuza, in Western Phrygia (Epiphan. *De Haefes.* 48, 14), which they termed the New Jerusalem. Those who followed the Holy Ghost, speaking through these new prophets, were held to be the only genuine Christians, and were to form the Church. They were the *pneumatici,* the spiritually-minded; and all the opponents of these new revelations were the *psychici,* the carnally-minded. As a sect they condemned second marriages, considering wedlock a spiritual union sanctified by Christ, and intended to be renewed beyond the grave. They expelled from the Church all that were guilty of notorious crimes, imposed rigid fasts, advocated celibacy, encouraged martyrdom, allowed of divorce, and held it unlawful to fly in time of persecution. Such were their notions of their own sanctity that, while they did not directly separate from the rest of the Church, they esteemed others very imperfect Christians, and deemed themselves a spiritual Church within the carnal Church. The Christian life was by them not merely referred to a miraculous beginning, the intervention in history of a reparative and saving power, inaugurating a new and final historical development. No there must be nothing less than a perpetual miracle; everything would be lost if the concurrence of natural activity, of patient labor, were for a moment admitted, if the conditions of a slowly progressive development were in any degree recognised. The Montanists thus conceived religion as a process of development, which they illustrated by the analogy of organic growth in nature, distinguishing in this process four stages:

(1.) natural religion, or the innate idea of God;

(2.) the legal religion of the Old Testament;

(3.) the Gospel during the earthly life of Christ; and

(4.) the revelation of the Paraclete; that is, the spiritual religion of the Montanists, and accordingly they called themselves the πνευματικοί, or the spiritual Church, in distinction from the psychical Catholic Church.

This is the first instance of a theory of development which assumes an advance beyond the New Testament and the Christianity of the apostles; misapplying the parables of the mustard seed and the leaven, and Paul's doctrine of the growth of the Church *in* Christ and his Word, not *beyond* them. In such a light, "the religion of the Spirit," says Pressense aptly, therefore "is not a new sun which has arisen on the horizon of humanity, and which is to run its regular course after the primary miracle of its appearance; it is to retain ever the brilliancy of its lightning; it is to be one long flashing storm, rather than the quiet shining of the sun. The divine does not harmonize with the human element; it always descends upon it as on its prey, overcoming and subverting" *(Heresy and Christian Doctr.* page 105). Such was the fundamental error of Montanism; it did not recognise the supernatural as taking possession of the natural order, penetrating and transforming it; it marked out the two domains as in direct and constant opposition. The Montanists, then, believed in the constancy of supernatural phenomena *within* the Church. The miraculous element, particularly the prophetic ecstasy, was not removed; on the contrary, the necessity for it was greater than ever, and they considered those only to be true or perfect Christians who possessed the inward prophetic illumination of the Holy Spirit — they, indeed, were the true Church; and the more highly gifted were to be looked upon as the genuine successors of the apostles. They thus asserted a claim to universal validity, which the Catholic Church was compelled, for her own interest, to reject; since she left the effort after extraordinary holiness to the comparatively small circle of ascetics and priests, and sought rather to lighten Christianity, than add to its weight, for the great mass of its professors.

According to Apollinaris of Hierapolis (quoted by Eusebius in his *Ecclesiastical History,* chapter 16), the earliest Montanists were exclusively Phrygians; but this is not correct, though it is easy to see, from what we have said in the article MONTANUS, why his views should have laid strong hold on that race of excitable and superstitious Asiatics. Gieseler and Milman remark that the national character of the Phrygians impressed itself on their Christianity, and led to a sensuous, enthusiastic worship of the Deity, and to a wild mysticism. But this cannot have been the cause of the Montanist movement; it can only have given a peculiar character to the heresy, and influenced its details. For "Montanism is but one of a number of similar movements in the Church. At intervals throughout the annals of Christianity. the Holy Ghost has been summoned

by the hopes, felt as present by the enkindled imaginations, been proclaimed by the passionate enthusiasm of a few as accomplishing in them the imperfect revelation as the third revelation which is to supersede and to fulfil the law and the Gospel." This notion appears not only thus early, but again in the Middle Ages, as the doctrine of the abbot Joachim, of John Peter de Oliva, and the Fratricelli; in a milder form it is that of George Fox and of Barclay (Milman, *Lat. Christianity,* 1:1), and in the Irvingites of today. In all these cases there is a striving, but a misguided striving, after a higher standard. Certain it is that, whatever doubt may exist as to the historical existence and consequent influence of Montanus, the heresy which bears his name spread not only in Phrygia, but throughout the bounds of the Catholic Church; and that if he existed, and taught Montailism, he was rather, as Neander observes, "the unconscious organ through which a peculiar mental tendency, which had developed itself in various parts of the Church, expressed itself with clearer intelligence and greater strength" *(Antignost.).* Indeed, there was much in the system which their pretended revelations were employed to establish, not only well adapted to take root and flourish among such a people as the Phrygians, but also sure to find in every country persons prepared to receive it by previous habits of mind. "It was attractive to the more rigid feelings, by holding out the idea of a life stricter than that of ordinary Christians; to weakness, by offering the guidance of precise rules where the Gospel had only laid down general principles; to enthusiasm and the love of excitement, by its pretensions to prophetical gifts; to pride, by professing to realize the pure and spotless mystical Church in an exactly defined visible communion; and by encouraging the members of this body to regard themselves as spiritual, and all other Christians as carnal" (Robertson, page 71). It is said to have been chiefly among the lower orders that Montanism spread; but even in the powerful mind of Tertullian it found congenial soil; and his embracing their opinions is one of the most interesting events in the history of the sect, as it is also in the biography of Tertullian himself. It occurred about A.D. 200, and the treatises which he wrote after that important period in his life give us the clearest insight into the essential character of Montanism; for he carried the opinions of the sect to their utmost length of rigid and uncompromising severity, though at the same time on the great fundamental points in which the Montanists did not differ from the Church he continued, as he had before been, one of the ablest champions of scriptural truth, and one of the mightiest opponents of every form of heresy.

Montanism, it is apparent, then, must be treated as a doctrinal development of the 3d rather than of the 2d century; for though the history of the sect may be dated back to the middle of he 2d century, it remained for Tertullian to give definite shape to Montanism, and it is as a *separate* sect that we call first deal with the Montanists (or Tertullianists, as they were also called in Africa) in the 3d century, continuing to flourish as a sect until the close of the 6th century, and all this time being the subject of legal enactments under all the successors of Constantine down to Justinian (A.D. 530). As a doctrinal system, Montanism in its original inception agreed in all essential points with the most catholic teachings, and held very firmly to the traditional rule of faith. This was acknowledged even by those who were opposed to Montanism (compare Epiphanius, *Haer.* 28:1). Nor is this to be wondered at. "For Montanism," as Dr. Schaff has well said, " was not originally a departure from the faith, but a morbid overstraining of the practical morality of the early Church. It is the first example of an earnest and well-meaning, but gloomy and fanatical hyperchristianity, which, like all hyperspiritualism, ends again in the flesh... Its views were rooted neither (like Ebionism) in Judaism nor (like Gnosticism) in heathenism, but in Christianity, and its errors consist in a morbid exaggeration of Christian ideas and demands." It is true also that the Montanists combated the Gnostic heresy with all decision, and, through Tertullian, contributed to the development of the orthodox doctrine of the Trinity, in asserting against Patripassianism the personal distinctions in God, and the import of the Holy Ghost. Yet this orthodoxy in the substance of its doctrine did not give Montanism the right to claim its place in evangelical Catholicity, for it was itself a principle of implacable and irreconcilable exclusion. Though first seen and felt only in the field of practical life and discipline, this Montanistic movement, coming then into conflict with the reigning Catholicism, finally and consistently carried out, broke to some extent into the province of doctrine, and thus proved true the theory that "every schismatic tendency becomes in its progress more or less heretical" (Schaff).

The one thing by which Montanism came to be especially distinguished from the Church catholic was its assertion of the *continuance of prophecy,* and hence it went generally under the name *of nova prophetia.* Now there was nothing heretical in the simple doctrine that charismata had not ceased in the Church; but there was heresy in the doctrine, which the Montanists espoused, that these charismata introduced a new dispensation superior to

that of Christ and his apostles. That Christ, who came to fulfil the law and the prophets, and promised his Holy Spirit to his apostles to guide them into all truth, bequeathed to his Church only an insufficient morality, and a dispensation which needed to be supplemented by the Paraclete of Montanus, is utterly inconsistent with a true reception of the doctrines of the Church catholic and of the Holy Ghost, who spake by the prophets. This distinction in Montanism between the Paraclete and the Holy Ghost is not a distinction (or difference, rather) of person or nature, but the distinction of a plenary bestowal for a complete revelation following a partial bestowal for an imperfect and temporary revelation. It may be compared, and is virtually compared by Tertullian in the passages cited above from the treatises *De Monog.* and *De Virg. Vel.,* to the distinction drawn by St. John when he says, "The Holy Ghost was not yet given." It was the same Spirit in the Mosaic and the Christian dispensations, yet might be called another on account of the different and larger grace of the Christian dispensation. So the Paraclete is in person and being identified with the Holy Ghost, but the larger measure of the Spirit given for the completion of Christianity introduces a distinction by which the Holy Ghost bestowed on the apostles is inferior to the Paraclete. The Paraclete is undeniably identified with the promised Spirit of Truth — i.e., the promise of Christ, which the Church believes to have been fulfilled on the first Pentecostal day, was not fulfilled until the Spirit came on Montanus. Mosheim (cent. 2, part 2, chapter 5, section 23, note), we must take the liberty of saying, entirely mistakes the nature of the distinction if his words imply, as we understand them to imply, a teacher other than the third person of the Christian Trinity. This heresy gave a character to the new disciplinary rules. It introduced also schism in its most aggravated form, asserting that the party of Montanus alone was the true Church, the pneumatic, all other nominal Christians being psychic.

Montanism manifestly claimed for itself a position above the organization and regular powers of the Church, asserting as its own monopoly the continuity of revelation. Anterior revelations, to be sure, are not set aside; they are, however, regarded simply as initiatory steps. The Old Testament retains its claims, but the New Testament suffers depreciation, inasmuch as it is no longer the final utterance of the divine teaching. It has not brought revelation to perfection; it has made, especially in the teaching of the apostles, more than one concession to human weakness, and, like Moses, it has allowed certain practices because of the hardness of men's hearts. "The

Lord," says Tertullian, "has sent the Paraclete, because human weakness was not capable of receiving the truth all at once; it was necessary that the discipline should be regulated and progressively ordered, until it was carried to perfection by the Holy Spirit" *(De Virg. Veland.* part 1). Paul gave certain instructions rather by permission than in the name of God; he tolerated marriage because of the weakness of the flesh, in the same manner as Moses permitted divorce. "If Christ has abolished that which Moses had commanded, why should not the Paraclete forbid that which Paul allows?" *(De Mozog.* 1:4). "In fine, the Holy Spirit is rather a restorer than an inovator (ibid.). Was not the new development of the revelations given foreseen and declared by Jesus Christ? The final and glorious economy of the Paraclete may, indeed, have commenced at Pentecost, but it only reached its culminating point with the appearance of Montanus and the prophetesses of Phrygia; none can tell where its developments may end." Such were the principles of Montanism. Surely it were impossible to make a more serious assault than this upon apostolic Christianity. It clearly enough regarded revelation not as a fact, but rather as a doctrine or a law, and in consequence religion lost the definitive character which belongs to that which is absolute. "Inspiration," says Pressense, "which thus had power to change everything, was exempted from the restraint of all the rules of reason, as well as from the authority of the Holy Scriptures. It was admitted to be a sort of ecstasy, and its great merit, according to the sect, consisted in its bringing man into a state of complete passivity. Ecstasy seized the inspired man; this is the power of the Holy Spirit which produces prophecy' (Tertullian, *De Anima,* part 2). It is a sort of God-sent madness, which constitutes the spiritual faculty called by us prophecy. The soul is no longer self-possessed when it prophesies; it is in a state of delirium; a power not its own masters it. *Dreams and visions occupy the principal place in the inspiration of the Montanists.* Inspiration is only the harp which vibrates as it is touched by the player's finger (Epiphanius, *Haer.* 48, 4). 'Man sleeps; I alone am walking,' says the Paraclete (ibid.). In such a conception of inspiration, flexible natures, susceptible of keen and rapid impressions, were the chosen organs of revelation... Ambiguous and lying oracles could thus be substituted for the clear and exact prescriptions of the sacred books. It is obvious that the whole of Christianity was imperiled by this doctrine of the Paraclete (q.v.). This was the fundamental heresy of Montanism, and infinitely more serious than the particular errors into which it might be led" *(Heresy and Doctrine,* pages 114-115).

The view which the Montanists took of divine inspiration led them to ignore the demands of the ecclesiastical order, and to assert the universal prophetic and priestly office of Christians — even of females. They found the true qualification and appointment for the office of teacher in direct endowment by the Spirit of God, in distinction from outward ordination and episcopal succession. They everywhere proposed the supernatural element, and the free motion of the spirit, against the mechanism of a fixed ecclesiastical order. Now they were undoubtedly right in their resistance to the encroachments of the hierarchy, and to the relaxation of discipline; but they went too far on this point, as on every other — insisting upon a Church of saints and perfect men, a standard applicable only to the invisible Church. "The Church," said Tertullian, "is not constituted by the number of bishops; it is the Holy Spirit in the spiritual man" *(De Pudicit.* page 21) — a false and dangerous theory for practice in the visible Church, where the secrets of the heart can never be judged of where, as Pressense has aptly said, "the tares grow with the good wheat, and their separation is impossible. For the evil is not excluded by making a profession of the faith the personal condition of membership; there is no guarantee that this profession will be in all cases sincere, and, even were it so, there is no religious community in which it is not incomplete. It follows that no one such community can claim to be itself, to the exclusion of all others, the temple of the Holy Ghost; else it becomes an exclusive sect like the Montanists, who called themselves the perfect, the spiritual men, speaking scornfully of all other Christians as carnal. Their conception of inspiration, as never final and complete, moreover rendered any fixed order impossible, and destroyed ecclesiastical authority. All the elements of the faith were daily liable to change. It was impossible to divine what strange answers to spiritual questions might fall from heaven" *(Heresy,* page 116). Here, then, was the point where they necessarily assumed a schismatic character, and arrayed against themselves the episcopal hierarchy. They only brought another kind of aristocracy into the place of the condemned distinction of clergy and laity. They claimed for their prophets what they denied to the Catholic bishops. They put a great gulf between the true spiritual Christians and the merely psychical, and thus induced spiritual pride and false pietism. Their affinity with the Protestant idea of the universal priesthood is clearly more apparent than real; they go on altogether different principles. (Compare Schaff, 1:367.)

As to its matter, the Montanistic prophecy related

(1) to the approaching heavy *judgements of God,* a sort of visionary millenarianism;

(2) *the persecutions;*

(3) fasting and other *ascetic practices,* which were to be enforced as laws; and

(4) as to the distinction to, be made between *the various kinds of sins.*

One of the most essential and prominent traits of Montanism was its visionary millenarianism, founded, indeed, on the Apocalypse and on the apostolic expectation of the speedy return of Christ, but giving them extravagant weight and a materialistic coloring. The Montanists lived under a vivid impression of the great final catastrophe, and looked therefore with contempt upon the present world, and directed all their desires to the second advent of Christ, which they believed to be near at hand. "After me," exclaimed one of its prophetesses, "there is no more prophecy, but only the end of the world" (Epiphanius, *Haer.* 48, 2). The failure of these predictions weakened, of course, all the other pretensions of the system; though, on the other hand, it must be confessed here that the abatement of faith in the near approach of the Lord was certainly accompanied with an increase of worldliness in the Catholic Church.

But besides the prominent traits of Montanism already indicated, there remain those questions of *discipline and morals,* which were made the subject of special revelation in order to impart to the system its legal character. The distinction between the two covenants was lost sight of. "The Church," says Tertullian, "blends the law and the prophets with the Gospels and the writings of the apostles" *(De Prescript. § 6).* The Gospel was a code, no less than Mosaism, especially with the amplifications given to it by the Paraclete. "The law of liberty," says Pressense, "is replaced by precepts of the minutest detail. All that was not permissible was laid under a stern interdict (Tertullian, De *Corona Milit.* page 2), and thus vanished that noble Christian liberty which enlarges the domain of the moral: principle instead of narrowing it, and takes possession of the entire life, to bring it all under our direction, and to animate it with the inspiration of love as with the breath of life" *(Heresy,* page 117). Montanism, indeed, tended to a system of growing severity; and Tertullian, moreover, gloried in that the restoration of this rigorous discipline was made the chief office of the new prophecy *(De Monog.* c. 2 and 4). Now it must be confessed

that the Montanists raised a zealous protest against the growing looseness of the Catholic penitential discipline, which in Rome particularly, under Zephyrinus and Callistus, to the great grief of earnest minds, established a scheme of indulgence for the grossest sins, and began, long before Constantine, to obscure the line between the Church and the world; but, on the other hand, it must be remembered also that Montanism certainly went to the opposite extreme, and fell from evangelical freedom into Jewish legalism. It turned with horror from all the enjoyments of life, and held even art to be incompatible with Christian soberness and humility. Above all, it laid stress upon three points: first, it exalted martyrdom with solemn fervor. It courted blood-baptism, and condemned concealment or flight in persecution as a denial of Christ: "For if persecution proceeds from God, it is in no way their duty to flee from what has God for its author; it ought not to be avoided, and it cannot be evaded." The treatise of Tertullian, *Flight and Persecution,* clearly and perfectly expresses these ideas, and they were the ideas of the Montanists. The Church had given to martyrdom no niggardly honor, but in the spirit of its founder's teachings (Matthew 10:23) flight was considered proper. Montanism, however, severely condemned every measure of prudence in times of proscription (comp. Eusebius, *Hist. Eccles.* 5:16; Tertullian, *De Fuga,* § 4, pages 691-697).

The same extreme severity characterizes their practice of fasting. Kaye (in his *Tertullian,* page 416) sums up the differences between the orthodox and Montanists on the. subject of fasting thus: "With respect to the jejunium, or total abstinence from food, the orthodox thought that the interval between our Savioor's death and resurrection was only the period during which the apostles observed a total fast, and consequently the only period during which fasting was of positive obligation upon all Christians. At other times it rested with themselves to determine whether they would fast or not. The Montanists, on the contrary, contended that there were other seasons during which fasting was obligatory, and that the appointment of those seasons constituted a part of the revelations of the Paraclete. With respect to the Dies stationarii, the Montanists not only pronounced the fast obligatory on all Christians, but prolonged it until evening, instead of terminating it, as was the custom, at the ninth hour. In the observance of *Xerophagice* (q.v.), the Montanists abstained not only from flesh and wine, like the orthodox, but also from richer fruits, and omitted their customary ablutions." Apollonius (in Eusebius, *H.E.* 5:18), in this particular, simply notices of Montanus, "This is he who laid down laws

of fasting," pointing out in these words that Montanus's offence was not the changing of one law for another, but the imposition of a law where there had been liberty. Tertullian has written an entire treatise ill defence of fasting, and the objections brought against Montanism on this point show clearly the exaggerated legalism by which it was estranged from the true Christian tradition. The law and the prophets, it was said to the Montanists, were until John; fasting thenceforward should be a voluntary, not an enjoined act. The apostles themselves observed it, without laying it as a yoke upon any: we must not return to legal prescriptions. The prophets showed great contempt for all that is merely outward observance. Tertullian *(Dejejuniis,* c. 2 and 3) replies that nothing is more adapted to give large license to the flesh than the reducing of the law to the great commandment of love. He .maintains the necessity of fasting-first. on the ground that self-indulgence led to the fall. "It is necessary," he says, "that man should give satisfaction to God with the same element by which he offended, and that he should deny himself food, which caused his fall." That fasting is agreeable to God is proved by the words full of tenderness addressed to Elijah when he was fasting in the desert of Horeb, especially as compared with the severe tone of the call to Adam when he had been eating the forbidden fruit. Fasting facilitates holy visions, as is proved by sacred history from Daniel to Peter, and it prepares for martyrdom; while the neglect of such abstinence leads to apostasy, by fostering the love for material pleasures. To the objections drawn from Holy Scripture, Tertullian replies by the revelations of the Paraclete, which legitimately give expansion to its obligation, and refuses to recognise any distinction between the O.T and N.T., as might be naturally enough expected from his strictly legal stand-point (comp. *De jejuniis,* c. 6-8).

Its strongest protests, however, Montanism, like all ascetic doctrines, entered against the union of the sexes. It not only prohibited second marriage as adultery, for laity as well as clergy, but even went so far as to distinctly impugn all marriage, urging its faithful ones to absolute continence. Tertullian does not hesitate to compare the conjugal union to adultery, forgetting his own beautiful words about the perpetuity of marriage after death *(Ado. Marc.* 1, c. 29, page 452), and brands the union of sexes as caused by an impulse of lust. "Thus, then," he suggests, as an objection urged, "you set a brand even on first marriages." *"And rightly,"* he replies, *"since they consist in the same act as adultery...* Thus it is good for a man not to touch a woman; virginity is the highest holiness, since it is

furthest removed from adultery" *(De Virg. Veland.* page 16). In his treatise on monogamy, however, Tertullian contents himself with prohibiting second marriages, taking his stand on Scripture, when he can make it sustain his view, appealing to the higher power of the Paraclete when he has to deal with the exact texts of St. Paul. The apostle, according to him, gave sanction to second marriages, but with a marked tone of antipathy, and simply in consequence of his knowledge and prophecy having been only in part. The Paraclete, however, in his new revelation, always acts in conformity with Jesus Christ and his promises. "We acknowledge," said Tertullian, "only one marriage, as we acknowledge only one God. Jesus Christ has had only one bride, which is the Church. By his example, and by the explicit command revealed by the Paraclete, he has restored the true nature; for monogamy dates from Eden. The priests were to have only one wife. Now, under the new economy, every Christian is a priest of Christ. No difference should be made in a moral point of view between the clergy and the laity, for the former are taken from among Christian people. Besides, how can marriage, which makes of the man and woman one flesh, be renewed? Is such an assimilation capable of repetition? Besides, the bonds between husband and wife continue in death; they have only become more sacred by becoming more spiritual." Yet Tertullian's views, though extreme, do not in this instance clearly set forth the views of all Montanists. Indeed some of them insisted that their founder taught λύσεις γάμων dissolution of marriage and that Prisca and Maximilla, as soon as they recognised the spirit, abandoned their husbands. It is true Wernsdorf (see Routh's note, *Rel. Sac.* 1:473) observes that Montanus's teaching was on this point not by precept, but by the example of his two prophetesses, and yet the extreme asceticism must have had a far reaching influence even for Tertullian to advocate celibacy on the strength of it, and in his *Exhortation to Chastity* he comes to recognise a morality of perfection which rises above the ordinary standard. "Permanent virginity is its highest point; abstinence from the sexual relations in marriage is akin to it in virtue." In an extreme ascetic tendency Montanism forbade women all ornamental clothing, and required virgins to be veiled. Thus Tertullian urges that it be done so as not to kindle the flame of passion. "I entreat thee, O woman, be thou mother, daughter, or virgin, veil thy head: as mother, veil it for the sake of thy son; as sister, for thy brother; as daughter, for thy father. For thou dost imperil men of every age. Put on the armor of modesty ; encircle thee with a rampart of chastity. Set a guard

over thine own eyes, and over those of others. Art thou not married to Christ?" *(De Virg. Veland.* page 16).

The perversion of the doctrine of redemption, which is the source of all such legalism, casuistry, and extreme asceticism, as the Montanists taught, is more especially notable in the arbitrary disposition made by Montanism of various kinds of sins. In the same manner as it recognises two orders of perfection, and thus does violence to the true idea of good, so does it tamper with the idea of evil. In accordance with the words of John — "a sin not unto death," and "a sin unto death" — it made a difference between sins venial and mortal, and denied that the Church had power to pardon the latter, because, as it taught, there is no possibility of a second repentance for mortal sins, and therefore no power in the Church to restore the lapsed into fellowship. Tertullian's treatise on *Modesty,* called forth by the decree of the bishop of Rome, who had assumed the right to pardon the gravest sins, expresses the Montanist theory with perfect clearness. He does not dwell for an instant on the real difficulty of obtaining proof of true repentance, but speaks only of the comparative gravity of sins. "Some," he says, "are pardonable; others, on the contrary, are beyond remission some merit punishment, others damnation. From this difference in the offences comes the difference in the penitence, which varies according as it is exercised on account of a pardonable or unpardonable sin." He held all mortal sins (of which he numbers seven) committed after baptism to be unpardonable *(De Pudicit.* c. 2 and 19), at least in this world; and a Church which showed such lenity towards gross offenders, as the Roman Church at that time did, according to the corroborating testimony of Hippolytus, he called worse than a "den of thieves," even a "spelunca moechorum et fornicatorum." At the head of the black catalogue of unpardonable or mortal sins the Montanists placed adultery and apostasy. They did not deny that God could pardon them directly, or through the medium of an exceptional revelation; but on this side the grave no restoration was possible for those who had been guilty of such sins, even though they gave the strongest pledges of their repentance. Here we have a clear departure from the grand Christian doctrine of the fulness of God's mercy, irrespective of the proportion of sin, and that the Church must suffer all to enter its fellowship who manifest "a desire to flee from the wrath to come." If Montanism taught truly, it follows that the work of redemption is insufficient, and that, in addition to repentance, a certain satisfaction is

demanded of the sinner. We have here unquestionably reached the root of the error of Montanism, from which grows its legalism and its asceticism.

The religious earnestness which animated Montanism, and the fanatical extremes into which it ran have frequently reappeared in the Church after the death of Montanism, under various names and forms, as in Novatianism, Donatism, Anabaptism. the Camisard enthusiasm, Puritanism, Pietism, Irvingism, and so on, by way of protest and wholesome reaction against various evils in the Church. And what may appear perhaps more strange, several of those very doctrines of the Montanists which in their earliest rise were pronounced heretical gradually made their way into the Church of Rome, and. with slight modifications, remain to this day a part of her creed. Thus it is to Montanism that it owes the idea of the infallibility of its councils, which attempt in the same way to add to revelation. From the same source, too, it has derived its "counsels of perfection," and the distinction between venial and mortal sins. Says Dr. Newman, in his *Essay on Development,* a work which he would hardly care to own now," the prophets of the Montanists prefigure the Church's doctors, and their inspiration her infallibility; their revelations her developments" (pages 349-352). Since this was written a new significance has been given it by the proceedings of the last Vatican Council (1869), which has lodged in the individual head of the Church the infallibility formerly attributed to the Church as a whole. *SEE INFALLIBILITY*; *SEE PAPACY*.

We now return to the *external* history of Montanism. We have stated that it probably originated in Phrygia about the middle of the 2d century, and that it spread rapidly during the bloody persecutions under Marcus Aurelius. In Asia Minor, however, it met with opposition, and the bishops and synods almost universally declared against the new prophecy as the work of dsemons. Among its literary opponents in the East are mentioned Claudius Apollinaris of Hierapolis, Miltiades, Apollonius, Serapion of Antioch, and Clement of Alexandria. The Roman Church likewise, during the episcopate of Eleutherus (177-190) or of Victor (190-202), after some vacillation, set itself against it at the instigation of the presbyter Caius and the confessor Praxeas. Yet the opposition of Hippolytus to Zephyrinus and Callistus, and the later Novatian schism, shows that the disciplinary rigorism of Montanism found energetic advocates in Rome till after the middle of the 3d century. Indeed it was some time before the Montanists formed themselves into an independent sect in the Western Church (comp.

Gieseler, *Eccles. Hist.* 1:125, note 6). The Gallic Christians, Irenaeus at their head, took, it is now generally believed, a conciliatory posture, and sympathized at least with the moral earnestness, the enthusiasm for martyrdom, and the chiliastic hopes of the Montanists. They sent the bishop Irenseus to bishop Eleutherus at Rome to intercede in their behalf, and this mission may have induced him or his successor to issue letters of peace, which were, however, soon afterwards recalled. In North Africa they met with extensive sympathy, as the Punic national character leans naturally towards gloomy and rigorous acerbity. Here it secured Tertullian, who helped the gropers in the dark towards a twilight of philosophy. He is its proper and only theologian. Through him, too, its principles reacted in many respects on the Catholic Church; and that not only in North Africa, but also in Spain, as we may see from the harsh decrees of the Council of Elvira in 203. It is singular that Cyprian, who, with all his High-Church tendencies and abhorrence of schism, was a daily reader of Tertullian, makes no allusion to Montanism. Augustine *(De hcresibus, § 6)* relates that Tertullian left the Montanists and founded a new sect, which was called after him, but was through his (Augustine's) agency reconciled to the Catholic congregation at Carthage. As a sect, the Montanists run down into the 6th century; but, as has been remarked with much truth, although the actual number of the Montanists was at one period very considerable, the importance of the sect is really to be estimated by the extent to which their character became infused into the Church. Neander attributes much of this to the great influence which Tertullian exerted through the relation in which he stood to Cyprian, who called him his teacher. At the same time it is to be noticed that there was some tendency in the opposite direction in the introduction of a prophetical order superior in rank and importance to the order of bishops. The first order among the Montanists was that of *patriarch,* the second that of *cenones,* and the third that of *bishop.* The patriarch resided at Pepuza, in Phrygia, the anticipated seat of the millennial kingdom, and at that time almost exclusively inhabited by Montanists.

See Tertullian's works, especially his numerous Montanistic writings; Eusebius, *Hist. Eccles.* 5:3, 14-19; Epiphanius, *Her.* pages 48, 49; Wernsdorf, *De Montanistis* (Dantsic, 1741); Muinter, *Effata et oracula Montanistar.* (Copenh. 1829); Neander, *Antignosticus oder Geist aus Tertullian's Schriften* (Berl. 1825; 2d cd. 1849); Schwegler, *Der Montanismus u. die christl. Kirche des 2ten Jahrh.* (Tub. 1841); Kirchner,

De Montanistis (Jena, 1852, 8vo); Baur, *Das Wesen des Montanismus nach den neuesten Forschungen,* in the *Theol. Jahrbiucher* (Tub. 1851; comp. his *Christenth. der ersten Jahrh.* pages 213-224); Niedner, *Kirchen-Geschichte,* p. 253 sq., 259 sq.; Ritschl, *Entstehung der altkathol. Kirche* (2d ed. 1857), p. 402-550; Pressense, *Early Years of Christianity* (Heresy and Doctr.), 3:101-124; Neander, *Ch. Hist.* 1:507, 526; *Hist. Christian Dogma* (see Index); Schaff, *Ch. Hist.* 1:362-469; Hagenbach, *Hist. Doctr.* 1:60 sq.; Walch, *Gesch. der Ketzereien,* 1:611 sq.; Killen, *Anc. Ch.* page 436 sq.; Burton, *Eccl. Hist. First Three Cent.* page 405 sq.; Ebrard, *Kirchen u. Dogmengesch.* 1:137 sq.; Mossman, *Hist. Catholic Church* (Lond. 1873, 8vo), ch. v; Lipsius, in Hilgenfeld's *Zeitschr. fur wissenschaftliche Theologie,* 1865 and 1866; *Lond. Qu. Rev.* January 1869, page 473; *Christian Examiner,* September 1863, page 157; *Brit. Qu. Rev.* October 1873, page 288.

Montano, Leandro

a Spanish theologian, a native of Murcia, flourished in the 17th century. He was also known under the name *Leandro of Murcia.* He was a Capuchin monk, ecclesiastical inspector of Castile, qualificator of the Inquisition, and preacher to the king. Among his numerous works may be mentioned, *Questiones regulares y reyla dee los menores* (Madrid, 1645, 4to): — *Commentaria in Esther* (ibid. 1647, fol): — *Explicacion de las bulas de Innocencio X* (ibid. 1650, 4to): — *Disquisitiones morales in primarm S. Thomas* (ibid. 1663-70, 2 vols. fol.). See Antonio, *Bibl. Nova Hispana;* Saint-Antoine, *Bibl. univ. Franciscana,* 2:279.

Montanus

a celebrated heresiarch of the early Christian Church, the supposed founder of a sect named after him *Montanists* (q.v.), was a Phrygian by birth, and, according to Eusebius *(Hist. Eccles.* 5:16), made his first public appearance about A.D. 170, in the village of Ardabar, on the confines of Phrygia and Mysia, of which place he is believed to have been a native (comp., however, the bishop of Lincoln's [Kaye] *Tertullian,* page 13 sq.). He was brought up in heathenism, but appears to have embraced Christianity (about 170) with all the fanatical enthusiasm for which his countrymen were noted. Neander endeavors to explain his character and tendencies on the supposition of his possessing an essentially Phrygian temperament, and the little we know concerning him renders this highly

probable. The frenzy, the paroxysms, the fierce belief in the supernatural, that marked the old Phrygian priests of Cybele and Bacchus, are repeated under less savage, but not less abnormal conditions, in the ecstasies, somnambulism, and passion for self-immolation of the Montalists. According to some of the ancient writers, Montanus was believed by his followers to be the Paraclete, or Holy Spirit. But this is an exaggeration, for he, falling into somnambulistic ecstasies, came simply to consider himself the *inspired organ* of the Paraclete, the Helper and Comforter promised by Christ in these last times of distress. He, however, certainly claimed divine inspiration for himself and his associates. They delivered their prophecies in an ecstasy, and their example seems to have introduced into the Church the practice of appealing to visions in favor of opinions and actions, of which practice Cyprian and others availed themselves to a great extent (comp. Middleton, *Free Inquiry,* page 98, etc.). His principal associates were two prophetesses, named Prisca, or Priscilla, and Maximilla. The doctrines which Montanus, if he taught at all as a leader of a sect, disseminated are now clearly seen to have been in general agreement with those of the Church catholic of the 2d century, and the fact that Tertullian at one time became the most brilliant exponent of the Montanists would go far to confirm such a position. But the austerity of manner, the strictness of discipline, and the doctrine of a permanent extraordinary influence of the Paraclete, manifesting itself by prophetic ecstasies and visions, opened wide the door to all manner of fanatical extravagances, and brought reproach upon the name of founder and sect alike. Ecclesiastical writers of succeeding centuries have in consequence brought more or less reproach upon the name of Montanus by accusations of immorality and crime, and he is even said to have ended his days violently. But there is no authority for such statements, if we may believe Schwegler, *Der Montanismus u. die christliche Kirche des zweiten Jahrh.* (Tub. 1841, 8vo). He insists upon it that "there is nothing of historical value in the life of this man at our command" (page 242), and believes that "the person Montanus is of no significance in the examination and elucidation of what is known as *Montanism,*" and would go ven so far as to " doubt the historical existence of this apocryphal character" (page 243). There is certainly ground for such a position in the fact that in their earliest days the Montanists were never spoken of under that name, but were generally called, especially by Tertullian and Eusebius, after the name of the country in which they originated, *Cataphrygians,* or after the name of the place to which they assigned special sanctity, *Iepuzzians* (comp.

Epiphan. *Haer.* 48, 14). Bishop Kaye, in his *Tertullian* (page 28 sq.), takes it for granted that Mcnatanus was a historical character, and awards to him the dignity of founder of the Montanists. The learned bishop even believes, depending upon Tertullian's work, "that the effusions of Montanus and his female associates had been committed to writing," and that "Tertullian, believing that Montanus was commissioned to complete the Christian revelation, could not deem him inferior to the apostles, by whom it was only obscurely and imperfectly developed." See references to the article *SEE MONTANISTS*.

Montanus, Benedict Arias

SEE ARIAS.

Montanus of Toledo

a noted Spanish prelate of the early Christian Church, flourished in the 6th century. But little is known of his personal history. He succeeded Celsus in the see of Toledo A.D. 531; he presided at the council held in Toledo, and died in the year 540. There are two letters of his extant, one to the brethren of Palantia, and the other to Theodorius, bishop of Plalantia. See Clarke, *Sacred Lit.* 2:306.

Montanye, Thomas B.

a Baptist minister, was born in New York in 1769. He began preaching when quite young, and was in 1788 ordained pastor of the Baptist society in Warwick, N.Y., where he remained until 1801, when he accepted a call from the Church in Southampton, Bucks County, Pa., which situation he held until his death, September 27, 1829. He was a truly popular preacher, and on account of his talents and piety his services came to be much sought after for ordinations, councils, and especially religious anniversaries, yet none of his works have been published. See Sprague, *Annals,* 6:265.

Montargon, Robert Francois De

(Hyacinthe de l'Assomption), a French preacher and theologian, was born at Paris May 27, 1705. He assumed the vows of the Augustines of the street Notre Dame of the Victoires at Paris *(les Petits Peres),* and very soon became remarkable for his oratorical talent. He was made court preacher by Louis XV, and received the title of almoner to Stanislaus I (ex-king of Poland), duke of Lorraine and of Bar. His life was consecrated to

his ministry. Attacked by paralysis, he resorted in 1770 to the waters of Plombieres for relief. An inundation of the Angronne destroyed that city, and Montargon found only death where he had expected recovery — July 25,1770. He is the author of *Dictionnaire apostolique a l'usage de moessieurs les cures de la ville et de la campagne qui se destinent* a *la chaire* (Paris, 1752-58, 13 volumes, 8vo); this work has remained the vade mecum of the ecclesiastics. It has often been reprinted, and translated into different languages. The first six volumes treat of morals, the seventh and eighth of the mysteries of Jesus Christ, the ninth of the Virgin, the tenth of the saints, the eleventh of the homilies of Lent, the twelfth of different subjects, and the thirteenth is a general table of the subjects treated in the other twelve volumes. See *Recueils d'Eoquence sainte; Histoire de l'institution de lafete du Saint-Sacrement* (1753, 12mo); *Dictionnaire portatif des predicateurs,* s.v.

Montazet, Antoine De Malvin De

a French prelate, was born August 17, 1713, in the castle of Quissac, near Agen. He belonged to a good family of the Agenais, and, embracing the ecclesiastical profession, obtained, among other benefices, the abbeys of Saint-Victor of Paris and of Monstier in Argonne. At the close of 1742 he became almoner to the king, and in 1748 was appointed bishop of Autun. March 31, 1759, he was raised to the archbishopric of Lyons in the place of cardinal de Tencin. "Zealously opposed to the philosophers," says Feller, "an ardent defender of the prerogatives of his see, which he claimed privileged even to the reformation of metropolitan judgments, a successful adversary to the customs and privileges of his chapter, which he succeeded in suppressing by civil authority, this prelate holds a distinguished place in the history of the Gallican Church of this century." He had numerous debates with M. de Beaumont, archbishop of Paris, relative to the religious quarrels of the time. He felt much inclined to side with the Jansenists, and did say much in their favor; yet he never became one of the number of the *Appellants,* and avoided any formal proceedings of opposition against the bull *Unigenitus.* He died May 2, 1788, at Paris. Montazet had a happy memory, a brilliant imagination, an active mind; his eloquence was lofty, energetic, and copious. In 1757 he was admitted to the French Academy. His principal writings are, *Lettre a l'Archeveque de Paris* (Lyons, 1760, 4to); he there takes the title of *Primate of France: — Mandement contre "L'Histoire du Peuple de Dieu" de Berruyer* (Lyons, 1762, 12mo): — *Instruction pastorale sur les sources de l'incredulite et les fondements de*

la religion (Paris, 1775, 4to); this work was greatly praised up to the time whee it was reprinted under the title of *Plagiats de M. l'Archeveque,* and with the passages drawn from the *Principes de la foi chretienne* of Daguet; but there is reason for believing that the composition of the *Instruction pastorale* is by P. *Lambert: — Catechisme* (Lyons, 1768): — *Rituel de diocese de Lyon* (Lyons, 1788, 3 volumes, 12mo). It was under his auspices that the *Institutiones Theologicae* appeared (Lyons, 1782,1784,6 volumes, 12mo); and the *Institutiones Philosophicae* (Lyons, 1784, 5 volumes, 12mo); this system of theology, proscribed in France, was introduced into Italy and Spain, where it was held in esteem for a short time. See *L'Ami de la Religion,* 22:161, 172; Bachaumont, *Memoires secrets,* passim; Migne, *Diet. des Jansenistes,* s.v.; Feller, *Diet. Hist.* s.v.; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Generale*, s.v.; Jervis, *Hist. Ch. of France* (Lond. 1872, 2 volumes, 8vo), 2:325 sq.

Montbas, Jean Barton De

a French prelate, a native of Gueret, flourished in the 15th century. He was abbot of the Dorat in 1446, and on April 1,1457, was made bishop of Limoges, and counsellor to the Parliament. In 1465 he resigned his functions in favor of his nephew, Jean Barton de Montbas II, who put into print the *Breviariumo Lemovicense* (Paris, 1500, 8vo) and the *Breviarium dioecesis Lemovicensis* (1504), *manuscrit de* 1638, in the library of Limoges. He died in the castle of Isle, March 4, 1497, with the honorable title of archbishop of Nazareth. We owe to him the construction of the magnificent nave in the cathedral of Limloges, and the impression of the *Missale ad usum Lemovicensis Ecclesiae: Parisiis, per Joannem de Prato* (1483, 4to). See *Gallia Christiana nova,* volume 2, col. 536, 551; Bonaventura, 3:166, 713, 729, 731.

Montboissier

SEE PETER THE VENERABLE.

Montbray, Geffroi De

a French prelate, was born at Montbray, near Saint Lo, in the early part of the 11th century. Descended from a noble family of Normandy, he was early devoted to the Church, and on April 10, 1049, was consecrated bishop of Coutances. He was present at the assembly held in 1066 by William, duke of Normandy, at Lillebonne, in which it was resolved to

invade England. One of the principal promoters of that war, he followed the duke, his friend, to the conquest, and acquitted himself very courageously at the battle of Hastings. He accompanied William to London, and in the ceremony of the coronation at Westminster acted as chamberlain for the states of Normandy. When the Conqueror was recalled to his duchy, he left Geffroi de Montbray at the head of his soldiery. In 1067, when he had defeated the two Anglo-Saxon princes, Edmund and Godwin, Geffroi entered Dorset and Somerset, and there destroyed all who rose in arms, or who were suspected of having taken up arms. Some years after the earls of Northumberland, Norfolk, and Hereford, having rebelled against the Conqueror, Geffroi powerfully aided in the victory of Fagadon, obtained over them in 1074, and forced them to take refuge in Norwich, where he besieged and took them by capitulation. As a reward for these noble and numerous deeds, William gave to him in fief 280 manorial lands. After the death of that prince (1087) he was obliged to return to Normandy, where lie died, February 2, 1094. See Ordericus Vitalis, *Historia ecclesiastica; Gallia Christiana,* volume 11; Thierry, *Hist. de la Conquete de l'Angletere par les Normands;* Lecanu, *Hist. des Eveques de Coutances;* Fisquet, *France poontificale.*

Montbrun, Charles du Puy

a Huguenot warrior, and a zealous Protestant, was born in the diocese of Gap in 1530. He took an active part in the civil wars of his time, and rendered the Huguenots great service, performing several very daring deeds, and showing his bravery in an especial manner at Jarnac and Monontntoutr. He was at last captured and executed in 1575. See Allard, *Vie du brave Montbrun* (Grenoble, 1675, 12mo); Martin, *Hist. de Charles Dupuy* (2d ed. Paris, 1816, 8vo); Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Generale,* 36:141-43; Smiles, *Huguenots.*

Montbrun, Guillaume

SEE BRISONNET.

Montchal, Charles De

a French prelate, was born in 1589 at Annonay (Vivarais). His mother was Anne of Guillon. At first abbot of Saint-Amand-de-Boisse, in the diocese of Angouleme, and of Saint-Sauveur-le-Vicomte, in the diocese of Coutances, he became archbishop of Toulouse in 1627 by the resignation

of Louis de Nogaret, cardinal of La Villette. The cardinal of La Villette had not received holy orders, and was not even a simple clerk. As for Montchal, he had not only been ordained, but he was that rare thing among ecclesiastics of quality, a theologian, and even an erudite theologian. He was consecrated in Paris January 9, 1628, and subsequently repaired to his metropolitan town. Toulouse then had a prelate who, clothed in his sacerdotal robes, officiated and preached, which was a great novelty. Charles de Montchal returned to Paris in 1635, and assisted at the assembly of the clergy, where he was one of the principal orators. In 1641 he was present at the assembly of Mantes, the history of which he wrote. In 1645 he again took his seat in the assembly of Paris, where he energetically pleaded the cause of ecclesiastical franchise. September 8, 1643, he consecrated the church of Soreze. Under his administration the Church of Toulouse prospered greatly, and became enriched by a considerable number of monasteries and convents. He died at Carcassonne Aug. 22, 1651. The zeal of Montchal for religion was that of an enlightened mind. He thought that the Church should be powerful, and was sensible enough to seek for the elements of that power in the example of good morals, the progress of ecclesiastical studies, and the noble triumphs of eloquence. He was the patron of a multitude of learned men, who dedicated their works to him; among them may be mentioned Etienne Molinier, Francois Combefis, Innocent Cironius, Casanova, Ravel, etc. He is the author of *Memoirs* (Rotterdam, 1718, 2 volumes, 12mo); in these *Meloires* is the *Journal de l'Assemblee (de Mantes.* See *Gallia Christ.* volume 13, col. 61; Du Mege,*Hist. des Institut. de la ville de Toulouse,* 3:126, 127.

Mont de Piete

SEE MONTES PIETATIS.

Monte, Cardinal del

SEE JULIUS II.

Monte, Andreas de

(yfnwm yd sayrdna), a celebrated Jewish convert to Christianity, so named after he had embraced the new faith (before his conversion he was called *R. Joseph Tsarpathi Ha-Alphasi,* yspl ah ytprx ãswy), was born in the early part of the 16th century at Fez, in Africa (hence his second surname, yspl ah), of Jewish parents, who were natives of

France, which is indicated by his first surname (ytprx, *Gallus*). He emigrated to Rome, where, after exercising the office of chief rabbi for many years, and distinguishing himself as an expounder of the Mosaic law, he embraced Christianity about the year 1552, during the pontificate of Julius III. He at once consecrated his vast knowledge of Hebrew and rabbinical literature to the elucidation of the prophecies, with a view to bringing his brethren into the fold of the Romish Church, and wrote —

(1) A voluminous work, entitled μydwhyh tkwbm, *The Perplexity of the Jews,* demonstrating both from the Scriptures and the ancient rabbinical writings all the doctrines of the Christian religion. Bartolocci, who found the MS. in loose sheets in the Neophyte College at Rome, carefully collated it and had it bound. He did not know that it ever was printed, but Furst *(Bibliothecae Judaica,* 3:544, s.v. Zarfati) states that it was published in Rome, 16—, 4to. However, Fabiano Fiocchi, in his work called *Dialogo della Fede,* has almost entirely transcribed it, so that the Biblical student may derive all the advantages from it for Christological purposes.

(2) An epistle to the various synagogues, written both in Hebrew and Italian, and entitled μwl ç twga, *Lettera di Pace,* dated January 12, 1581. It treats of the coming of the true Messiah, and shows from the prophecies of the O.T., as well as from the works of the ancient rabbins, that he must have come long ago in the person of Jesus Christ (Rome, 16—, 4to). This learned work and the former one are very important contributions to the exposition of the Messianic prophecies, and to the understanding of the ancient Jewish views about the Messiah. Gregory XIII appointed Monte in 1576 preacher to the Hebrews of Rome in the oratory of the Holy Trinity; he was afterwards made Oriental interpreter to the pope, in which capacity he translated several ecclesiastical works from the Syriac and Arabic. He died in the beginning of the 17th century. See Bartolocci, *Bibliotheca Magna Rabbinica, 3:*848 sq.; Wolf, *Bibliotheca Hebrcea* i, 556 sq.; Ginsburg, in Kitto, *Cyclop. Bibl. Lit.* s.v.; Kalkar, *Israel u. die Kirche,* page 71; Fiirst, *Bibl. Jud.* 1:45 (s.v. Andreas).

Monte Cas(s)ino

the first Benedictine convent ever established, "the venerable mother of Western monachism," and for a thousand years the spot especially dear to

the great Benedictine order, was so named after the place in which it was located.

Benedict of Nursia

(q.v.) having been induced by the representations of the priest Florentius to settle in the Campania, near Naples, found on a mountain, near the old *Castrum Casinum,* a temple of Apollo and a shrine of Venus, which were still resorted to by the heathen inhabitants. He converted them, destroyed the temple and shrine, and in their place erected a chapel dedicated to St. Martin, and soon after commenced building a convent for himself and his followers, which subsequently received the name of Monte Cassino. The undertaking succeeded in spite of difficulties of all kinds (it is said the devil made the stones so heavy that it was impossible to lift them, etc.!), and was terminated in 529. The convent was, of course, subject to the rule of Benedict, who remained its abbot until his death, March 21, 543. He was succeeded by the abbots Constantine, Simplicius, and Vitalis, under whose government the convent, although often invaded by the barbarians, continued to prosper, owing chiefly to the miracles performed by the relics of its founder. In 580 Monte Cassino was stormed by the Lombards. The abbot and monks, taking with them their most valuable ornaments, and the original copy of their rule, fled to Rome, where they were well received by pope Pelagius I. They soon built a new convent by the side of the Quirinal Palace, and remained in possession of it during 140 years. Gregory the Great proved particularly welldisposed towards the order, inciting them to turn their attention towards missions, and particularly to England, from whence they spread to Scotland, Ireland, and Germany. St. Willibrod introduced the order in Friesland, and under St. Bonifacius it acquired supremacy throughout Germany. In 720 pope Gregory II appointed the Brescian Petronax to build a new convent and a church on the ruins of Monte Cassino, which was then only inhabited by hermits, and the church was consecrated by pope Zacharias himself in 748. Petronax was appointed abbot, and the pope confirmed all the donations made to the convent, exempting it at the same time from episcopal jurisdiction, and restoring to it the autograph rule of St. Benedict. But in the mean time the convent had met with an irreparable loss: a French monk, Aigulf de Fleury, had in 633 taken from the ruins the remains of the saint, and carried them to his own convent, which henceforth had taken the name of St. Benoit sur Loire. Abbot Petronax died May 6, 740. Under his successors Monte Cassino became a centre of learning. Prof. Leo, in his *Gesch. v. Italien,* says:

"Benevento and the convent of Monte Cassino must be considered as having been for a time, in the beginning of the Middle Ages, the most important abode of scientific activity. Africa, Greece, and the Western German countries met there; and from the meeting of the distinguished men of these different countries resulted naturally a higher intellectual life than could be found anywhere else; for there neither trade nor the coarse enjoyments of immoderate eating or drinking, which engross all in the sea-towns and on the northern coasts, were the adversaries of science" (2:21). Among its eminent men we may mention Paulus, the son of Warnefried, the historian of the Lombards, whom, after in sorrow at the fate of his country he had retired to Monte Cassino, Charlemagne repeatedly invited to his court, and who wrote the *Homiliarium,* and taught Greek to the clergy. Under his influence Charlemagne granted great privileges to the order, and subjected all the convents of his empire to their rule. The relations between Rome and Monte Cassino were always of the most friendly character; and while, down to the 8th century, it was Rome that encouraged and sustained the convent in its progress, the latter came in the troubled times of the 8th, 9th, and 10th centuries to be considered by the Romish clergy as the centre of scientific culture. However, in 884, the Saracens attacked the convent, slew the abbot, Bertharius, at the altar, and destroyed Monte Cassino and St. Salvator; and the monks had to flee with their treasures to the convent of Teano. In 886, monk Erchembert, at the head of some of the order, made an attempt to restore the convent; but they were driven off by Greek robbers, and remained until the death of abbot Leo in 915 at Teano, gradually losing their importance. The count of Teano was thus enabled to seize without opposition some of the property of the convent; those of Capua appropriated also a part, and, finally, after the death of Leo, the young archdeacon, John of Capua, a cousin of the duke of Capua, became the abbot of the remaining Cassinites, who now removed to Capua. There they built the church of St. Benedetto, together with a rich college of canons. But they now commenced gradually relaxing the severity of their rule, and we find pope Agapetus II complaining bitterly of their insubordination. In 949 abbot Aligernus succeeded by his zeal in restoring Monte Cassino; through the protection of the princes of Capua he regained the possessions taken from it in former times; he invited colonists, with whom he concluded a "placitum libellari statuto," and built for them in several places churches and chapels. He obliged the monks to devote themselves to agriculture and to literary labors, and enforced the discipline. He obtained also from the emperors Otto I and II the confirmation of the

possessions and privileges of the convent, and used every exertion to restore it to its former splendor. He remained abbot thirty-five years, and is called the third founder of Monte Cassino. His successor, Manso (986), only sought to increase the temporal welfare of the convent, regardless of discipline. He led a princely life, and the disorder became so great during his administration that Nilus, visiting the convent, exclaimed: "Let us quickly, my brethren, leave this place, which will soon be visited by the anger of God." Manso, deceived by some of his own monks, died of grief in 996. Nothing particular occurred under the succeeding abbots Athenulph (1011-22), Theobald (1022-35), Richerius (1038-55), Frederick (1057-58). Under abbot Desiderius (1058-87) the order commenced to improve again; he was a son of a duke of Benevento, and had been educated in the convent De la Casa; Leo IX made him cardinal deacon of St. Sergius and Bacchus, and on March 26, 1059, Nicholas II appointed him cardinal priest of the title of St. Cecilia. The next day he was appointed abbot of Monte Cassino. He restored the building, the church was consecrated by pope Alexander II in person, and the number of the monks increased to two hundred. At the same time the discipline was strictly enforced, and scientific studies vigorously resumed (see Giesebrecht, *De litt. studiis apud Italos primis medii cevi sceculis* (Berol. 1845). Gregory VII himself designated Desiderius as his successor, and he was finally made pope, somewhat by force, in 1086, as Victor III. He ever regretted having left his convent, and finally returned to die in the place he loved so dearly, after reigning eight years. His successor as abbot was Oderisius I (1087-1105). Under him the convent received various valuable endowments, a hospital was added to the already existing buildings, and these completed in a very handsome manner. Pope Urban II confirmed by a bull all the donations which had been made to the convent, and replaced the abbey of Glanfeuil, in France, founded by St. Maurus, under the rule of Monte Cassino. Under the successors of Oderisius I the reputation of Monte.

Cassino gradually declined again, and was never regained. Among those who inhabited it are yet to be mentioned bishop Bruno of Segni (abbot 1107-11), cardinal Giovanni Gaetano, afterwards pope Gelasius II, and especially the learned Petrus Diaconus. In 1239 the emperor Frederick II dispersed the monks, and occupied the convent with his soldiers. Urban IV then appointed the wise and learned Bernard Ayglerius of Lyons abbot and reformer of the convent. He succeeded in regaining some of its lost possessions, and in subjecting the monks to the discipline, for which

purpose he composed the *Speculum Monachorum* (Venice, 1505), and a commentary on the rule of St. Benedict. Bernard died April 3, 1282. In 1294 pope Celestine V made an attempt to change the rule into that of the Celestines, and with that view appointed the Celestine Angelarius abbot of Monte Cassino; but Boniface VIII gave up the attempt. A bull of John XXII made the church of Monte Cassino a cathedral, the abbot bishop, and the monks cathedral canons. Still the order continued to sink and in 1359 there remained but a few monks living in huts built on the ruins of their convent. Pope Urban V sought to revive an interest in the convent, became himself its abbot, invited the assistance of the other Benedictine convents, had well-disciplined Benedictines imported from two other convents, and finally in 1370 appointed Andreas de Faenza, a Benedictine of the Camaldula, abbot of Monte Cassino. But the political troubles which were then agitating Italy, and particularly Naples, prevented prosperity in the convent, and pope Julius II incorporated it with the Benedictine convent of St. Justina.

The services which have been rendered to science by the convent of Monte Cassino are related by Dom Luigi Tosti in his *Storia della Badia di Monte-Cassino, divisa in libri nove ed illustrata di note et documenti* (Naples, 1842-43, 3 volumes). He concludes with the words: "At present there are some twenty monks dwelling in the vast convent, attending with praiseworthy diligence to the singing of psalms and their devotions; they take much trouble in educating a school of fifteen boys, who wear the monks' garb, and they direct the seminary of the diocese of Cassino, containing some sixty pupils. They occupy themselves, besides, in publishing old works contained in the archives of the convent." See Tosti's *Archivi Casinese* (Naples, 1847); Maclear's, *Hist. Christian, Missions,* page 172. *SEE MONASTERY*.

Monte Catino, Antonio

an Italian philosopher, was born at Ferrara in 1536. Of noble extraction, he studied different sciences in his own country, and became professor of philosophy. He was particularly esteemed by duke Alfonso II, who chose him for his secretary, and sent him as ambassador to the court of France, and to that of Rome. According to Muratori, he repaid the family of his benefactor with ingratitude, and was the principal instrument in the overthrow of the duchy of Ferrara by the Holy See. He died at Ferrara in 1599. Monte Catino is the author of *Aristotelis Politicorutm lib. iii*

(Ferrara, 1587-97, 3 volumes, fol.); this Latin version is accompanied by a commentary, which Naude does not esteem very highly; and the second volume, which appeared in 1784, contains also the *Republic* and the *Laws* of Plato, as well as some frag*ments: — In octavum librum Physicae Aristotelis Commentarius* (Ferrara, 1591, fol.): — In *primam partem lib. iii Aristotelis de Anima.* Francesco Patrizi has dedicated to Monte Catino one of the volumes of his *Discussiones Peripatetice,* and he has left a magnificent eulogy of the virtues of this philosopher. See Bayle, *Dict. Critique,* s.v.; Naude, *Bibliogr. Polit.* volume 27; Ag. Superbi, *Apparato degli Uomini illustri di Fecrrara;* Muratori, *Antichita Estensi,* part 2, c. 14; Tiraboschi, *Storia della Letter. Ital.* volume 7, part 1.

Monte Corvino, John De

(chiefly known on account of his wonderful missionary labors in the East), a native of France, was born in 1247. By papal authority Monte Corvino visited India in 1291, and thence proceeded to China, where he was kindly received by the emperor Kublai Khan, who permitted him to build a church at Peking, then called Cambalu. In spite of the opposition he met, not only from Pagans, but also from Nestorians, he seems to have been so successful that as a result of eleven years' labor he baptized nearly 6000 persons and gathered 150 children, whom he taught Greek and Latin, and for whom he composed sundry devotional works. He also translated into the Tartar language all of the N.T. and Psalms. The success which attended his labors caused Clement V to constitute him archbishop of Peking in 1307, and seven bishops were sent to him as suffragans. His death occurred in 1330, and scarcely forty years passed before the results of his life-work were almost annihilated by the Ming dynasty, which expelled his successors. See Williams, *Middle Kingdom* (see Index in volume 2); Newcomb, *Cyclop. of Missions.* (H.W.T.)

Monte Oliveto

a rich and famous abbey in Italy, is the most noted place of this order. The Order of the Holy Sacrament, also known as the Congregation of the Body of Jesus Christ, united with the Olivetenses in 1582. See Brunel, *Hist. du Clergy seculier et regulier* (Amst. 1716, 18mo), 2:288, 291.

Monte, Pietro dal

a celebrated Italian ecclesiastical canonist, was born at Venice in the latter part of the 15th century. After studying Greek and Italian under the direction of Guarino, he was made master of arts in Paris, and then obtained the rank of doctor in Padua. In 1433 he was made apostolic prothonotary, and in 1434 was sent by pope Eugenius IV to the council at Basle. He afterwards went to Rome to ask of her citizens, in the name of that council, a tax for liberating a nephew of the pope, whom cardinal Condolmieri had imprisoned. In 1434 he was sent to England to collect the taxes due the pontifical court. He remained in that country five years, during which time he became a favorite of the duke of Gloucester, uncle of the king. In 1442 he was made bishop of Brescia, a position which he held for two years. He was afterwards sent to France as legate of the Holy See. In 1447 he again visited Rome to assist in the ceremonies attending the ordination of pope Nicholas V. On his return to Brescia he founded many churches and a few religious institutions. Monte died in 1457, leaving a reputation worthy of a learned and pious man. His works are, *Repertoarium Juris utriusque* (Bologna, 1465, 3 vols. fol.): — *Monarchia, in qua generalium conciliorum materia, de potestate et prcestantiat Romani Pontificis et Imperatoris discutitur* (Rome, 1496, 4to): — a Latin translation of the *Miraculum Eucharistice* of St. Epiphany (Rome, 1523, 8vo). Some fragments of his discourses and letters have been published by cardinal Quirini in his *Fr. Barbari Epistolce,* t. 2, and in his *Epistolae ad Benedictum.*

Montenat, Benoit

a French ecclesiastic, was born about the commencement of the 16th century; he was almoner to duke Charles of Bourbon, but he was so little known that his name cannot be found in the *Bibliotheque Frangaise* of La Croix du Maine. At the request of Anne of France, daughter of Louis XI, he wrote in 1505 a treatise on the *Conformite desprophetes et Sibylles avec les douze articles de lafoi;* this work remains unedited, and is preserved among the manuscripts of the Imperial Library, No. 7287. See Paulin. Paris, *Manuscrits Frangais de la bibliotheque du Roi,* 7:310.

Montenegro

called by the natives *Tchernagora,* and by the Turks *Karadagh,* i.e., Black Mountains, in view of the dark appearance of the wooded hills of this

remarkably mountainous country, is a semi-independent Slavish principality, between lat. 420 10' and 420 56' N., and long. 180 41' and 200 22' E.; bounded on the north by the Turkish provinces of Bosnia and Herzegovina, on the south and east by Albania, and on the west by the Dalmatian circle of Cattaro, and covering a territory of 3738 square miles, with a population of about 311,000.

General Description. — The country is very mountainous, and agriculture is therefore prosecuted to a moderate extent only, and in a very rude and primitive manner. The products are like those of other European lands of the same latitudes. "The general aspect of Montenegro," says Wilkinson, the celebrated English traveller, "is that of a succession of elevated ridges, diversified here and there by a lofty mountain-peak, and in some parts looking like a sea of immense waves turned into stone. Trees and bushes grow amid the crags, and in the rugged district of Ceoo the fissures in the rocks are like a glacier, which no horse could pass over without breaking its legs. The mountains are all limestone, as in Dalmatia; but in no part of that country do they appear to be tossed about as in Montenegro, where a circuitous track, barely indicated by some large loose stones, calling itself a road, enables a man on foot with difficulty to pass from the crest of one ascent to another. Some idea of the rugged character of the country may be formed from the impression of the people themselves, who say that 'when God was in the act of distributing stones over the earth, the bag that held them burst, and let them all fall upon Montenegro.' The chief productions cultivated there are Indian corn and potatoes; cabbages, cauliflowers, and tobacco are also grown in great quantities, and vegetables are among the principal exports of Montenegro. Potatoes, indeed, have been a most profitable acquisition to the poor mountaineers, as well for home consumption as for exportation, since their introduction in 1786" *(Dalmatia and Montenegro* London, 1848, 2 volumes, 8vol, 1:411-413). Besides agriculture, the chief occupation of the Montenegrins is fishing. There are few who exercise any trade, though some perform the offices of blacksmiths, farriers, or whatever else their immediate wants may require. They are knit together in clans and families, and have many feuds among themselves, which are perpetuated by the hereditary obligation of avenging blood. In their disposition towards strangers they are, like most mountaineers, hospitable and courteous, and bear a friendly feeling for those who sympathize with their high notions of independence and devotion to their country. They are cheerful hi manner, and though very

rude, yet by no means uncouth. Education among them is at a very low ebb; in fact, it is held in contempt, and many, even among the priests, are unable to read or write. In 1841 several schools were established, and the art of printing introduced; but the unsettled state of the country has hitherto prevented much improvement. Their language is a very pure Servian dialect, called by Krasinski "the nearest of all the Slavonian dialects to the original Slavonic tongue; that is, that into which the Scriptures were translated by St. Cyril and Methodius in the 9th century, and which still continues to be the sacred tongue of all the Slavonian nations who follow the Eastern Church."

There are no towns in Montenegro, and the largest village contains only 1200 inhabitants. Cettigne or Tzettinie, the seat of government, contains between twenty and thirty well-built houses, besides a convent and the palace of the prince of Montenegro. The villages are unwalled; the houses, or rather huts, which compose them are very rarely provided with chimneys, and in the elevated districts are more wretched in appearance than even the mud-hovels of Ireland. "The houses," says Wilkinson, "are of stone, generally with thatched roofs, but many are covered partly or entirely with wooden shingles, a mode of roofing very common in Slavonic countries. Some of the better kinds are roofed with tiles, on which large stones, the primitive nails of Montenegro, are ranged in squares, to keep them from being torn off by the wind. Each house generally contains one or two rooms on the ground-floor, with a loft above, occupying the space between the gables, where they keep their Indian corn and other stores. The ascent to it is by a ladder, applied to a square hole in its floor, calling itself a door; and this floor, which performs the part of ceiling to the lower room, is frequently of wicker-work, laid on rafters running from wall to wall. The lower room is at once the parlor, the sleeping-room, and the kitchen; but in the small villages the houses have no loft, and their style of building is very primitive, the walls being merely of rude stones, without cement, and the roof of the coarsest thatch. In the better kind of houses is a bedstead, standing in one corner of the room. It may be styled a large bench, and generally consists of planks resting on a simple frame, having the head and one side to the wall; and a foot-board, with a post running up to the ceiling, completes the whole wood-work. Those who can afford it have a large mattress and quilt, or blankets; but no Montenegrinbed is encumbered with curtains or sheets, and the only extras seen upon it are intended for warmth, in which the struccha [somewhat like the Scotch

plaid, and worn by both sexes over their shoulders] performs an essential part. Native visitors are satisfied to roll themselves up in their strucche and lie on the floor, which is the bare earth; and the poorer people, who cannot afford bedsteads, do the same at their homes, though this is no great hardship to the Montenegrin, who is accustomed, as long as the season will allow him, to sleep out of doors, upon the ground, or on a bench made of stones and mud. But whether in or out of the house, in a bed or on the ground, the Montenegrin always keeps on his clothes, his arms are close to his side, and when aroused by any alarm, or by the approach of morning, he is up at the shortest notice; and no toilet intervenes, on ordinary occasions, between his rising and his pipe. The embers of the fire, which had been covered up with ashes the night before, are then scraped up, and the usual habits of the day begin. The fireplace, which is in another corner of the room, is a raised hearth on the floor, with a caldron suspended from a ring above; it also serves as an oven, the Montenegrin bread being merely dough baked in ashes, as by the Arabs now and by the patriarchs of old, and without leaven. Chimneys are an unknown luxury in most Montenegrin houses, and the smoke escapes as it can. The furniture is not abundant, consisting of a bench, a few wooden stools, and a simple table; and the only brilliant-looking objects in the house are the arms and dresses of the inmates. Clocks or watches are also luxuries unknown to Montenegro, except at Tzettinie and the convents, and the only mode of ascertaining time is by watching the sun, or by common hour-glasses, and an occasional sundial. In some of the wildest mountain districts the houses or huts are of the meanest character, made of rough stones piled one on the other, or of mere wicker-work, and covered with the rudest thatch, the whole building being merely a few feet high. Few houses in Montenegro have an upper story, except at Tzettinie, Rieka, and some other places, where they are better built than in the generality of the villages, of solid stone, and roofed with tiles. Warm houses are indeed very requisite there in winter, when it is very cold, the level of the whole country being considerably above the sea, amid lofty peaks covered with snow during many months, and subject to stormy winds that blow over a long range of bleak mountains. The climate, however, is healthy, and these hardy people are remarkable for longevity.

"Both men and women are very robust, and they are known to carry as much as 200 funti (about 175 pounds) on their shoulders, over the steepest and most rugged rocks. All appear muscular, strong, and hardy in Montenegro; and the knotted trees, as they grow amid the crags, seem to

be emblematic of their country, and in character with the tough, sinewy fibre of the inhabitants. But, though able, the men are seldom inclined to carry anything, or take any trouble that they can transfer to the women, who are the beasts of burden in Montenegro; and one sees women toiling up the steepest hills under loads which men seldom carry in other countries. They are therefore very muscular and strong, and the beauty they frequently possess is soon lost by the hard and coarse complexions they acquire, their youth being generally exhausted by laborious and unfeminine occupations. The sheaves of Indian corn, the bundles of wood, and everything required for the house or the granary are carried by women; and the men are supposed to be too much interested about the nobler pursuits of war or pillage to have time to attend to meaner labors. As soon as the tillage of the lands is performed, they think they have done all the duties incumbent upon men; the inferior drudgery is the province of the women, and the Montenegrin toils only when his inclination demands the effort. The men therefore (as often is the case in that state of society), whenever active and exciting pursuits are wanting, instead of returning to participate in or lighten the toils necessity had imposed on the women, are contented to smoke the pipe of idleness or indulge in desultory talk, imagining that they maintain the dignity of their sex by reducing women to the condition of slaves. The men wear a white or yellow cloth frock, reaching nearly to the knees, secured by a sash around the waist; under it is a red cloth vest, and over it a red or green jacket without sleeves, both richly embroidered, and the whole covered by a jacket bordered with fur. They wear a red Fez cap, and white or red turban, below which protrudes at the back of the neck a long lock of hair. The women wear a flock or pelisse of white cloth and open in front, but much longer than that of the men, and trimmed with various devices, and with gold ornaments in front as well as around the neck. The red cap of the girls is covered with Turkish coins arranged like scales. The red cap of the married women has, instead of coins, a black silk border, and on gala days a bandeau of gold ornaments. Women and men wear opanche (sandals), the soles of which are made of untanned ox-hide, with the hair taken off, and that side outward, and these enable them to run over the steepest and most slippery rocks with facility. The marriage ceremonies are celebrated with great signs of rejoicing. Eating and drinking form a principal part of the festivity, with the noisy discharge of guns and pistols, and the duration of the entertainment depends on the condition of the parties." When a young man resolves on marrying, he expresses the wish to the oldest and nearest

relation of his family, who repairs to the house of the girl, and asks her parents to consent to the match. This is seldom refused; but if the girl objects to the suitor, he induces some of his friends to join him and carry her off; which done, he obtains the blessing of a priest, and the matter is then arranged with the parents. The bride only receives her clothes, and some cattle, for her dowry.

Political Divisions and Government. — Montenegro is divided into the districts of Montenegro Proper and Brda or Zjeta, each of these being subdivided into four "nahies" or departments, and these are further subdivided, each subdivision having its own hereditary chief. Some islands in the Lake of Scutari also belong to Montenegro. Until 1852 the head of the government was the *Vladika* ("metropolitan," or "spiritual chief"), who, besides his proper office of archbishop and ecclesiastical superior, was at the same time chief ruler, lawgiver, judge, and military leader. This theocratic administration became (1697) hereditary in the Petrovitch family, but as the vladika cannot marry, the dignity was inherited through brothers and nephews. (See below.) Since 1852 the two offices have been disjoined, and the vladika is restricted to his ecclesiastical office, while the cares of government devolve upon the "Gospodar" (" hospodar") or lord, though the common people still apply to him the title "sveti gospodar," which properly belongs to the vladika alone. The vladika Pietro II (1830-51) established a senate of sixteen members, elected from the chief families of the country, and in this body the executive power is vested. The public officers, local judges, and public representatives are appointed by popular election. From time to time an *Assembly* of all the adult males of the country takes place in a grassy hollow near Cettigne, the capital; but the powers of this assembly are very undefined. For defraying the expenses of government, taxes are levied on each household. The prince also receives from Russia a subsidy of 8000 ducats (£3733), and from France one of 50,000 francs (£1980). As the Montenegrin, even when engaged in agricultural operations, is always armed with rifle, vataghlan, and pistols, an army of 26,000 men can be summoned on the shortest notice, and in desperate cases 14,000 more troops can be raised. Their intense love of independence and heroism in defence of their country are worthy of the highest respect; but out of their own country they are savage barbarians, who destroy with fire and sword everything they cannot carry off.

Picture for Montenegro 1

History. — Montenegro belonged in the Middle Ages to the great Servian kingdom, but after the dismemberment of the latter, and its conquest by the Turks at the battle of Kossovo (1389), the Montenegrins, under their prince, who was of the royal blood of Servia, maintained their independence, though compelled to relinquish the level tracts about Scutari. with their chief fortress of Zabliak, and confine themselves to the mountains (1485). In 1516 their last secular prince resigned his office, and transferred the government to the vladika. The Porte continued to assert its claim to Montenegro, and included it in the pachalic of Scutari; but the country: was not conquered till 1719, and on the withdrawal of the Turks soon afterwards, it resumed its independence. In 1710 Montenegro sought and obtained the protection of Russia, the czar agreeing to grant an annual subsidy on condition of harassing the Turks by inroads, and this compact has, down to the present time, been faithfully observed by both parties. Another part of the agreement was that the vladika be consecrated by the czar, and this continues to be done even now, though this officer is at present only an ecclesiastical ruler. In 1796 the prince-bishop, Pietro I, defeated the pacha of Scutari, who had invaded Montenegro, with the loss of 30,000 men; and for the next quarter of a century we hear no more of Turkish invasions. The Montenegrins rendered important aid to Russia in 1803 against the French in Dalmatia, and took a prominent part in the attack on Ragusa, the capture of Curzola, and other achievements. Pietro II, who ruled from 1830 to 1851, made great efforts to civilize his people and improve their condition. He established the senate, introduced schools, and endeavored, though unsuccessfully, to put an end to internal feuds and predatory expeditions into the neighboring provinces. Some Turkish districts having joined Montenegro, the Turks attacked the latter in 1832, but were repulsed. A dispute with Austria regarding the boundary resulted in a war, which was terminated by treaty in 1840. In 1851 the last prince-bishop died, and his successor, Danilo I, separated the religious from the secular supremacy, retaining the latter under the title of gospodar. This step caused the czar Nicholas to withdraw his subsidy (which was renewed, and the arrears paid, by the czar Alexander II), and the imposition of taxes thus rendered necessary caused great confusion. This was taken advantage of by the Turks, who, under Omer Pasha, invaded the country; but the intervention of the great powers compelled a treaty, February 15, 1853. Danilo, however, in vain endeavored to obtain the

recognition of Montenegro as an independent power, though he repaired to the Paris Conference in 1857 for this purpose. He, moreover, greatly improved the laws and condition of the country. In 1860 the Montenegrins excited an insurrection against the Turkish rule in the Herzegovina, which was soon suppressed, and in return they themselves were so hard pressed by the Turks that they were glad to agree to a treaty (September 13, 1862) by which the sovereignty of the Sublime Porte over Montenegro was recognised, though the word itself consigning such authority is not stated in the compact. The present ruler of the country is Nikita, a man of good education, secured in Paris and Berlin, and an excellent politician, who has been actively engaged in seeking support from Austria, Russia, and Germany to establish the complete independence of his realm. Since the commencement of the Pan-Slavic movement he has enjoyed many favors from Russia, and received from its emperor in 1869, while on a visit to St. Petersburg, a historical sword, with the Servian inscription "God save the king." In 1874 new complications arose with Turkey on account of murders committed on the Albanian borders, and Montenegro declared war in January 1875; but a compromise was effected towards the end of the month. Since 1871 a political weekly has been published at Cettigne, and there are now telegraphic connections in the Montenegrin possessions. There is also a postoffice department, which was established with the aid of the Austrian government in 1872. The most recent improvements are of a character indicating a very rapid progress in culture.

Picture for Montenegro 2

Religion. — The Montenegrins are members of the Non-united Greek Church, excepting only a few Roman Catholics and Jews. The czar of Russia is recognised as the highest authority, for to him belongs the ordination of the *Vladika,* the spiritual head of the Montenegrin Church. As we have seen above, the vladika was formerly both temporal and spiritual ruler. He is now prince-bishop, and next to him in authority stands the archimandrite of the convent of Ostrok. Priests, of whom there are about 200, are ordained by the vladika, and are charged thirty dollars for admission to holy orders, the money going to the state. They join in war and in the other occupations of the people. The priests must also be married before they can come up for consecration, but the vladika is not allowed to marry; and as the office must be kept within the family to which it has descended since 1516, the succession always falls to a nephew, or some other male relative. The vladika has an annual revenue of $10,000.

The Montenegrin Greek Christians, who number, according to the *Statistical Year-book of the Russian Empire* (volume 2, 1871), 125,000, hate the pope equally as the Turks. They reject images, crucifixes, and pictures, and will not admit a Romanist without rebaptizing him. Monasticism exists to a small extent. Their principal convents are those of Tzetinie, Ostrok, and St. Stefano. See Wilkinson, *Dalmatia and Montenegro,* volume 1, chapter 6; Krasinski, *Montenegro and the Slavonians in Turkey* (Lond. 1855); and the same author in the *Brit. and For. Qu. Rev.* July 1840; Vaclik, *La Souverainte du Montenegro* (Leipsic, 1858); Ubicini, *Les Serbes du Turquie* (Paris, 1865); Noe, *Montenegro* (Leipsic, 1870); Nightingale, *Religious Ceremonies,* pages 99-112; Daniels, *Geographie,* 2:61 sq.

Montenses

seems to have been a local name of the *Donatists.* St. Augustine says distinctly that in his time those heretics were called "Montenses" at Rome (Aug. *Hier.* 69). Epiphanius and Theodoret both associate the name, on the other hand, with the *Novatians* (Epiph. *Hier.* 59; Theodor. *Haer.-fab.* 3:5). In the early list of heresies which goes under the name of St. Jerome it is said that the Montenses were found chiefly at Rome, and that they were so named because they had concealed themselves in the hill-country during a time of persecution. This author speaks of them as distinct from the Donatists and Novatians, but as adopting the heresy of the one as to the rejection of penitents, and of the other as to rebaptism (Pseudo-Hieron. *Indicul. de Haeres.* 34). In one of the canons of the African code, which directs the mode of receiving a person into the Church when coming "de Donatistis vel de Montensibus," the two names seem to be used as synonymous.

Montereuil, Bernardin

a learned Jesuit, was born in Paris in 1569, and died there in 1646. But little is known of his personal history. He is, however, distinguished for his works, of which *A History of the early State of the Church* and *A Life of Jesus Christ* are highly esteemed.

Montesar

SEE MONCON.

Montesilo, Anthony

a noted Spanish Dominican, flourished in the 16th century. He entered the order at Salamanca, and died as a martyr in the West Indies in 1645. His only work is, *Informatio juridica in Judaeorum defensionem.* See Echard, *Biblioth. Proedicatorumn* (Par. 1719-21, 2 volumes, fol.), 2:123.

Montespan, Francoise Athenais, Marquise de

one of the mistresses of Louis XIV. noted for her profligacy and vices, deserves a place here because of the influence she exerted on the fate of the religion of France. She was born in 1641, married to the marquis de Montespan in 1663, but, supplanting the duchess de la Valliere in the affections of the king in 1668, the marquis was banished from court. The marchioness, freed from the authority of her husband, became the mistress of a ruler who claimed to be a faithful servant of the Church of Rome. In 1670 she accompanied him to Flanders, and unblushingly revealed her real position at court. She openly braved the queen and the whole kingdom. But, what is stranger still, she endeavored to reconcile imperious vice with humble piety, and formed a set of morals for herself which Christians would hardly care to endorse. She did not disdain to work for the poor, and, like many others, brought herself to believe that frequent alms and exterior practices of devotion would purchase a pardon for everything. She even presented herself at the communion-table, favored by absolutions, which she either purchased from mercenary or procured from ignorant priests. One day she endeavored to obtain absolution from the curate of a village who had been recommended to her on account of his flexibility. "What?" said this man of God, "are you that marchioness de Montespan whose crime is an offence to the whole kingdom? Go, madam, renounce your wicked habits, and then come to this awful tribunal." She went, not indeed to renounce her wicked habits, but to complain to the king of the insult she had received, and to demand justice upon the confessor. The king, naturally religious, was not sure that his authority extended so far as to judge of what passed in the holy sacraments, and therefore consulted Bossuet, preceptor to the dauphin and bishop of Condom, and the duke de Montauzier, his governor. The minister and the bishop both supported the curate, and tried upon this occasion to detach the king from Madame de Montespan. The strife was doubtful for some time, but the mistress at length prevailed. In 1675 she lost her hold on the king, who had fallen in love with Madame de Maintenon (q.v.), and she never regained her former

position in the reign of her master and former lover. She retired to Paris for the winter, and in the summer visited watering-places. In 1707, while away at one of these places (Bourbon), she died, neither regretted by the king, her children, nor the nation. One half of her life was spent in grandeur, and the other half in contempt. She was rather ashamed of her faults than penitent for them. In a word, her reign was so intolerable and fatal that it was looked upon in France as a judgment from heaven. See *General Biographical Dictionary,* s.v.; Saint-Simon. *Memoires;* Voltaire, *Siecle de Louis XIV;* Houssaye, *Mlle. de la Valliere et Mme. de Montespan;* see also Louis XIV. (J.H.W.)

Montes Pietatis

(Fr. *Mont de Piete,* Ital. *Monte di Pieta)* is the name of charitable institutions, thoroughly Christian in origin and purpose, the object of which is to lend money to the very poor at a moderate rate of interest. They date from the close of the mediaeval period, when all such transactions were in the hands of usurers to whom the necessities of the poor were but an inducement to the most oppressive extortion. The principle was to advance small sums, not ordinarily exceeding $100, on the security of pledges, but at a rate of interest barely sufficient to cover the working expenses of the institution, any surplus to be expended for charitable purposes. The earliest of these charitable banks is believed to have been that founded by the Minorite Barnabas at Perugia in 1464, and was confirmed by pope Paul III. Another was founded at Padua in 1491, and a third (the first in Germany) was established in 1498 at Nuremberg. The first opened at Rome was under Leo X; and the Roman Monti di Pieta are confessed to have been at all times the most successful and the best managed in Italy. The institution extended to Florence, Milan, Naples, and other cities. The Mont-de-Piete system has been generally introduced into France and Germany, the state now controlling its affairs, and not the Church. It has also been introduced into Spain, and into the Spanish provinces of the Netherlands. It formed the model of the *Loan Fund Board* of Ireland, established by the administration of queen Victoria.

Montesquieu, Charles De Secondat, Baron de la Brede et de

Picture for Montesquieu

one of the most noted moralists of the world, and a celebrated French writer, was born January 18, 1689, at the Chateau de la Brede in the

immediate neighborhood of Bordeaux. He was descended from a noble and otherwise distinguished family of the province of Guienne. Even as a youth he gave the promise of his future fame. His habits were most studious, and his desire for learning was encouraged in every way by a fond and judicious father. While engaged in a most laborious study of the civil law, with a view to the profession for which he was destined, young Montesquieu was also much devoted to the study of general literature and philosophy, and even found time to prepare a work on a theological subject, namely, *Whether the Idolatry which prevailed among the Heathen deserved eternal Damnation?* His love of the writers of antiquity had led him to enter the lists in defence of pagan writers, pronouncing them worthy of salvation. The book was favorably received, but did not create much stir. In 1714 Montesquieu attained the rank of "conseiller" in the Parliament of Bordeaux, and three years afterwards, on the death of a paternal uncle, he succeeded at the same time to his fortune and to his post of "president mortier" in the same Parliament. With the most assiduous and conscientious discharge of his duties as a judge, he yet continued the pursuit of literature. His most favorite studies were historical and moral sciences. But he also loved the study of the natural sciences, and even joined in 1716 the Academy of Bordeaux, zealous to direct the attention of this body to physical science. He seems at this time to have been very much impressed with the importance of physical science. He wrote about this time his *Physical History of the Ancient and Modern World,* which was published in 1719. He shortly returned, however, and allowed the academy likewise to return, to literature and morals; and he now wrote several small essays on literary and moral subjects, which were read at meetings of the academy. In 1721, just six years after the death of Louis XIV, when France had outlived the lethargy of the last years of the great reign, and the orgies of the regency were in full swing, Montesquieu appeared with the work which first brought him fame, the *Leftres Persanes,* which was published anonymously. The author, however, was soon recognised, and his name was in everybody's mouth. The book, in which in the character of a Persian, he ridicules with exquisite humor and clear, sharp criticism the religious, political, social, and literary life of his countrymen, secured him a place in the "Academy," though he had even levied his attacks against it. It is supposed that the *Siamoois* of Dufresny, or the *Espion Turc,* suggested the plan of this work, but, be this as it may, its execution is entirely original. "The delineation of Oriental manners," says D'Alembert, "real or supposed, of the pride and the dulness of Asiatic love, is but the smallest of

the author's objects; it serves only, so to speak, as a pretext for his delicate satire of our customs, and for other important matters which he fathoms, though appearing but to glance at them." Some censures which Montesquieu in his *Persian Letters* bestowed upon the conduct of Louis XIV caused the work to be regarded with an evil eye at court; and one or two sarcasms levelled at the pope awakened the zeal of such as were rigidly devout Romanists, or found it convenient to seem so, and Montesquieu was industriously represented as a man equally hostile to the interest of religion and the peace of society. Those calumnies reached the ear of cardinal de Fleury; and when Montesquieu, sustained by the public opinion of his talents, applied for the place which M. Sacy's death had left vacant in the French Academy, that learned body was made to understand that his majesty would never give his consent to the writer of the *Lettres Persanes;* because, though his majesty had not read the work, persons in whom he placed confidence had pointed out its poisonous tendency. Without feeling too much anxiety for literary distinction, Montesquieu perceived the fatal effect that such an accusation might produce upon his dearest interests. According to D'Alembert, Montesquieu waited upon Fleury, therefore, and signified that, although for particular reasons he had not acknowledged the *Lettres Persanes,* he was very far from wishing to disown that work, which he believed to contain nothing disgraceful to him, and which ought at least to be read before it was condemned. Struck by these remonstrances, the cardinal perused the work, the objections were removed, and France avoided the disgrace of forcing this great man to depart, as he had threatened, and seek among foreigners, who invited him, the security and respect which his own country seemed little inclined to grant. This story of D'Alembert is by some discredited, and, instead of it, Voltaire's version is accepted. According to him, "Montesquieu adopted a skilful artifice to regain the minister's favor: in two or three days he prepared a new edition of his book, in which he retrenched or softened whatever might be condemned by a cardinal and a minister. M. de Montesquieu himself carried the work to Fleury — no great reader — who examined a part of it. This air of confidence. supported by the zeal of some persons in authority, quieted the cardinal, and Montesquieu gained admission to the Academy" *(Ecrivains du Siecle de Louis XIV, s*ec. *Montesquieu).* The authenticity of this statement, however, appears to rest solely on Voltaire's evidence, not altogether unexceptionable in the present case. D'Alembert's account is generally preferred. Shortly after his admission to the Academy, January 24, 1728, Montesquieu set out for a

journey to qualify himself for the arduous task of investigating and appreciating the different political or civil constitutions of ancient or modern times, and in order to study, as far as possible, the manners and character, the physical and moral condition, of the European nations by actual inspection. He first visited Vienna, along with lord Waldegrave, the English ambassador. From this city, after conversing with the celebrated prince Eugene, and surveying all that seemed worthy of notice, he passed into Hungary, and afterwards to Italy, where he met with lord Chesterfield, and travelled in his company to Venice. While examining the singular institutions of this republic, and canvassing the subject with eager frankness in places of public resort, he learned that he had incurred the displeasure of the authorities, and was in danger of persecution. He instantly embarked for Fucino, next visited Rome, and, having surveyed Switzerland and the United Provinces, he repaired in 1730 to Great Britain. Newton and Locke were dead, but the philosophical traveller found men in England qualified to estimate his talents. He was respected and patronized by queen Caroline, and enjoyed the intimacy of Pope, Bolingbroke, and many other eminent characters of that period. He spent there two years, and collected much material for his future literary labors. He was made aware of the great esteem in which the English held him by being chosen a fellow of the Royal Society. After his return to Brede, Montesquieu published his *Considerations sur les Causes de la Grandeur et de la Decadence des Romains* (Paris, 1734), a masterly view of Roman history, expressed in a sententious, oracular, and vigorous style. "In attempting to derive the grandeur and downfall of Rome from the admitted principles of human nature, he gave a new turn to such investigations. If some elements of a problem so complex have been omitted, and others rated too high or too low, the work must be allowed to exhibit views of political society, at all times specious, often equally just and profound: the vivid pictures, the acute and original thoughts, with which it everywhere abounds, are to be traced in many succeeding speculations. It deserves praise also for the manly and liberal tone of feeling that pervades it." But by far his greatest work, on which he had been engaged for twenty years, the *Esprit des Lois,* he published in 1748 (Geneva, 2 volumes). In it Montesquieu attempts to exhibit the relation between the laws of different countries and their local and social circumstances. It was immensely popular. No fewer than twenty-two editions were published in eighteen months, and it was translated into various European languages. "The *Esprit des Lois,"* says a contemporary, "is a wonderfully good book, considering the age in which it

appeared. Without adopting Voltaire's hypereulogistic criticism, that 'when the human race had lost their charters, Montesquieu rediscovered and restored them,' it may be said that it was the first work in which the questions of civil liberty were ever treated in an enlightened and systematic manner, and. to Montesquieu, more than to any other man, is it owing that the science of politics has become a favorite subject of study with the educated public." "The *Esprit des Lois,"* says another, "is one of the most laborious books ever written. It had an immense influence on the literature of the age, and founded that method of philosophizing and finding out facts to justify opinion which characterized his followers of the French school, and entered in a great measure into the spirit of the Scottish school of philosophy. Like most original-minded men, he brought to his work a degree of genius and knowledge which his imitators could not cope with, and which concealed, in his hands, the defects of the system." "Notwithstanding," says Villemain, "some expressions here and there inexact, according to our ideas, from their very materialism, the character of his writing is generally metaphysical. Succeeding the light and brilliant epicureanism and scepticism of the 18th century, the *Esprit des Lois* began the spiritualist reaction which Rousseau carried on" *(Cours de Litterature,* volume 1, chapter 4). The work rendered great service to humanitarianism by the respect it paid to human life. Pascal, indeed, in his letter on homicide, had preceded him in this, but we know how indifferent on this subject were the courtly and elegant Frenchmen of that day; how little they troubled themselves about "those Breton peasants who were never tired of being hanged." Montesquieu did not wish absolutely to restrain the utmost penal power of the law, but he recommended clemency and equity, and in his own century Tuscany abolished capital punishment. As Dr. Vinet has well said, we may further commend the author of the *Spirit of Laws* for his "respect for human nature; his love for justice; his true philanthropy; his reverence for all the virtues which ennoble man and his destiny; and, in short, for his attachment to the principles which form the basis of human society." But, though the work found many friends, there were vet some who took decided exception to many of its doctrines. Thus the editor of the *Gazette Ecclesiastique,* long deeply engaged in the Jansenist quarrels which then agitated France, assailed the author of the *Esprit des Lois* in two pamphlets with the charge of deism, and the weightier though contradictory one of following the doctrines of Spinoza. The defence which Montesquieu published, admirable for its strain of polite irony, candor, and placid contempt, was entirely triumphant. Indeed, abilities of a

much lower order than his would have sufficed to cover with ridicule the weak and purblind adversary who discovered the source of the *Esprit des Lois* in the *Bull Unigenitus,* and blamed his opponent for neglecting to examine the doctrines of grace and original sin. It is to be wished that Montesquieu had employed means so legitimate to counteract Dupin's criticism. His admirers would willingly forget that when a copy of the latter's work, ready for circulation, fell into his hands, he carried it to the royal mistress, Madame Pompadour, and allowed her to inform Dupin that, as the *Esprit des Lois* enjoyed her special favor, all objections to it must be instantly suppressed. It must be borne in mind, however, that Montesquieu held a place peculiarly his own, and quite apart from the Christian writers. He was a moralist to be sure, but he did not claim to be a theologian, nor even a devoted or enthusiastic Christian, but simply a cold and calculating philosopher, and as such it was much for him to turn aside and pay the high tributes and warm encomiums to Christianity which he did pay in all his writings; and it may indeed be asserted that "among the laymen of the 18th century no one has spoken so admirably of Christianity." Says he, in the *Spirit of Laws,* "How admirable the Christian religion, which, while it seems only to have in view the felicity of the other life, constitutes the happiness of this" (book 24, chapter 3). This is very unlike the sneering infidelity of Bayle or Voltaire.

Montesquieu's moral doctrine is, perhaps, best gleaned from his *Pensees Diverses,* collected from his MSS., and published in 1758. From this work it appears that he differed little from the ancient stoicism, though he has not laid it down in a systematic form. His own nature was his true system. Nevertheless he loses no opportunity of boasting of stoicism in general: "No philosopher has ever made men feel the sweetness of virtue and the dignity of their nature better than Marcus Aurelius; he affects the heart, enlarges the soul, and elevates the mind." "If I could for a moment cease to think that I am a Christian, I could not possibly avoid ranking the destruction of the sect of Zeno among the misfortunes that have befallen the human race." The stoicism of Montesquieu is softened and restrained by a certain feeling of religion. Stoicism alone could not satisfy this loving mind. In the picture which he draws of human virtues, the idea of God constantly returns, not as something useless, but as its necessary completion. He several times took the opportunity of expressing the very lively aversion that he felt to atheism: "The pious man and atheist always talk of religion: the one speaks of what he loves, and the other of what he

fears." This aversion, which had its principle in the uprightness of his mind, was strengthened by his acquaintance with the real necessities and true condition of society. He defended with no less warmth the immortality of the soul: "Although the immortality of the soul were an error, I should be sorry not to believe it: I confess I am not so humble as the atheists. I know not how they think, but, for myself, I would not exchange the idea of my immortality for the happiness of a day. I delight in believing that I am immortal as God himself. Independently of revelation, metaphysics give me a very strong hope of my eternal happiness, which I would not willingly renounce. Indifference about a future life leads us to be soft and easy with regard to the present, and renders us insensible and incapable of everything which implies an effort." Montesquieu knew that all religion is social, while atheism is eminently anti-social. Montesquieu felt this, and more than once expressed it. Not only does he admit that "all religions contain precepts useful to society," but he declares that religion is the best guarantee that we can have for the morals of mankind;" and he goes so far as to say that "all societies require a religion." No one has shown better than he the intimate relation between religion and social life; and it is interesting to observe that it is in the *Persian Letters,* namely in the work into which he has introduced the rashest statements, and in which he has conceded most to the ideas and manners of his time, that we find this remarkable passage, which explains so well what we have merely indicated: "In any religion which we profess, the observance of laws, love to men, devotedness to parents, are always the first religious acts... For, whatever religion a man professes, the moment any religion is supposed, it must also necessarily be supposed that God loves mankind, since he establishes a religion to render them happy; that, if he loves men, we are certain of pleasing him in loving them also; that is, in exercising towards them all the duties of charity and humanity, and not breaking the laws under which they live." In the *Spirit of Laws,* and in the *Thoughts, we* meet with passages much stronger in favor of Christianity, proving that Montesquieu understood it far better than the moralists of his time, at least in the philosophical view. But for further development of these criticisms we must refer the reader to Vinet, *Hist. of French Lit. 18th Century* (Engl. by the Reverend James Bryce, Edinb. 1855, 8vo), page 199 sq. Montesquieu died at Paris, February 10, 1755. The private character of Montesquieu was such as the tendency of his works might lead us to anticipate. Possessing that calm independence which secured him respect, he possessed also that mildness and benignity of character which displayed itself in a cheerful temper, and obtained for

him universal love. He was distinguished by the readiness which he always manifested to use his influence with the government in behalf of persecuted men of letters; and strict frugality frequently enabled him, without impairing the property of his family, to mitigate the wants of the indigent. Burke characterizes him as "a genius not born in every country or every time; a man gifted by nature with a penetrating, aquiline eye; with a judgment trained by the most extensive erudition; with a herculean robustness of mind, and nerves not to be broken with labor." The most complete edition of his works is that by D'Alembert and Villemain (Paris, 1827, 8 volumes, 8vo). Nugent's translation of the *Spirit of the Laws,* together with D'Alembert's biographical sketch of Montesquieu, were published at Cincinnati in 1873. See Voltaire, *Siecle de Louis XIV et Louis XV;* D'Alembert, *Ebloge de Montesquieu;* Villemain, *Eloge de Montesquieu* (1820); Riaux, *Notice sur Montesquieu* (1849); Maupertui, *Eloge de Montesquieu* (1755); Bersot, *Montesquieu* (Paris, 1852); Burs, *Montesquieu u. Cartesius,* in *Philos. Monatshefte,* October 1, 1869; Sainte-Beuve, *Causeries du Lundi,* 7:41 sq.; Mennechet, *Litirature Moderne* (Paris, 1857, 12mo), 4:125-143; and the excellent article in the *Edinburgh Cyclop.* s.v.

Montesquieu-Fezensac, De, Francois Xavier Marc Antoine, abbe

a French ecclesiastic, was born near Auch in 1757. He was a deputy from the clergy of Paris to the States-General in 1789, and was twice elected president of the National Assembly. During the Reign of Terror he took refuge in England, but after the second Restoration returned to his native country and was made a duke, receiving the title 6f minister of state. He died in 1832. See Guizot, *Memoires.*

Monteth (or Monteith, or even Montieth), Robert

a Scotch priest, who was chaplain of cardinal de Retz and a canon of Notre Dame, flourished near the middle of the 17th century. He wrote mainly works on secular history. See Allibone, *Dict. of British and American Authors,* s.v.

Monteverde, Claudio

an Italian composer, was born at Cremona about 1565, and died at Venice in 1649. He composed both secular and ecclesiastical music, but was

particularly celebrated for his motets and madrigals; of the latter he produced five books.

Montfaucon, Bernard De

one of the learned Benedictines of Saint-Maur, noted for his valuable antiquarian labors, was born January 17, 1655, of a high family of Soulage, in Languedoc. He early evinced great facility for acquiring languages, and a remarkable love of study. He was educated at the College of Limoux, but threw aside his books, and in 1672 entered the army, and served in several campaigns under Turenne. After the death of his parents, he joined the Benedictines at Toulouse in 1675. His time was now largely employed in correcting the Latin translations of the Greek Church historians. Dom Claude Martin, to whom he communicated his work, pointed him out to his superiors as a man of great capacity, and particularly fitted to take a part in the publication of the Greek fathers contemplated by the Congregation of St. Maur. He was consequently called to Paris in 1687. The following year he published his *Analecta sive varia opuscula Graeca* (Paris, 1844, 4to), which contains also some lives of saints. In 1690 he published *La verite de l'histoire de Judith* (2d ed. Paris, 1692, 12mo), in which, with a great deal of historical talent, he attempts to establish the authenticity of the facts related in that narrative against the opinion of those who consider it as a fable or a parable. But his reputation rests chiefly on the part he took in the publication of the works of the fathers. He first gave Athanasius (Paris, 1698, 3 volumes, folio), revised by means of the MSS. of Paris and of the Vatican, with a new Latin translation; the third volume contains the. doubtful and spurious works. With this is connected the *Collectio nova patrum et scriptorum Graecorum* (Par. 1707, 2 volumes, fol.). In this work Montfaucon gives, besides an excellent biography of Athanasius, some newly discovered works of that father, those of Eusebius of Caesarea, and the *Topographia Christiana* of the Egyptian monk Cosmas Indicopleustes. The critical tact and acumen, the extensive learning, and the thorough linguistic knowledge which Montfaucon evinced in these works, led his superiors to intrust him also with the publication of the works of Chrysostom. As the MSS. at Paris were insufficient, he was sent to Rome to consult the codices of that city. Innocent XII showed him the greatest regard, while one of the librarians of the Vatican, out of jealousy, defamed and persecuted him. He refused high offices which were opened to him at Rome, and devoted himself exclusively to his studies. The pope and cardinals were lavish in their attentions and Montfaucon, during the

intervals of his ecclesiastical functions, gave frequent and unequivocal proofs of the learning which he possessed and was anxious to augment. It is related that Zacagni, then sublibrarian of the Vatican, feeling his vanity wounded by the praise bestowed on this accomplished foreigner, laid several schemes to lower him in the public estimation. One day while Montfaucon, among a crowd of distinguished persons, happened to be sauntering in the library, Zacagni, with affected politeness, requested the antiquary to favor him with the date of a Greek manuscript which he spread out before him. Montfaucon replied that apparently it was written about 700 years ago. His antagonist, with a triumphant sneer, desired him to observe the name of Basil, the Macedonian, written at the top. The Frenchman asked if it were not Basil Porphyrogenitus, later by 150 years; and as this, upon examination, proved to be the case, Zacagni retired with his manuscript, and thenceforth left the stranger at peace. After his return to Paris Montfaucon published the *Hexapla* of Origen (1713, 2 volumes, fol.), with variations, notes, and introductory remarks not only on the, work itself, but on the general history of the Greek versions of the Bible. His next publication was an edition of the works of Chrysostom (Par. 1718 sq., 13 volumes, fol.; Venice, 1780,14 volumes, 4to). Montfaucon had consulted the French, Roman, English, and German codices; the text was accompanied by a new Latin translation, a biography of Chrysostom, numerous notes, and an introduction to each separate work. This is universally pronounced one of the chef-d'oeuvres of the Maurines, and the best edition of this Church father. Some time previous to this Montfaucon had published another valuable work, *Le Livre de Philon de la Vie Contemplative* (Par. 1709, 12mo), with notes, and an attempt to prove that the Therapeutse of whom Philo speaks were Christians; and in 1710 an *Epistola* on the fact mentioned by Rufinus that St. Athanasius baptized children when himself a child. In 1719 he gave to the world a great work on the history of art, entitled, *L'Antiquit expliquee et Representee en Figures;* and in 1729 *Les Monuments de la Monarchie Francaise.* His last but not least important work is his *Bibliotheca Bibliothecarum MSS. nova* (Par. 1739, 2 volumes, fol.)! He died suddenly at the abbey of Saint-Germain-des-Pres, December 21, 1741. He was chosen a member of the Academy of Inscriptions in 1719, and contributed many papers to this and other learned bodies. Montfaucon was celebrated for the mildness and benignity of his character. Neither the favors which he had received from an emperor, nor the honors with which he was decorated by two successive popes, could at all abate his humility; and strangers who

conversed with him returned not more surprised at the amazing extent of his information than at the unpretending simplicity of his manners. Of an author who has left 44 volumes, folio, it may be expected that elegance will not be a characteristic; and, accordingly, Montfaucon's writings are blamed for their cumbrous style and defective arrangement. But his erudition, a quality more befitting such pursuits, has never been called in question; and his works are still looked up to as guides through that obscure and intricate department of knowledge which he devoted his life to study. See *Edinburgh Cyclop.* s.v.; Tassin, *Histoire litteraire de la Congreigation de St. Maur,* page 591 sq.; Fabricius, *Bibl. Graeca,* 13:849; *Eloge de Montfaucon,* in the *Hist. de l'Acad. des Inscriptions,* volume 16; *Gentleman's Magazine* (December 1855), page 572. (J.H.W.)

Montferrat

formerly an independent duchy of Italy, between Piedmont, Milan, and Genoa, and consisting of two separate portions, Casale and Acqui, lying between the Maritime Alps and the Po, and having an area of over 1300 square miles, with its capital at Casale, is now incorporated in the kingdom of Italy. Montferrat, after the downfall of the Frankish empire, was ruled by its own margraves till the beginning of the 14th century. This illustrious house for a long time disputed the sovereignty of Piedmont with the house of Savoy, and sent to the Crusades more heroes than any other sovereign house in Europe. Members of the family ruled simultaneously in Montferrat, Thessaly, and Jerusalem. On the death of the marquis John I in 1305, his sister, Iolande or Irene, who was empress of Constantinople, succeeded to Montferrat; and her second son became the founder of the family of Montferrat-Palaeologus, which became extinct in 1533, when Montferrat passed to the Gonzagas of Mantua. In 1631 the dukes of Savoy obtained possession of a portion of the territory, and in 1703, with the consent of the German emperor, the remaining portion passed under their sway, and was incorporated with their own dominions. The cession of Savoy to France after the war of 1869 placed Montferrat for a while under French rule, but after the conflict between Germany and France in 1870 Italy gained back this territory, and it now forms a part of the united kingdom. The ecclesiastical history is detailed in the article ITALY.

Montfiquet, Raoul De

a noted French writer on asceticism, was born in the village of Montfiquet, near Bayeux, towards the close of the 15th century. He was a doctor of theology, and enjoyed great distinction among his fellows. He died about 1520. His works, which are much sought after by bibliographers on account of their antiquity, are, *Tractatus de vera, reali atque mirabili existentia totius Christi* (Paris, 1481, fol.): — *Le Livre ou Traicte du sainct sacrement de l'autel* (Paris, 1500, 4to): — *Exposition de l'Oraison Dominicale* (Paris, 1485, 4to): — *Exposition de l'Ave Maria* (Paris, 4to): — *Le Guidon et Gouvernment des gens mariez, traitie singulier du sainct sacrement, estat et fruit du mariage* (Paris, about 1520, 4to). See Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Generale,* s.v.

Montfort, Simon De

a bold, merciless, and superstitidus, but devoted follower of the papacy, was descended from the counts of Montfort, near Paris. He was born about the middle of the 12th century. His career dates from the year 1199, when he appears as a leader in the Crusade of Cery, where he was associated with Rainald de Montmirail, Garnier, bishop of Troyes. Walther of Brienne, and the marshal of Champagne, Geoffroy of Villehardouin, and others. The crusade set forth October 8, 1202. A bargain had been previously made with the Venetians, by which the latter agreed to furnish "ships and other conveniences to pass the sea." When the time for embarkation arrived, the Crusaders were lacking 34,000 marks of the stipulated price. The "wise old doge" saw his advantage, and proposed that Venice would fulfil her part of the treaty if, in discharge of the 34,000 marks of silver, the Crusaders would lend their aid in the conquest of Zara. After much hesitation, the plan was acceded to by all but De Montfort. "We are Christians; we war not against our brother Christians," said he. " His object in assuming this position," says Villehardouin, "was to break up the misguided army." After the capture of Zara, the Crusaders advanced to Constantinople for the purpose of placing young Alexius on the throne. The pope denounced the design. He excommunicated the Venetians; but of this no one took the slightest heed, except De Montfort. He, with his brother and a few French knights, separated themselves from the camp of the Crusaders, passed over to the king of Hungary, and, amid many difficulties, made for the Holy Land to fulfil his vows to the Church. He finally, however, returned home, and after a short rest took up arms again

at the summons of pope Innocent III, and in the summer of 1209 he was made leader of the crusade against the Albigenses. Under his guidance and that of the pope's legate, Amaury, abbot of Citeaux, the crusading army marched into Languedoc and besieged the town of Bdziers, which was stormed July 22, 1209. A horrible massacre ensued. One of the superior officers inquired of the abbot of Citeaux how they were to distinguish the heretics from the faithful: "Slay them all!" returned the savage Churchman, "for the Lord knoweth those that are his." Not a living soul was spared. It is said that fifteen thousand people were thus mercilessly slaughtered in this one place. Carcassone was scarcely better treated; and at Lavaur the ferocious deeds of Montfort made his name a byword of tyranny and cruelty. In 1210 De Montfort was invested by Peter of Aragon with the viscounty of Beziers and Carcassone. Peter designed, no doubt, in this way to conciliate De Montfort, and protect his (Peter's) kinsmen from the rapacity and savagery of De Montfort. He was, however, disappointed, and in 1213 Peter crossed the Pyrenees with a force superior to that of Simon to protect his own. Yet Simon, impressed with a fanatical conviction that God would give him the victory, confessed his sins, made his will, placed his sword upon the altar, and declared that he took it back from God to fight his battles, and at the battle of Muret defeated and slew Peter and the larger part of his army. After the battle of Muret, the progress and success of the Crusaders were uninterrupted. Toulouse was taken in 1215. De Montfort was chosen prince of the whole subjugated territory; a strict inquisition after heretics was ordered, and the Church of Rome, pleased with the faithfulness of her servant Simon, at a Council of the Lateran, November, 1215 (styled the twelfth General Council), confirmed him in all his conquests. On his return to Northern France, he was received with the greatest honor as the champion of the faith, and hailed with acclamations: "Blessed is he that cometh in the name of the Lord!" The remaining years of the life of De Montfort were consumed in a bloody struggle to maintain his ascendency over the territory he had subdued. During the year 1216 the people, under the leadership of the younger count Raymond, broke out in general insurrection. But success still followed De Montfort. He with his army sacked Toulouse, and plundered the inhabitants to the very last piece of cloth or measure of meal. "Oh, noble city of Toulouse!" exclaims the troubadour, "thy very bones are broken!" The ensuing year the war with the young count Raymond continued to the advantage of De Montfort, till suddenly the old count Raymond appeared before Toulouse. The city received him with the utmost joy. New walls were built and new

fortifications raised. It was in the siege of this place that De Montfort lost his life, June 25, 1218; when heading an attack, a stone from an engine struck on the head the champion of Jesus Christ (as he was called by his admirers), and he died on the spot. His fanatical followers reproached God with his death. A monkish historian adds also that he received five wounds from arrows; and in this respect likens him to the Redeemer, "in whose cause he died, and with whom we trust he is in bliss and glory." A daring and skilful leader; chivalric, affable, and popular; enthusiastically devout and fanatically attached to Romanism; ambitious, unscrupulous, and remorseless, he naturally rose to the position of guiding spirit in the turbulent times in which he lived and the cruel war in which he engaged. See Milman, *Hist. of Latin Christianity; Chronique de Simon, Comte de Montfort* (printed in Guizot's *Memoires relatifs a l'Histoire de France);* Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Generale,* 36:246-257; and the histories of the *Albigenses* (q.v.).

Montfort Manuscript

Picture for Montfort Manuscript

(CODEX MONTFORTIANUS, known as MS. 61 of the Gospels, 34 of the Acts, 40 of the Pauline Epistles, and 92 of Revelation), so named from a Cambridge divine of the 17th century, who gave it to archbishop Usher, by whom it was presented to Trinity College, Dublin, in the library of which it still remains (there designated as G. 97); an octavo cursive Greek MS. of the entire N.T., written in the 15th or 16th century, on 455 paper leaves, and famous as containing the text of "the three heavenly witnesses" (1 John 5:7, that leaf being *glazed* to preserve it from injury). An earlier owner was William Clap, once a fellow of Cambridge, who derived it from Thomas Clement, and originally it belonged to one Froy, a Franciscan friar. It is apparently the work of three or four successive scribes, perhaps in part at first independent of each other; and the Apocalypse bears marks of having been copied from the Codex Leicestrensis. It is doubtless the "Codex Britannicus" referred to by Erasmus as his sole authority for inserting the above disputed text in his edition of 1522, in accordance with a promise he had made to his detractors that if a single Greek MS. could be found containing it he would add it. *SEE WITNESSES, THE THREE HEAVENLY*. It has the Ammonian sections, and the number of verses noted at the end of the MS., with the Latin division of chapters. There are many corrections by a more recent hand, erasures of the pen, etc. An

imperfect collation of it, while in Usher's hands, was printed in Walton's *Polyglot.* Dr. Banet collated the remainder for his edition of the Dublin palimpsest Z, and more recently Dr. Dobbin has published a complete collation *(The Codex Montfortianus,* etc., Lond. 1854). See Tregelles, in Horne's *Introd.* 4:218 sq.; Scrivener, *Introd. to N.T.* page 149. *SEE MANUSCRIPTS, BIBLICAL.*

Montgaillard, Bernard de

also known as *Petit Feuillant,* a Roman Catholic ecclesiastic noted for his great talent in pulpit oratory, but especially for the part he bore in the Roman Catholic intrigues against the Huguenots, was born at Montgaillard, in the diocese of Toulouse, in 1563. He commenced as a Feuillant. or mendicant friar, in 1579, and began to preach immediately, though he had not studied divinity. He preached at Rieux, Rhodes, and Toulouse with so much success that they applied to him this passage in Holy Writ, "Happy is the womb which bare thee." He went to France at the time when Henry III drew the Feuillants thither, and so charmed the French court with his sermons that the king and queen-mother appointed him to preach upon several particular occasions. Here he acquired the reputation of the most eminent preacher that had been known in the memory of man — so great were his talents for the pulpit, especially in moving the passions and subduing the heart. He condemned himself to so austere a way of life among the Feuillants that the pope commanded him to quit that order, lest he should shorten his days by it. He behaved himself furiously in supporting the interest of the League, and bore a considerable part in the horrible crimes of that villainous combination. "The preachers," says Maimbourg *(Hist. de la Ligue,* 54, 3:295), "of whom the most noted were father Bernard de Montgaillard, surnamed the Petit Feuillant, and the famous Cordelier Feuardent, who preached in the parishes of Paris during the Christmas holidays, changed their sermons into invectives against the sacred person of the king," etc. Montgaillard is charged with having been instrumental in inflaming the rebellious elements of his day, and with having suborned an assassin to murder Henry IV. Montgaillard died in 1628. He was at that time abbe of Orval. Such a saint as Montgaillard, and one who had done such singular services to the holy Church must needs have possessed qualities above the usual standard, and therefore the writers of his life have not hesitated to assert that God performed great miracles both in his favor and by his means. See Bayle, *Dict. Hist.* s.v.; *Genesis Biogr. Dict.* s.v.

Montgaillard, Jean Jacques de

a French monastic, noted as a writer on religious topics, was born in 1633 at Toulouse, and early entered the Dominican order in his native place. He died there March 21, 1711. He is the author of a curious work entitled, *Monumnenta Conventus Tolosani ordinis F.F. Predicatorum* (Toul. 1693, fol.), which contains much valuable material for the history of the Inquisition in that district of France. Himself a devoted Romanist, and believing the harshest measures of the Inquisition justifiable in behalf of religion, he does not withhold anything, however barbarous or outrageous, and his work contains many a page presenting a most ghastly spectacle of inhumanity perpetrated by misguided fanatics.

Montgaillard, Pierre Jean Francois de

a French prelate, brother of the preceding, was born at Toulouse, March 29, 1633, and was educated at Paris, where he entered the Sorbonne, by which high school he was created doctor. He entered holy orders, and soon rose to positions of ecclesiastical distinction. In 1664 he was made bishop of Saint-Pons, and distinguished himself by great liberality of sentiment as well as religious devotion. He was one of the nineteen bishops who signed a petition to pope Clement IX for the pardon of the bishops of Alet, Passiers, Beauvais, and Angers, who had opposed the doctrines espoused in the papal bull issued by Alexander VII to defend the Jesuits and their tenets and practices. He also afterwards defended persecuted ecclesiastics against the Jesuits, whose immorality he unhesitatingly denounced. He was so severe that he was branded as a Jansenist, but there is proof extant that he freed himself from the imputation of disloyalty to the Church of Rome. He died March 13, 1713. He was well versed in archaeological studies, and noted for his valuable attainments in ancient ecclesiastical history. His works are of a controversial nature, and of value only to those interested in the Jansenist controversy. A list of them is given by Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Generale,* 36:265, 266.

Montgomery, Alexander

a Presbyterian minister, was born in Westfield, N.Y., in 1808. He graduated at Amherst College, Mass., in 1837; studied theology first in Union Seminary, New York City, and afterwards in Auburn Seminary, N.Y.; was licensed by Hampden Congregational Association, Mass., and ordained in 1839 as pastor of Maryville Church, N.Y., where he remained

until he removed West, and joined the Presbytery of Chicago, and was agent for some time. He finally settled at Beaver Dam, Wisconsin, where he labored until his death, February 18, 1859. Mr. Montgomery was an earnest Christian, a good theologian, and a fervent preacher. See Wilson, *Presb. Hist. Almanac,* 1868, page 121.

Montgomery, Henry Eglinton, D.D.

a noted clergyman of the Protestant Episcopal Church, was born in Philadelphia December 9, 1820; was educated at the University of Pennsylvania, class of 1839; studied law for two years; travelled in Europe, and then continued his studies in Nashotah College, in Wisconsin. After remaining there two years, he entered the general theological seminary at New York. He was ordained for the holy ministry by bishop Alonzo Potter, and in 1846 assumed charge of All-Saints' Church of Philadelphia, then a small organization. His labors were very successful; the Church-membership rapidly increased, and the pastor became highly respected and beloved. In 1855 he received and accepted a call to the Church of the Incarnation of New York, which was an offshoot of and dependent upon Grace Church, and which worshipped in the edifice at the corner of Madison Avenue and Twenty-eighth Street. During the earlier years of his ministry in New York he was able to separate his church from Grace Church; and so efficient and satisfactory was his work that in 1864 a new church building was erected at Madison Avenue and Thirty-fifth Street. His labors were identified with it until his sudden decease, October 15, 1874. Dr. Montgomery was a man of acknowledged ability, and of more than ordinary endurance. He was always a hard worker; he had no assistant in his ministry, and, besides the constant demands upon his strength made by a growing Church, he had for years been a prominent member of nearly all the missionary and home societies for the advancement of the Gospel. The Missionary Society, which was in session when his death occurred, paid him a very warm and merited tribute through bishop Vail on October 15, 1874. See *The Church Journal and Gospel Messenger,* October 22, 1874.

Montgomery, James (1), D.D.

a clergyman of the Protestant Episcopal Church, was born in Philadelphia November 25, 1787, and was educated at Princeton College, where he graduated in 1815. After practicing law for a short time, he prepared for holy orders; was ordained in 1816, and elected rector of St. Michael's, N.J.

In 1818 he became rector of Grace Church, New York, and subsequently removed to St. Stephen's, Philadelphia, where he held several important offices, and devoted himself to his ministry with much earnestness till his death, March 17, 1834. His works are five *Sermons,* issued at different times. See Sprague, *Annals of the Amer. Pulpit,* 5:596.

Montgomery, James (2)

one of the greatest of English hymnologists, was born at Irvine, in Ayrshire, Scotland, November 4, 1771. His parents were Irish — his father a Moravian preacher. James was designed for the same office, and in his sixth year was placed in the Moravian establishment at Fulneck, near Leeds, England. While here his parents went as missionaries to the West Indies, where they soon died. To their fate he thus beautifully alludes:

"My father-mother-parents, are no more!
Beneath the lion-star they sleep,
Beyond the Western deep;
And when the sun's noon glory crests the waves,
He shines without a shadow on their graves."

Left to himself, he refused to study for the ministry, and the Brethren placed him as an apprentice to a grocer in Mirfield. He disliked the drudgery of the shop, wrote verses, and at length ran away, with three shillings and sixpence in his pocket. He was soon compelled by necessity to engage as a shopboy in the village of Wath, in Yorkshire. He remained there but a year, and then, intent upon publishing a volume of verses, went up to London, and introduced himself to one of the Brethren in Paternoster Row, and gained employment as clerk and general assistant; but he could get no one to undertake publishing his poetry. In eight months we find him back again at Wath. In his twenty-first year he went to Sheffield as clerk to the editor of the *Sheffield Register;* and when, two years afterwards, a political prosecution was instituted against the editor, Montgomery succeeded him in the management of the paper, changing its name to that of *The Iris.* The tone of his paper was very temperate, but firm. At that time the quailing cause of arbitrary power and divine right was making its last struggles against freedom and commonsense. Notwithstanding the moderation of our poeteditor, it was not long before the hands of the officers of the law were upon him. The publication of a song written by a clergyman to commemorate the destruction of the Bastile, which had been printed in half the newspapers in the kingdom, was made the pretence of

fining Montgomery £20 and imprisoning him three months in the Castle of York. On his deliverance from his incarceration he resumed his editorial labors, and avoided every extreme in politics; but in giving a narrative of the circumstances attending the death of two men killed in a riot in the streets of Sheffield by the military, a volunteer officer, who was also a magistrate, feeling his honor wounded by the statement, presented him for libel. The result was another fine of £30, and imprisonment for six months. During his confinement, in 1796, he wrote his poems entitled *Prison Amusements.* He now became a regular contributor to magazines, and, despite adverse criticism in the *Edinburgh Review* (January 1807, pages 347-355; comp. however, July 1835, page 473), established his right to rank as a poet. (See the defence by Southey in [Lond.] *Qu. Rev.* 6:405 sq., and by Wilson in *Blackwood's Magazine,* September 1831, page 476.) In 1805 he issued *The Ocean;* in 1806, *The Wanderer of Switzerland, and other Poems;* and the next year *The West Indies* — this last meeting in its various editions with a most extraordinary patronage. In 1813 appeared *The World before the Flood;* in 1819, *Greenland;* and in 1827 *The Pelican Island,* the most original and powerful of all Montgomery's works. He now also collected two volumes of his sketches from periodicals, entitled *Prose by a Poet. A Poet's Portfolio* appeared in 1835. In 1830-31 he delivered a course of lectures on poetry and general literature, which were afterwards published in one volume. His collected works appeared in 1851 (1 volume, 8vo).

But it is with the poet as a writer of hymns and sacred songs that we have most to do, as it is by these that he has most endeared himself to his age, and will be longest and most favorably remembered. In 1822 he published his *Songs of Zion, being Imitations of Psalms.* This work consisted of sixty-seven pieces, being versions of fifty-nine Psalms, closely as well as beautifully rendered. In 1828 he published his *Christian Psalmist,* containing 103 original hymns; in 1853, *Original Hymns for Public, Private, and Social Devotion.* Judged by the use made of these hymns by the Christian world, Montgomery takes his place next to Watts and Wesley, in compare with Doddridge. This place we think he has well earned. What Advent song surpasses for comprehensiveness, appropriateness of expression, force, and elevation of sentiment, this one beginning "Angels from the realms of glory?" What a glorifying of God and his work from eternity to eternity is found in this hymn, " Songs of praise the angels sang!" Will the time ever come on earth when the Church will

not respond to "Stand up and bless the Lord, ye people of his choice?" or cease to look forward with anticipations of victory in the "Hark, the song of jubilee?" or forbear to encourage one another with "Daughter of Zion, from the dust?" or fail to use "Oh, where shall rest be found?" What a spirit of Christian love, mingled with hope drawn from the deepest truths of our faith, flows through the invitation, "Come to Calvary's holy mountain;" and a reaching out of the right hand of fellowship in this, "Come in, thou blessed of the Lord!"

In a letter written in 1807 Montgomery gives us the history of his hymnological efforts. "When I was a boy," he says, "I wrote a great many hymns; indeed, the first-fruits of my mind were all consecrated to Him who never despises the day of small things, even in the poorest of his creatures. But as I grew up, and my heart degenerated, I directed my talents, such as they were, to other services; and seldom indeed, since my fourteenth year, have they been employed in the delightful duties of the sanctuary. Many conspiring and adverse circumstances that have confounded, afflicted, and discouraged my mind, have also compelled me to forbear from composing hymns of prayer and praise, because I found that I could not enter into the spirit of such divine themes with that humble boldness, that earnest expectation and ardent feeling of love to God and truth which were wont to inspire me when I was an uncorrupted boy, full of tenderness and zeal and simplicity." We have indicated here the main ground of the excellence and usefulness of his hymns. They are the offspring not only of a heart naturally sensitive to religious themes, but of a deep, rich, and varied Christian experience. They were lived before they were sung. From the experiences of the Christian life came their expression in Christian song; hence they are applicable to every believer's feelings, and touch unexpectedly the most secret springs of joy and sorrow, faith, fear, hope, love, despondency, and triumph. This was the reason for their success given by the author himself. When advanced in life and seriously ill, he placed in the hands of his friend, Dr. Holland, "transcripts of his original hymns to be read to him. But as the poet was much affected, the doctor was about to desist, when Montgomery said, 'Read on; I am glad to hear you. The words recall the feelings which first suggested them, and it is good for me to feel affected and humbled by the terms in which I have endeavored to provide for the expression of similar religious experience in others. As all my hymns embody some portion of the joys or sorrows, the hopes and fears of this poor heart, so I cannot doubt but that they will be

found an acceptable vehicle of expression of the experience of many of my fellow creatures who may be similarly exercised during the pilgrimage of their Christian life.'

From the fact that he was a layman in active and laborious business, he was less likely than some of his clerical brothers in song to make the hymn simply a doctrine in rhyme. While evangelical in faith, his hymns are always far more than doctrinal statement in verse. The rules which he laid down in the "Introductory Essay" to his *Christian Psalmist,* which should be adhered to in writing hymns, he has seldom failed to regard. "There should be," he says, "unity, gradation, and mutual dependence in the thoughts, a conscious progress, and at the end a sense of completeness," and he insists that hymns ought to be easy to understand. It may be said of his hymns without exception that there is nothing in them to offend the taste, and much to gratify it. The most precious truths of Scripture and the richest experiences of the Christian find in them simple but poetic expression; and they are made suitable for the use of congregations by a poet who was quite familiar with the requirements of an assembly of worshippers. As expressive of how important Mr. Montgomery deemed his last work, and of his high appreciation of the works of others, may be quoted part of the closing paragraph of his preface. He says: "Having on three former occasions expatiated freely on hymnology and sacred poesy, I will close this egotistical preamble to the most serious work of my long life (now passing fourscore years) with a brief quotation from what may be esteemed a sainted authority on such a subject. Bishop Ken somewhere says, beautifully, humbly, and poetically:

'And should the well-meant song I leave behind
With Jesus' lovers some acceptance find,
Twill heighten even the joys of heaven to know
That in my verse saints sing God's praise below.'"

His last years were passed in ease and comfort, he enjoying, besides the frugal earnings of an industrious life. from 1835 a pension from the government of £150 per annum. He died at his own residence near Sheffield, April 30, 1854. The London *Atheneum,* shortly after his death, thus spoke of him: "Montgomery held a place in the eyes of the English public — universal as well as sectarian — not far behind Campbell, by the side of Lisle Bowles and Milman, and before such lesser lights as Carrington and Crowe. This generation knows less than its predecessor of the poems of James Montgomery, of Sheffield. Some have adopted Pollok

as their religious poet elect; others have taken Keble as their bosom friend. But the author of 'The West Indies,' 'The World before the Flood,' and 'Greenland,' is still not forgotten, in spite of these shiftings of the shrine at which religious fashion chooses to burn its incense; and his vogue may one day return — the sooner because it was merited by the genuine gifts of the poet as well as by the eloquence of the class-preacher." *Memoirs of the Life and Writings of James Montgomery, with Extracts from his Correspondence,* etc., were published in 1855-6 (7 volumes, 8vo) by two of his friends, John Holland and James Everett. An abridgment of these Memoirs was published by Mrs. Helen C. Knight at Boston in 1857 (12mo, 416 pages). See *British and For. Ev. Rev.* volume 22; 43, 248; [Lond.] *Qu. Rev.* volume 11, art. 9; *North Amer. Rev.* (October 1857) page 563: *Livin Age,* 4, 370; 47, 282; Howitt. *Homes and Haunts of British Poets;* Wilson, *Essays, Crit. and Imag.* (1856) 2:238; and especially the excellent article in Allibone's *Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Auth.* 2:1345-47.

Montgomery, Robert

an Anglican clergyman, very noted especially as a writer of sacred poetry, was born at Bath, England, in 1807, and was educated at Lincoln College, Oxford, where he secured his A.B. in 1833, and A.M. in 1838. He took holy orders in 1835; became curate of Whittington, subsequently (1836) removed to London as minister of Percy Street Episcopal Chapel; afterwards went to Glasgow, where he preached for four years, but returned to London, and resumed functions at Percy Street Chapel in 1843, and there preached until his death, December 3, 1855. Montgomery's works comprise a large number of volumes in prose and verse, on themes more or less sacred. He is best known by his poem *The Omnipresence of the Deity* (1828), which has passed through twenty-eight editions, and *The Christian Life: a Manual of Sacred Verse* (1848,12mo; 6th edition, 1853, 24mo). The former of these provoked unusual severity of criticism — even lord Macaulay unmercifully poured his invectives against it: "His works have received more enthusiastic praise, and have deserved more unmixed contempt, than any which, as far as our knowledge extends, have appeared within the last three or four years... The circulation of this writer's poetry has been greater than that of Southey's *Roderick,* and beyond all comparison greater than that of Cary's *Dante,* or of the best works of Coleridge" (Macaulay, *Essays,* 1:257, 265-7, 269, 276). Nevertheless, as has been well said, the book must have pleased, or people would not have bought it in the face of such unfavorable comments. It must be stated also

that the work on its appearance met with the high commendations of those illustrious writers, Southey, Wilson, Alison, and Sharon Turner. Montgomery's *Christian Life* was generally commended; and some Anglican writers were most enthusiastic in its praise. The *Church of England Quarterly* (April 9, 1849, No. 50, page 286) pronounced it "far superior to anything else from the author; and, of all the uninspired collections of religious poetry which any poet has ever produced in any Church or age or country, there is none which, in our opinion, can venture a comparison — intellectual or poetical with Montgomery's *Christian Life."* A writer in the *Scottish Magazine* goes even further: "To eulogize this divine *now* as a successful Christian poet would be to offer an indignity to all who have the slightest knowledge of what is passing in the literary world. His *Omnipresence* long ago stamped him as one of our greatest poets... We must, however, express our honest conviction that the present volume manifests higher and more intrinsic beauties and excellences than any one of his previous poetic works. And what will very much enhance it in the opinion of all true Churchmen is the fact that it is a thoroughly *Church* volumebreathing and inculcating her scriptural and catholic verities, exhibiting her in the thrilling and beautiful expression of a fond and sacred mother, who lovingly cares and unweariedly provides for the spiritual wants and comforts of her children. While all these poems are fraught with deep truth and lofty sentiments, portraying in poetical form the Church's creed and character, the duties and dangers the hopes and fears, the faults, privileges, and final destinies of a believer in the religion of Christ,... we must declare that we have not read anything more beautiful and heavenly, more eloquent and pathetic, than the poems on 'Baptism,' 'Visitation of the Sick.' 'Burial of the Dead.' 'Commination,' and the 'Eucharist.' Nothing like this volume has appeared since the 'Christian Year,' whether we' consider its style and tone, its sentiments, the variety of its metres, or the harmony of its verse. It is a 'Voice of the Church,' a kind of second 'Christian Year.' A list of all his works is given by Allibone *(Diet. of Brit. and Amer. Auth.* 2:1348-9). We have room only for mention of his other religious works. Of those in verse: *A Universal Prayer, Death, Heaven, Hell* (1828, 4to, and often)*: Satan: or Intellect without God* (1830): — *The Messiah* (1832): — *Luther; or the Ideal of the Reformation* (1842): — The *Sacred Gift: a Series of Meditations upon Scripture Subjects* (1842): — *The Sanctuary: a Companion in Verse for the English Prayer-book* (1855). Of those in prose: *The Gospel in Advance of the Age: a homily for the Times, with an Introduction on the*

Spirit of the Bible and the Spirit of the Age (1st ed. 1847; 3d ed. revised and rearranged, with additional matter, etc., 1848, and often *since)*: — *The Ideal of the English Church* (1845): — *Christ our All in All* (1845): — *Eight Sermons: being Reflective Discourses on some Important Texts* (1843, 8vo): — *The Great Salvation, and our Sin in Neglecting it: a Religious Essay, in Three Parts* (1846): — *The Scottish Church, the English Schismatics* (1846; 3d ed. with documentary evidence, 1847, 12mo). A collected edition of his poetical works (in 6 volumes, 8vo) was published in 1839-40, and his *Christian Poetry,* by Ed. Farr, in 1854 (12mo). Selections from them were also made under the title, *Religion and Poetry, with an Introductory Essay by Archer Gurney* (1847, 8vo); and *Lyra Christiana* (1851, 32mo). See *Fraser's Magazine,* 1:95, 721; 4:672; *Westm. Rev.* 12:355; *Lond. Month. Rev.* 117, 30; 121, 313; *Blackwood's Magazine,* 23:751-71; 26:241 sq.; *Lond. Gentleman's Mag.* 1856, part 1:313; [Lond.] *Athenceum,* 1832, page 348; *South. Qu. Rev.* 2:290; *N.Y. Lit. and Theol. Review,* 1:688; Breen, *Mod. Eng. Lit.: its Blemishes and Defcts* (1857), page 206; Koenen, *Voorlozing over den Engelschen Dichter Rob. Montgomery* (Amst. 1853, 8vo); and the excellent and very full article in Allibone's *Dict, of Brit. and Amer. Auth.* s.v. (J.H.W.)

Montgomery, William B.

a missionary to the Osage Indians, who flourished in the early half of this century, died in 1834. He published a translation into the Osage language of various portions of Scripture.

Month

(usually ‫וחדש‬ *cho'desh,* i.e., *new* moon; later also ‫ירח‬ *ye'rach,* Chald. ‫ירח‬ *yerach';* Gr. μήν, etc.). The terms for ' month" and "moon" have the same close connection in the Hebrew language as in our own and in the Indo-European languages generally; we need only instance the familiar cases of the Greek μήν and μήνη, and the Latin *mensis;* the German *mond* and *amonat;* and the Sanscrit *malsa,* which answers to both month and moon. The Hebrew *chodesh* is perhaps more distinctive than the corresponding terms in other languages; for it expresses not simply the idea of a *lunation,* but the recurrence of a period commencing definitely with the *new moon;* it is derived from the word *chaddsh, "* new," which was transferred in the first instance to the "new moon," and in the second instance to the ' month," or, as it is sometimes more fully expressed, ‫חדש‬

vdj ρ"a month of days" (⁰¹²⁹⁴Genesis 29:14; ⁰⁴¹²⁰Numbers 11:20, 21; comp. ⁰⁵²¹³Deuteronomy 21:13; ¹²¹⁵¹³2 Kings 15:13). The term *yerach* is derived from *yareach,* "the moon;" it occurs occasionally in the historical (⁰⁰¹⁰²Exodus 2:2; ¹¹⁰⁵⁷1 Kings 6:37, 38; 8:2; ¹²¹⁵¹³2 Kings 15:13), but more frequently in the poetical portions of the Bible.

1. The most important point in connection with the month of the Hebrews is its length, and the mode by which it was calculated. The difficulties attending this inquiry are considerable, in consequence of the scantiness of the *datat.* Though it may fairly be presumed from the terms used that the month originally corresponded to a lunation, no reliance can be placed on the mere verbal argument to prove the exact length of the month in historical times. The word appears even in the earliest times to have passed into its secondary sense, as describing a period approaching to a lunation; for in ⁰¹⁰⁷¹Genesis 7:11; 8:4, where we first meet with it, equal periods of 30 days are described, the interval between the 17th days of the second and the seventh months being equal to 150 days (⁰¹⁰⁷¹Genesis 7:11; 8:3, 4). We have therefore in this instance an approximation to the solar month, and as, in addition to this, an indication of a double calculation by a solar and a lunar year has been detected in a subsequent date (for from 8:14, compared with 7:11, we find that the total duration of the flood exceeded the year by eleven days; in other words, by the precise difference between the lunar year of 354 days and the solar one of 365 days), the passage has attracted considerable attention on the part of certain critics, who have endeavored to deduce from it arguments prejudicial to the originality of the Bible narrative. It has been urged that the Hebrews themselves knew nothing of a solar month, that they must have derived their knowledge of it from more easterly nations (Ewald, *Jahrbiich.* 1854, page 8), and consequently that the materials for the narrative and the date of its composition must be referred to the period when close intercourse existed between the Hebrews and the Babylonians (Von Bohlen's *Introd. to* ⁰¹²¹⁵*Genesis* 2:155 sq.). It is unnecessary for us to discuss in detail the arguments on which these conclusions are founded; we submit in answer to them that the *data* are insufficient to form any decided opinion at all on the matter, and that a more obvious explanation of the matter is to be found in the Egyptian system of months. To prove the first of these points, it will be only necessary to state the various calculations founded on this passage: it has been deduced from it (1) that there were 12 months of 30 days each *SEE CHRONOLOGY*; (2) that there were 12 months of 30 days, with 5

intercalated days at the end to make up the solar year (Ewald, 1.c.); (3) that there were 7 months of 30 days, and 5 of 31 days (Von Bohlen); (4) that there were 5 months of 30 days, and 7 of 29 days (Knobel, *in* Genesis 8:1-3); or, lastly, it is possible to cut away the foundation of any calculation whatever by assuming that a period might have elapsed between the termination of the 150 days and the 17th day of the 7th month (Ideler, *Chronol.* 1:70). "The year being lunar, the interval is, in fact, but 148 days; the discrepancy, however, is of no account" (Browne, *Ordo Sceclorum,* page 326): both extremes are included, as is usual in Hebrew computations. *SEE DELUGE*. But, assuming that the narrative implies equal months of 30 days, and that the date given in 8:14 does involve the fact of a double calcullation by a solar and a lunar year, it is unnecessary to refer to the Babylonians for a solution of the difficulty. The month of 30 days was in use among the Egyptians at a period long anterior to the period of the exodus, and formed the basis of their computation either by an unintercalated year of 360 days or an intercalated one of 365 (Rawlinson's *Herodotus,* 2:283-286). Indeed, the Bible itself furnishes us with an indication of a double year, solar and lunar, in that it assigns the regulation of its length indifferently to both sun and moon (Genesis 1:14). *SEE YEAR*.

From the time of the institution of the Mosaic law downward the month appears to have been a lunar one. The cycle of religious feasts, commencing with the Passover, depended not simply on the month, but on the moon (Josephus, *Ant.* 3:10, 5); the 14th of Abib was coincident with the full moon (Philo, *Vit. Mos*. 3, page 686); and the new moons themselves were the occasions of regular festivals (Numbers 10:10; 28:11-14). The statements of the Talmudists (Mishna, *Rosh Hash.* 1-3) are decisive as to the practice in their time, and the lunar month is observed by the modern Jews. The commencement of the month was generally decided by observation of the new moon, which may be detected about forty hours after the period of its conjunction with the sun: in the later times of Jewish history this was effected according to strict rule, the appearance of the new moon being reported by competent witnesses to the local authorities, who then officially announced the commencement of the new month by the twice-repeated word "Mekuddash," i.e., *consecrated* (see Cudworth's *Intellectual System,* 2, Append. page 528). According to the rabbinical rule, however, there must at all times have been a little uncertainty beforehand as to the exact day on which the month would begin; for it

depended not only on the appearance, but on the announcement: if the important word *Mekuddash were* not pronounced until after dark, the following day was the first of the month — if before dark, then that day *(Rosh Hash.* 3:1). But we can hardly suppose that such a strict rule of observation prevailed in early times, nor was it in any way necessary; the recurrence of the new moon can be predicted with considerable accuracy by a calculation of the interval that would elapse either from the last new moon, from the full moon (which can be detected by a practiced eye), or from the disappearance of the waning moon. Hence David announces definitely "To-morrow is the new moon," that being the first of the month (⟨0205⟩1 Samuel 20:5, 24, 27), though the new moon could not as yet have been observed, and still less announced. Jahn *(Arch.* 3:3, § 352) regards the discrepancy of the dates in ⟨12527⟩2 Kings 25:27, and ⟨24531⟩Jeremiah 52:31, as originating in the different modes of computing by astronomical calculation and by observation. It is more probable that it arises from a mistake of a copyist, substituting ˆ for h, as a similar discrepancy exists in ⟨12519⟩2 Kings 25:19 and ⟨24525⟩Jeremiah 52:25, without admitting a similar explanation. The length of the month by observation would be alternately 29 and 30 days; nor was it allowed by the Talmudists that a month should fall short of the former or exceed the latter number, whatever might be the state of the weather. The months containing only 29 days were termed in Talmudical language *chaser* (רסֶּ), or "deficient," and those with 30 *nmal* (al מ), or "full."

The usual number of months in a year was twelve, as implied in ⟨10407⟩1 Kings 4:7; ⟨13701⟩1 Chronicles 27:1-15; but inasmuch as the Hebrew months coincided, as we shall presently show, with the seasons, it follows as a matter of course that an additional month must have been inserted about every third year. which would bring the number up to thirteen. No notice, however, is taken of this month in the Bible. We have no reason to think that the intercalary month was inserted according to any exact rule; it was sufficient for practical purposes to add it whenever it was discovered that the barley harvest did not coincide with the ordinary return of the month of Abib. In the modern Jewish calendar the intercalary month is introduced seven times in every 19 years, according to the Metonic cycle, which was adopted by the Jews about A.D. 360 (Prideaux's *Connection,* 1:209, note). At the same time the length of the synodical month was fixed by R. Hillel at 29 days, 12 hours, 44 minutes, and 3½ seconds, which accords very nearly with the truth.

2. The usual method of designating the months was by their numerical order, e.g. "the second month" (⟨0071⟩Genesis 7:11), "the fourth month" (⟨2258⟩2 Kings 25:3); and this was generally retained even when the names were given, e.g. "in the month Zif, which is the second month" (⟨1060⟩1 Kings 6:1); "' in the third month, that is, the month Sivan" (⟨7089⟩Esther 8:9). An exception occurs, however, in regard to Abib in the early portion of the Bible (⟨0234⟩Exodus 13:4; 23:15; ⟨5160⟩Deuteronomy 16:1), which is always mentioned, by name alone, inasmuch as it was necessarily coincident with a certain season, while the numerical order might have changed from year to year. We doubt indeed whether Abib was really a proper name. In the first place, it is always accompanied by the article, "the Abib," as an appellation (the season of the new ears of grain); in the second place, it appears almost impossible that it could have been superseded by Nisan if it had been regarded as a proper name, considering the important associations connected with it. The practice of the writers of the post-Babylonian period in this respect varied: Ezra, Esther, and Zechariah specify both the names and the numbered order; Nehemiah only the former; Daniel and Haggai only the latter. The names of the months belong to two distinct periods: in the first place we have those peculiar to the period of Jewish independence, of which four only, even including Abib, which we hardly regard as a proper name, are mentioned, viz.: Abib, in which the Passover fell (⟨0234⟩Exodus 13:4; 23:15; 34:18; ⟨5160⟩Deuteronomy 16:1), and which was established as the first month in commemoration of the exodus (⟨0212⟩Exodus 12:2); Zif, the second month (⟨1060⟩1 Kings 6:1, 37); Bul, the eighth (⟨1068⟩1 Kings 6:38); and Ethanim, the seventh (⟨1082⟩1 Kings 8:2) — the three latter being noticed only in connection with the building and dedication of the Temple, so that we might almost infer that their use was restricted to the official documents of the day, and that they never attained the popular use which the later names had. Hence it is not difficult to account for their having been superseded. In the second place we have the names which prevailed subsequently to the Babylonian captivity; of these the following seven appear in the Bible: Nisan, the first, in which the Passover was held (⟨6020⟩Nehemiah 2:1; ⟨7007⟩Esther 3:7); Sivan, the third (⟨7089⟩Esther 8:9; Bar. 1:8); Elul, the sixth (⟨6065⟩Nehemiah 6:15; 1 Macc. 14:27); Chisleu, the ninth (⟨6010⟩Nehemiah 1:1; ⟨3870⟩Zechariah 7:1; 1 Macc. 1:54); Tebeth, the tenth (⟨7026⟩Esther 2:16); Sebat, the eleventh (⟨3010⟩Zechariah 1:7; 1 Macc. 16:14); and Adar, the twelfth (⟨7007⟩Esther 3:7; 8:12; 2 Macc. 15:36). The names of the remaining five occur in the Talmud and other works; they were Iyar, the second (Targum, ⟨4302⟩2 Chronicles 30:2); Tammuz, the fourth (Mishna,

*Taan. 4:*5); Ab, the fifth, and Tisri, the seventh *(Rosh Hash.* i, 3); and Marchesvan, the eighth *(Taan.* 1:3; Josephus, *Ant.* 1:3, 3). The name of the intercalary month was Veadar, i.e., the *additional* Adar, because placed in the calendar after Adar and before Nisan. The opinion of Ideler *(Chronol.* 1:539) that the first Adar was regarded as the intercalary month, because the feast of Purim was held in Veadar in the intercalary year, has little foundation.

The first of these series of names is of Hebrew origin, and has reference to the characteristics of the seasons circumstance which clearly shows that the months returned at the same period of the year; in other words, that the Jewish year was a solar one. Thus Abib (אביב) was the month of" ears of corn," Zif the month of "blossom" (זו or זיו, or, more fully, as in the Targum, נץ אילן, "the bloom of flowers;" another explanation is given in Rawlinson's *Herodotus,* 1:622; viz. that Ziv is the same as the Assyrian *Giv,* "bull," and answers to the zodiacal sign of Taurus), and Bul the month of "rain" (בול; the name occurs in a recently discovered Phoenician inscription [Ewald, *Jathrb.* 1856, page 135]. A cognate term, מבול, is used for the "deliuge" [Genesis 6:17, etc.]; but there is no ground for the inference drawn by Von Bohlen *[Introd. to Genesis* 2:156] that there is any allusion to the month Bul). With regard to Ethanim there may be some doubt, as the usual explanation, "the month of violent or, rather, *incessant* rain," is decidedly inappropriate to the seventh month. Thenius, on 1 Kings 8:2, suggests that the true name was מתנא, as in the Sept. Ἀθανίμ, and that its meaning was the " month of gifts," i.e., of fruit, from נתן; "to give." There is the same peculiarity in this as in Abib. viz. the addition of the definite article (האתנים). In the second series, both origin and the meaning of the terms are controverted. It was the opinion of the Talmudists that the names were introduced by the Jews who returned from the Babylonian captivity (Jerusalem Talmud, *Rosh Hash.* 1:1), and they are certainly used exclusively by writers of the post-Babylonian period (see Benfey and Stern, *Monatsnamen einiger alter Vuolker,* Berlin, 1836). It was therefore perhaps natural to seek for their origin in the Persian language, and this was done some years since by Benfey *(Monatsnamen)* in a manner more ingenious than satisfactory. The view, though accepted to a certain extent by Gesenius in his *Thesaurus,* has since been abandoned, both on philological grounds and because it meets with no confirmation from the monumental documents of ancient Persia. The names of the

months, as read on the Behistun inscriptions, *Garmapada, Bagtayadish, Atriyata,* etc., bear no resemblance to the Hebrew names (Rawlinson's *Herodotus,* 2:593-6). The names are probably borrowed from the Syrians, in whose regular calendar we find names answering to Tisri, Sebat, Adar, Nisan, Iyar, Tammuz, Ab, and Elul (Ideler, *Chronol.* 1:430). The names of the Syrian months appear to have been in many instances of *local* use: for instance, the calendar of Heliopolis contains the names of Ag and Gelon (Ideler, 1:440), which do not appear in the regular Syrian calendar, while that of Palmyra, again, contains names unknown to either. Chisleu and Tebeth appear on the Palmyrene inscriptions (Gesenius, *Thesaur.* pages 702, 543). The resemblance in sound between Tebeth and the Egyptian Tobi, as well as its correspondence in the order of the months, was noticed by Jerome *(ad Ezek.* 39:1). Sivan may be borrowed from the Assyrials, who appear to have had a month so named, sacred to Sill or the moon (Rawlinson,1:615). Marchesvan, coinciding as it did with the rainy season in Palestine, was probably a purely Hebrew term. Von Bohlen connects it with the root *rachdsh* (ושׁחר), "to boil over" *(Introd. to* Genesis 2:157). The modern Jews consider it a compound word, *mar,* "drop," and *Cheshvan,* the former betokening that it was wet, and the latter being the proper name of the month (De Sola's *Mishna,* page 168, note). With regard to the meaning of the Syrian names we can only conjecture from the case of Tammuz, which undoubtedly refers to the festival of the deity of that name mentioned in Ezekiel 8:14, that some of them may have been derived from the names of deities. We draw attention to the similarity between Elul and the Arabic name of Venus Urania, *Alil-at* (Herod. 3:8); and again between Adar, the Egyptian Athor, and the Syrian Atargatis. Hebrew roots are suggested by Gesenius for others, but without much confidence. The Hebrew forms of the names are: ˆsynærYaæêwysæzWMTj ba; lWl æ, wræeTǽwv] rjhi wl sKætbǣefbv] rdạ} and rdaw]

Subsequently to the establishment of the Syro-Macedonian empire, the use of the Macedonian calendar was gradually adopted for the purpose of literature or intercommunication with other countries. Josephus, for instance, constantly uses the Macedonian months, even where he gives the Hebrew names (e.g. in *Ant.* 1:3, 3, he identifies Marchesvan with Dius, and Nisan with Xanthicus, and in 7:7, 6, Chisleu with Appelleus). The only instance in which the Macedonian names appear in the Bible is in 2 Macc. 11:30, 33, 38, where we have notice of Xanthicus in combination with another named Dioscorinthius (verse 21), which does not appear in the

Macedonian calendar. Various explanations have been offered with respect to the latter. Any attempt to connect it with the Macedonian Dius fails on account of the interval being too long to suit the narrative, Dius being the first and Xanthicus the sixth month. The opinion of Scaliger *(Emend. Temp.* 2:94) that it was the Macedonian intercalary month rests on no foundation whatever, and Ideler's assumption that that intercalary month preceded Xanthicus must be rejected along with it *(Chronol.* 1:399). It is most probable that the author of 2 Macc. or a copyist was familiar with the Cretan calendar, which contained a month named Dioscurus, holding the same place in the calendar as the Macedonian Dystrus (Ideler, 1:426), i.e., immediately before Xanthicus, and that he substituted one for the other. This view derives some confirmation from the Vulgate rendering, *Dioscorus.* We have further to notice the reference to the Egyptian calendar in 3 Macc. 6:38, Pachon and Epiphi in that passage answering to Pachons and Epep, the ninth and eleventh months (Wilkinson, *Anc. Egyp.* 1:14, 2d ser.).

3. The identification of the Jewish months with our own cannot be effected with precision on account of the variations that must inevitably exist between the lunar and the solar month, each of the former ranging over portions of two of the latter. It must therefore be understood that the following remarks apply to the general identity on an average of years. As the Jews still retain the names Nisan, etc., it may appear at first sight needless to do more than refer the reader to a modern almanac, and this would have been the case if it were not evident that the modern Nisan does not correspond to the ancient one. We are indebted to J.D. Michaelis for discovering the true state of this case, after the rabbinical writers had so universally established an erroneous opinion that it has not even yet disappeared from our popular books. His dissertation, "De Mensibus Hebraeorum" (in his *Commentationes per annos* 1763-68 *oblatae* [Bremen, 1769], page 16; translated by W. Bowyer, Lond. 1773; also in the *Critica Biblica* [London, 1827], 3:324-340), proceeds on the following chief arguments: First, that if the first month began with the new moon of *March,* as was commonly asserted, the climate of Palestine would not in that month permit the oblation of the sheaf of barley, which is ordered on the second day of the Paschal Feast (Leviticus 23:10); nor could the harvest be finished before the Feast of Weeks, which would then fall in May; nor could the Feast of Tabernacles, which was after the gathering of all fruits, accord with the month of September, because all these feasts

depend on certain stages in the agricultural year, which, as he shows from the observations of travellers, solely coincide with the states of vegetation which are found, in that climate, in the months of April, June, and October. This has been confirmed by later accounts; for the barley harvest does not take place even in the warm district about Jericho till the middle of April, and in the upland districts not before the end of that month (Robinson's *Researches,* 1:551; 3:102, 145). Secondly, that the Syrian calendar, which has essentially the same names for the months, makes its Nisan absolutely parallel with our April. Lastly, that Josephus *(Ant.* 2:14, 6) synchronizes Nisan with the Egyptian Pharmuth, which commenced on the 27th of March (Wilkinson, 1.c.), and with the Macedonian Xanthicus, which answers generally to the early part of April, though considerable variation occurs in the local calendars as to its place (comp. Ideler, 1:435, 442). He further informs us (3:10, 5) that the Passover took place when the sun was in Aries, which it does not enter until near the end of March. Michaelis concludes that the later Jews fell into this departure from their ancient order either through some mistake in the intercalation, or because they wished to imitate the Romans, whose year began in March. Ideler says, "So much is certain, that in the time of Moses the month of ears cannot have commenced before the first days of our April, which was then the period of the vernal equinox" *(Handbuch der Chronologie,* 1:490). As Nisan, then, began with the new moon of April, we have a scale for fixing the commencement of all the other months with reference to our calendar; and we must accordingly date their commencement one whole month later than is commonly done: allowing, of course, for the circumstance that, as the new moon varies in its place in our solar months, the Jewish months will almost invariably consist of portions of two of ours. For the details of each month, *SEE CALENDAR, JEWISH*. See, in addition to the treatises above noticed, Langenberg, *De mense ve. terun Hebrceorum lunari* (Jen. 1713). *SEE CHRONOLOGY*.

Monthly Meeting

SEE MEETING.

Montholon, Jean De

a French ecclesiastic, was born at Autun near the middle of the 15th century. At an early age he received the degree of doctor of laws, and was registered among the regular canons of St. Victor, at Paris. His theological

learning and his superior attainments in jurisprudence rapidly advanced his name among his fellows, and he was finally promoted to the cardinalship by pope Clement VII. Montholon died in Paris in 1528. His works are: *Promptuarium sen Brevitarium Juris divini et utriusque humani* (Paris, 1520, 2 volumes, fol.): — *De sacramento altaris* (ibid, 1517, 8vo).

Month's Mind

is the name by which is designated an office performed for the period of one month, in the Romish Church, for her dead. "Mind" in that case is used in its old sense of *memory,* as in the phrases "to call to mind," "time out of mind."

Monthyon (or Montyon), Antoine Jean Baptiste Robert Auget

a French baron, celebrated for his great philanthropic labors and munificent endowments of humanitarian institutions, was born at Paris December 23 or 26, 1733. He was successively intendant of the provinces of Provence, Auvergne, and Aunis; and, as a member of the royal council, opposed the unlawful proceedings resorted to in the case of Lachalotais, and protested against the dissolution of ancient parliaments decreed by chancellor Maupeon. In consequence of this latter act he was deprived of his office. Soon after the accession of Louis XVI he was appointed councillor of state; became, in 1780, chancellor of the count d'Artois (afterwards Charles X); emigrated to England on the breaking out of the French Revolution, and did not return to France until the second restoration. He possessed a princely fortune, and devoted the larger portion not only of his income, but also of his capital, to philanthropic purposes. He generously assisted his exiled countrymen, and bequeathed to French hospitals over 3,000,000 francs. As early as 1782 he had founded a prize for virtue, and several other prizes, to be awarded by the French Academy and the Academy of Sciences. These having been suppressed by order of the Convention, were renewed by the donor on his return to France in 1816, and afterwards increased. Every year the French Academy distributes two Monthvon prizes of 10,000 francs each: one to the poor person who has performed the most meritorious deed of virtue, the other to the author of the work which has been judged the most useful for the improvement of public morals. Two others, of equal amount, are awarded by the Academy of Sciences: one to him who shall have found during the year some means of

improvement of the medical and surgical art, the other to him who shall have discovered the means of rendering some mechanical art less unhealthy. Montoyon died in 1820.

Monti, Filippo Maria

an Italian prelate, was born March 23. 1675, at Bologna, of an illustrious and noble family; studied at the high school of his native place; then went to Rome, where by his superior talent and acquisitions he quickly rose to eminent favor with popes Clement XI and XII. In 1743 Benedict XIV created Monti a cardinal. He died January 17, 1754, at Rome. His library of over 12,000 volumes was given, by his request, to the library of his native place; also other valuable treasures, among them a fine collection of paintings. He wrote: *Roma tutrice delle belle arti, scultura ed architettura: — Prose degli Arcadi: — Elogia cardinalium pietate, doctrina, legationibus ac rebus pro Ecclesia gestis illustrium a pontificatu Alexandri III ad Benedictum XIII* (Rome, 1751, 4to).

Monti, Vincenzo

a noted Italian ecclesiastic, who wrote poetry of a superior order, and only used his position in the Church as a general passport into society, flourished in the second half of the 18th century. He was a native of Ferrara (born in 1753), and studied in the university of that place. He was made abbe in 1776, and became secretary to the pope's nephew. He soon found favor in the eyes of Roman celebrities, and was generally noticed by prelates and cardinals as a fit subject for promotion in the Church. He was especially popular when, in 1792, he wrote a poem commemorating the efforts of Pius II against the Austrian court, which then, in the person of Joseph II, was fast breaking away from the papacy. The poem which Monti wrote on this occasion of Pius's visit to Vienna is entitled *Il Pellegrino Apostolico.* He died at Milan, October 1828.

Montignot, Henri

a French ecclesiastic, was born about 1715, at Nancy. He was a doctor of theology, canon of the cathedral, and member of the academy in his native place, where he died about the close of the 18th century. He wrote: *Remarques theologiques et critiques sur l'histoire du Peuple de Dieu du P. Berruyer* (1755, 12mo): — *Dictionnaire diplomatique, ou Etymologie des termes de la basse Latinite pour servir a l'intelligence des archives, des*

chartes, etc. (Nancy, 1787, 8vo): — *Reflexions sur les immunites ecclesiastiques* (Paris, 1788, 8vo): — *Etat des Etoiles fixes au second sicle par Cl. Ptolemie, compare a laposition de memes etoiles en* 1786, *avec le texte Grec* a *la traduction Francaise* (Nancy, 1786; Strasburg, 1787, 4to).

Montigny, Jean De

a French prelate of some note, was born in Bretagne in 1637, of parents highly esteemed in the best social circles of France; and thus, surrounded with superior advantages, was especially fitted for the highest literary culture. He entered the ecclesiastic life, and soon attained to eminence. In 1670 he was made bishop of Leon, and in the same year was admitted to membership in the French Academy. He died September 28, 1671, at Vitre. He wrote: *Lettre a Eraste pour reponse a son libelle contre La Pucelle de Chapelain* (Paris, 1656, 4to): — *Oraison funebre d'Anne d'Autriche* (Rennes, 1666, 4to): — *Lettre contenant le voyaye de la cour en* 1660; *dans le Recueil de quelques pieces nouvelles et galantes.*

Montjoy

is the name given to mounds serving to direct the travellers on a highway, probably often originally tumuli, or funeral-mounds of an elder peopleheaps of stones, overgrown with grass, which have been piled over a dead chieftain. They often were crowned with a cross. Montjoie St. Denis was the French wgrcry; Montjoie St. Andrew, that of Burgundy; Montjoie Notre Dame, of the dukes of Bourbon; and Montjoie St. George, of England.

Montlaur, Jean De

a French prelate, was born near Montpellier about 1120; entered the ecclesiastical life while yet quite a youth, and rapidly advanced to positions of prominence and responsibility. In 1158 he was made bishop, and everywhere gained friends by his generous and open-hearted life. He was particularly devoted to his diocesan work, and built up the people in holy and consistent living. He died February 24, 1190, in his native place, with whose history his whole life was interwoven. His works remain in MS. See *Histoire litteraire de la France,* volume 14, s.v.; *Gallia Christiana,* volume 6.

Montluo, Blaise de

a French marshal, noted for his cruelty towards Protestants; one of the "two personages who obtained by their enormities a notoriety so hideous that the history of cruelty would be imperfect if they were passed over in silence" (Smedley, 1:211). He was a brother to the succeeding, and was born in Gascony in 1501. When only a youth of twenty, he entered military life, and soon distinguished himself by his bravery as well as his brutality. He was universally severe with his enemies, and would give no quarter. In the contest with the Huguenots, he advised their absolute extermination, and actually wrote a memoir (in 1562) showing how easily it might be done (see *Memoires de Conde,* 3:184 sq.). Placed in charge of his native province, he used his unlimited power to destroy every one who appeared to be tainted with the heresy, and instituted a strict inquisition " into the strange names of overseers, deacons, consistories, synods, and conferences," "food of which kind," he adds, " never yet had furnished me with a breakfast" *(Comment.* lib. 5, tom. 2, page 3). The number of persons who fell victims to his rage is legion, and he appears to us in the role of a modern Nero. We have not room to enter here into detail, but refer to Smedley *(Hist. of the Ref. Religion in France,* 1:211 sq.; 2:25). Montluc fought also against the imperialists, commanded by Charles V, and assisted at the siege of La Rochelle and Calais. For his services against the Protestants he was in 1573 made "marshal" by Henry III. Montluc died in 1577, leaving the *Memoires* of his military life (1592), which are not an honor to any man's memory nor to any man's country. See Brantome, *Vies des Hommes illustres Francais;* Mezeray, *Abregy de l'histoire de France;* Sainte-Beuve, in the *Moniteur* (Paris), October 1854; Browning, *Hist. of the Huguenots,* 1:118,136, 280; 2:4. (J.H.W.)

Montluc Jean de

brother of the preceding, a distinguished French prelate, noted both for his attainments in ecclesiastical and political life, was born about 1508. He entered in boyhood days the Dominican Order of Gray Friars, and soon made himself the favorite of his associates. The outer world also took a liking to him, and even at court he had many friends. Francis I reposed much confidence in him, and he was intrusted with diplomatic missions. He was successful especially in efforts for a peaceful solution of the differences between his native country and the Ottoman power, concluding for Francis an advantageous peace with Soliman. In 1553 he was made bishop of

Valence and of Die, and gained great popularity as a pulpit orator. He was not unfrequently invited to preach at court during the rule of Catharine de Medici. However, after the Conference of Poissy (1561), Montluc seems to have fallen into disrepute at court, for he was believed to have been one of the bishops whom Beza's argument had almost persuaded to be a Protestant" (Browning, *Huguenots,* 1:108); and two years later he was one of the prelates excommunicated by pope Pius IV (Browning, 1:180). Montluc was finally restored to his former influence and position by the French Parliament; but he never thereafter exerted himself much in ecclesiastical labors, and because of his shrewdness, wisdom, and learning, he was selected by the government of his country for several diplomatic missions, the most important of which was to Poland (in 1572), where he zealously exerted himself to secure the crown for the duke of Anjou. It is generally conceded that Montluc's conduct in this affair was anything but honorable and manly. He persuaded the Poles to believe that the duke had had no part in the massacre of St. Bartholomew. On his return to France he lived at Toulouse, where he died April 13, 1579. His theological writings are: *Deux instructions et deux epistres au clerge et peuple de Valence* (Avignon, 1557, 8vo): — *Cleri Valentii et Diensis Reformatio* (Paris, 1557, 8vo): — *Recueil des lieux de l'Ecriture servant a decouvrir les fautes contre les dix commandenants de la loi* (ibid. 1559, 8vo):*Sermons* (ibid. 1559, 8vo): — *Familiere Explication des articles de la foi* (ibid. 1561, 8vo): — *Sermons sur les articles de la foi et de l'Oraisoun dominicale* (ibid. 1561, 8vo). See De Thou, *Hist. sui temporis;* Sismondi, *Hist. des Francais,* chapters 17, 18, 19; Smedley, *Hist. of the Ref. Religion in France,* 1:122 sq., 189; 2:82; De Felice, *History of the Protestants of France,* page 142 sq. (J.H.W.)

Montmignon, Jean Baptiste

a French theologian, was born at Lucy in 1737, prepared in his studies for holy orders, and finally became successively secretary of the bishopric of Soissons, canon, vicar, grandvicar, and archdeacon. In 1786 he accepted the editorship of the *Journal Ecclesiastique;* but as early as January, 1788, abandoned this work, and took part in the publications which were preparing at the outbreak of the Revolution under the bishop of Soissons. Obliged to quit France in 1793, he went to Belgium, and remained there until the government of the Directory made his return possible. He was then nominated grand-vicar of Poitiers; in 1811 was made canon of the metropolis, and then grand-vicar of this diocese. He was also made censor

of all ecclesiastical publications at Paris. He died at Paris February 21, 1824. He wrote: *Crime d'apostasie; lettre d'un religieux a un de ses amis* (1790, 8vo): — *Vie edifiante de Benoit-Joseph Labre, mort a Rome, en odeur de Saintete, le* 16 *Avril,* 1783, *composee par ordre du Saint-Siege, etc., par M. M —— (Marconi), lecteur du college Romain, confesseur du serviteur de Dieu; traduit de l'Italien* (Paris, 1784, 12mo): — *Preservative contre le fanatisme, ou les nouveaux millenaires rappeles aux principes fondamentaux de la foi Catholique* (Paris, 1806, 8vo): — *Exposition des predictions et des promesses faites a l'Eglise, pour les derniers temps de la Gentilite* (1806, 2 volumes, 12mo): — *Choix de Lettres edifiantes, ecrites des missions etrangres,* etc. (1808, 8 volumes, 12mo): — Do *la Regle de varite et des Causes dufinatisme* (1808, 8vo).

Montmorency

is the name of one of the oldest noble families of France, which figures both in secular and ecclesiastical history, though oftentimes its celebrity was purchased at the expense of all humanitarian principles. The name of the family was derived from the village in which its several members lived, and dates from the 10th century. Oftentimes the house of Montmorency has been styled "the first barons of France," and in recognition of their services to Romanism, "the first *Christian* barons." They furnished officers of state and generals for the French army, distinguished ecclesiastics for the Church of Rome, some of whom rose even to the cardinalate, besides a number of grand-masters and knights of the different European orders. One of the branches established in the Netherlands furnished count of Horn (Philip II de Montmorency-Neville), who, together with Egmont, was executed in Brussels during the bloody reign of the Spanish general Alva. But we have room here only for those chiefly concerned in the Huguenot movement.

1. ANNE, first duke of Montmorency, marshal and grand-constable of France, noted for his alliance with the Guises, *SEE HUGUENOTS*, was born in March, 1493. His Christian name, *Anne,* it is said, he received from his godmother, Anne of Brittany. He distinguished himself by his gallantry and military skill in the wars between Francis I and the emperor Charles V, and was taken prisoner along with his sovereign in the battle of Pavia, which was fought against his advice. He afterwards became the leader of the French government, showing great ability in matters of finance and diplomacy, and was made constable in 1538; but his rough manners made

him an object of dislike to many; and the suspicions of the king having been aroused against him, he was suddenly banished from court in 1541, and passed ten years on his estates, till the accession of Henry II, when he came again to the head of affairs. In 1548 he suppressed the insurrection in Guienne, but was less successful in 1557 in his contest with the celebrated general of Philip II, duke Philibert Emmanuel of Savoy, which resulted in the, to France, disadvantageous peace of Chateau-Cambresis; and hence, with the accession of the youthful king, Francis II, there came a decline of the power of the house of Montmorency, and the ascendency of the house of the Guises, who had Francis entirely under their control. Fortunately for Montmorency, the widow of the late king, Catharine de Medici, ambitious to rule the kingdom, cast her influence with constable Montmorency, who had retired from court, though apparently she coveted the friendship of the Guises (Martin, 8:362). An alliance was now formed among disaffected courtiers, bourgeoisie, and Protestants against the Guises, and him who, ruling over the nation, had submitted to their guidance; and though it is not believed that Montmorency had any part in it, it is certain that some of his house-three brothers of the house of Chatillon (Obet, cardinal of Chatillon, admiral Coligny, and Dandelot, colonel of the Cisalpine infantry), sons of Louisa of Montmorency, the sister of the constable-were more or less intimately associated with all Protestant movements in France, and that possibly two of these three had actually a part in, or at least a knowledge of, the conspiracy of Amboise (*SEE HUGUENOTS*; and comp. Ranke, *Fracnzs. Gesch.* 1:147; Mrs. Marsh, *The Protest. Ref. in France,* 1:142; BrantSme, *Vie des Honmes illustres,* 3:20). The sudden termination of the reign of Francis II (1560) brought forward the minor, Charles IX, and with him the regency of Catharine. Her object was to effect a fusion of parties, or, rather, to hold the balance evenly between them, and, by allowing neither to preponderate, to preserve the paramount authority in her hands. By the advice of the sagacious counsellor L'HSpital (q.v.), the king of Navarre was made lieutenant-general, and Montmorency was again given the direction of military affairs, while the Guises kept their places in the council, and duke Francis retained the post of master of the royal household. The Guises, perceiving the intent of the queen, now denominated "apostate," labored earnestly for an alliance with Montmorency, in order to foil the queen in her designs. The constable finally separated from his nephews, who had reappeared at court, and were enjoying many favors, and allied himself with the duke of Guise and the marshal St. Andre, composing the famous triumvirate which resisted

Catharine de Medici, and proceeded in most stringent measures against the Huguenots (q.v.). The colloquy at Poissy had softened the heart of Catharine, and the Protestants were given many privileges. The triumvirate opposed all such concessions, and finally brought on the massacre at Vassy — "the St. Bartholomew of 1562" (March). The queen-mother and king were seized, and forced to inaugurate a new policy. Montmorency himself signalized the new departure by various open attacks on the Huguenots. Thus he led a mob to storm a Protestant church in the suburbs of Paris called "the Temple of Jerusalem." "Bursting in the doors of the empty place, they tore up the seats, and, placing them and the Bibles in a pile upon the floor, they set the whole on fire, amid great acclamation." He returned to Paris as if a victor fresh from battle, and, flushed with success, he rested not until other churches had been submitted to a like treatment, and he was given the nickname of "Captain Burnbenches." In 1562 he commanded the royal army against the Huguenots, but at the battle of Dreux was wounded and taken prisoner by the Protestants. Released by the peace of Amboise in 1563, he plotted a massacre of the Protestants; but the court not only refused to approve his proposal, but also caused his retirement finally. In 1567 he again appeared on the stage of public affairs, and again took part in the warfare against the Huguenots; but he did not long remain in the field, for he received a fatal wound at St. Denis, and died at Paris on the following day, November 12, 1567. His death was in many respects a blessing to France. From a neutral, if not a friend of the Huguenots, he had turned to a most deadly enemy, because, after he had espoused the Guises' interest, and had been placed in command of the army, he had never been able to gain a victory over the Huguenot armies. Even the duke of Guise, who had fallen in 1563 (when returning from his outposts he was mortally wounded by a fanatical Huguenot, Poltrot [q.v.] de Mere), had counselled in his dying hour that the queen-regent should make peace with her revolted subjects, but Montmorency insisted on their destruction, and counselled their massacre in open battle and by private means. His last hours were spent in a most deadly struggle, and yet even then he failed to be the victor; for, though he sacrificed himself, the contest remained undecided, the Huguenots. if anything, having the vantage-ground. as they had saved their leader. It is generally asserted that Montmorency's death was welcome news to Catharine de Medici and the courtiers, whom he had frequently offended by his overbearing manners. See Lescouvel, *Anne de Montmorency* (1696); Davila, *Hist. of the Civil Wars of France;* Martin, *Hist. of France,* volume 9; Ranke, *Franzosische*

Gesch. vornehmlich im 16 *u.* 17 *Jahrh.* (Engl. transl. *Hist. of Civil Wars and Monarchy in France),* 1:164-212; Sir J. Stephen, *Lect. Hist. France* (3d ed. Lond. 1857, 2 volumes, 8vo), volume 2, lects. 16 and 17; Student's *Hist. of France,* pages 311, 316, 319, 324, 337; Jervis, *Hist. of the Church of France* (Lond. 1872, 2 volumes, 8vo), volume 1, chapter 2; Fisher, *Hist. of the Ref* page 258 sq.; and the works referred to in the article *SEE HUGUENOTS*.

2. HENRI, second *Duc de Montmorency,* grandson of the famous constable de Montmorency, but more honorable and consistent in his conduct, thought he also warred against the Huguenots, was born at Chantilly April 30, 1595. His godfather was the great Henri Quatre, who always called him his "son." Louis XIII made him admiral when he was but a youth of seventeen. He succeeded his father in the governorship of Languedoc, and took an active part in the wars against the Hugueenots, distinguishing himself on the royal side in the sieges of Montauban and Montpellier, and in 1625 by taking the Isle of Re from the Huguenots of Rochelle. He afterwards gained other victories over them, and in 1629 was mainly instrumental in bringing about the peace of Alais, which terminated the religious civil wars in France. In 1630 he received the chief command of the French troops in Piedmont, where he defeated the Spaniards, for which he received a marshal's baton. Unfortunately for himself, he ventured to oppose Richelieu, who had always been his enemy, and espoused the cause of Gaston, duke of Orleans; for this he was declared guilty of high-treason, and marshal Schomberg being sent against him, defeated him at Castehlnaudary, and took him prisoner. Although almost mortally wounded, Montmorency was carried to Toulouse, sentenced to death by the Parliament, and notwithstanding his expressions of penitence, and the most powerful intercession made for him — for example, by king Charles I of England, the pope, the Venetian republic, and the duke of Savoy — was beheaded, October 30, 1632. He was distinguished for amiability and courtesy of manners, as well as for his valor. His life was written by one of his officers (1663, 4to). See also the works cited above.

Montolivetenses

a name given to the monks of Mount Olivet, because living in a residence so called. The Montolivetenses dress in white serge, and profess the rule of St. Benedict. They sprang up in the 14th century, were approved by pope John XXI, and confirmed by Gregory XI in 1371. They trace their origin to

St. Bernard Ptolornei of Sienna, and their first monastery was at Ancona; but the order soon spread through Italy and Sicily. *SEE MONKS, EASTERN*.

Montorsoli, Fragiovann' Angelo

a celebrated Italian sculptor, largely engaged on sacred and ecclesiastical subjects, was born about the beginning of the 16th century at Montorsoli, near Florence. His first instruction in art he received from Andrea de Fiesole, with whom he lived three years. He then found employment at Rome, at Perugia, and at Volterra. He was next employed by Michael Angelo on the church of San Lorenzo at Florence, and gained the admiration and lasting friendship of the great Florentine. In 1527 Montorsoli had a strong disposition to turn, as it appeared to him, to the only life in which peace was to be obtained; but after trying in vain several convents, he fixed in 1530 upon the brotherhood of the Nunziata at Florence, and became a friar of the Order Dei Servi della Nunziata. Shortly after he had taken up his abode in this convent, having been recommended to the pope by Michael Angelo, he was called to Rome by Clement VII to restore several ancient monuments, much to the dissatisfaction of his brothers of the Nunziata. When the tasks assigned him by the pope were finished, he returned to Florence with Michael Angelo to complete the statues and other sculptures of the sacristy and library of San Lorenzo. After the death of Clement, Montorsoli again joined Michael Angelo at Rome, and assisted him in the works of the monument of Julius II; but while engaged on this work he was invited by cardinal Turnone, and advised by Michael Angelo to go with the cardinal to Paris. Owing, however, to difficulties with the treasury and servants of the French court, Montorsoli left Paris and returned to Florence. After completing there several works, he went by Rome to Naples, and there constructed the tomb of Jacopo Sanazzaro. He next went to Genoa, and ornamented the church of San Matteo there, besides many other works, and upon their completion returned to Michael Angelo at Rome; but departed again soon afterwards, in 1547, for Messina, where he was employed to make a grand fountain for the place in front of the cathedral, and designed the church of San Lorenzo, etc. In 1557, by a decree of pope Paul IV, all religious persons, or all who had taken holy orders and were living at large in the world without respect to their religious character, were ordered to return to their convents and reassume their religious habits; and Montorsoli was accordingly obliged to leave many works unfinished, which he intrusted to his pupil Martino, and

he returned to his convent at Florence. He was, however, shortly afterwards called to Bologna to construct there the high altar of the church of his own order, Dei Servi, which he completed with great magnificence in twenty-eight months. He returned to Florence in 1561, and being rich he built a common sepulchre for artists in the chapter-house of the convent of the Nunziata, with the requisite endowment for regular masses at appointed times, and gave the whole sepulchre, chapter, and chapel to the then almost decayed society of St. Luke, or company of painters, etc., which, upon the completion of the sepulchre, was at a solemn feast celebrated by forty-eight of the principal artists of Florence, re-established by the consent and authority of the duke Cosmo I upon a firmer and permanent basis; and the society still subsists as the Academy of Florence, though since that time it has been considerably enriched and endowed by successive dukes of Tuscany. Montorsoli died, says Vasari, on the last day of August, 1563. See Cicognara, *Storia della Scultura;* Valery, *Voyages historiques et litteraires en Italie;* Spooner, *Biographical Hist. of the Fine Arts,* s.v.; *English Cyclop.* s.v.

Montpellier

(Lat. *Mons pessulanus* or *puellarum),* a city of France, in the department of Herault, in 43° 36' N. lat. and 30 50' E. long., with a population (1881) of 52,673, is noted as the seat of several Church councils held there in the 12th and 13th centuries. At the *first* of these, held in 1162, by pope Alexander III, assisted by ten bishops, the antipope Victor (Octavianus) was excommunicated (Labbe, *Conc.* 10:1410). At the *second* council, held in 1195, indulgences were granted to those who marched into Spain to fight against the infidels (Moors), and interdicts were intrusted to the bishops in whose dioceses the Albigenses were gaining ground (Labbe, *Conc.* 10:1796). At the *third* council, held in 1215, by the papal legate, Peter of Beneventum, the question was the disposition of the city of Toulouse, and the other cities conquered by the Crusaders, count Simon of Montfort claiming them. Montfort (q.v.) was granted his demand. There were also forty-six canons passed relating to the dress of monastics and the clergy (Labbe, *Conc.* 11:183, and Append. page 2330). At *the fourth* council. held in August, 1224, and composed of all the bishops of the province, under the archbishop of Narbonne, the propositions of peace made by Raymond, count of Toulouse, and the Albigenses were considered. Raymond promised to keep the Catholic faith, and to cause it to be held throughout his territories, to purge out from them all heretics, to

restore the Church to her rights, to preserve her liberties, and to pay within three years 15,000 marks as an indemnification for what she had suffered, upon condition that the count of Montfort should relinquish his pretensions to the lands of the county of Toulouse; but Amauri, who pretended to be count of Toulouse, in virtue of a decree of Innocent III given in the Council of Lateran, wrote to the bishops, and represented to them that, as he hoped to be able to bring the Albigenses into subjection, it would be a scandal to the whole Church should they enter into any agreement with Raymond. The council appear to have acquiesced in his view of the matter, and the offer of Raymond was rejected *(Conc.* 11:289, and Append. page 2334). *The fifth* council was held September 6, 1258, by James, archbishop of Narbonne. Eight statutes were published:

1, excommunicates *ipso facto* all who usurp the property of the Church and insult the persons of the clergy;

2, forbids bishops to give the tonsure or holy orders to persons not of their own diocese;

3, declares that clerks not living as clergymen ought to do so, or carrying on any business, they shall lose their privileges;

5, forbids Jews to exact usury;

6, forbids bishops to give letters to mendicant friars to authorize their begging before the friars have obtained leave of the metropolitan (Labbe, 11:778). See Hefele, *Concilienyeschichte,* volumes 5 and 6 (see Index); Landon, *Manual of Councils,* s.v.

Montpellierians

a fanatical sect which, under the religious garb, committed all manner of excesses, and became guilty of most immoral conduct, but which, fortunately, was only short-lived, the people soon becoming disgusted with the licentiousness of its members. It arose at Montpellier, France, about the year 1723. Its founder, master, and high-priest took the name of *Jacob Prophetus,* and designated his meeting as the "New Sion." They held nightly meetings, in which the grossest licentiousness was indulged in under cover of religion. Their place of assembly contained numerous apartments, carpeted with white, and furnished with beds and mattresses. In the farthest apartment, considered as the sanctum sanctorum, stood an altar, a pulpit, , candlestick with seven branches, and a gazophylakion.

There were also some priests dressed in the garb of the Hebrew priests. They circumcised and baptized their children, but in the latter ceremony brandy was used instead of water. Louis XV commissioned the marquis de Roquelaure to put an end to their abomination, and the sect was speedily suppressed. See P.I. von Huth, *Versulch einer Kirchengesch. d. 18ten Jahrh.* 1:543 sq.

Montredon

(also called Montrond), RAIMOND DE, a French prelate of some note, was born at Nismes near the beginning of the 12th century. He was in 1130 archdean of Beziers, when he was promoted to the bishopric of Agde. He was made archbishop of Arles in 1143. He died about 1155. He figured prominently in the civil affairs of France, but gave little time to theological studies, and left no works of value in that field of knowledge. See *Gallia Christiana,* volume 1, col. 560; *Hist. litter. de la France,* 13:236.

Montrelais, Hugues De

a French cardinal, was born at Montrelais, near Ancenis, about 1315. He early entered the service of the Church, and was made canon, and later archdeacon, of St. Peter's at Nantes. In 1354 he was elected bishop of Nantes, but the year after he was transferred by pope Innocent VI to the see of Treguier, and in 1358 to that of Sainte-Brienne. Devoted to Charles the Bald, Hugues accompanied that prince in 1364 to Poitiers to assist in diplomatic conferences. He also performed other diplomatic services. The troubles which agitated Brittany in 1371 caused Hugues's retirement to Avignon, where pope Gregory XI created him cardinal (December 20, 1375). He died there, February 28, 1384. See *Gallia Christiana,* volume 3, col. 71.

Montreuil, Bernardin De

a French theologian, was born in Paris in 1596. He joined the Jesuits in 1624, and taught philosophy and moral theology. He died in Paris in 1646. His works are: *Vie de Jesus Christ, tiree des quatre Evangelistes* (1637, 4to): — La *Vie glorieuse de Jesus-Christ et l'etablissement de son Eglise par le sministere des Aptres, ou fes Actes des Apotres et 1'Histoire de l'Eglise naissante* (Paris, 1640 and 1799, 2 volumes, 12mo): — *Les derniers Combats de l'Eglise, dans lexplication de l'Apocalypse* (Paris, 1645, 4to).

Montrocher

(Guido de Monte-Rocheri), GUI DE, a Spanish theologian of some note, who flourished in the first half of the 14th century at Valencia, is noted as the author of *Manipulus Curatorum,* a work regarded of so much value that it was among the very first books issued after the invention of the art of printing, and passed through over fifty editions in the first thirty years of the 15th century. The oldest edition is entitled *Manipulus Curatorum, liber utilissimus, per Christophorum Bugamumo et Johannem Glim* (Savigliano, 1471, folio). See Du Pin, *Biblioth. des Auteurs Eccles. du quartorzieme scicle;* Fabricius, *Biblioth. Graeca,* 10:786; *Biblioth. Hispana vetus,* 2:155, 156.

Montrose, James Graham, Marquis of

a Scotch soldier, noted for the part he took in the contests between the Covenanters and king Charles I, was a member of a celebrated noble family, and born at the family estate of Auld Montrose in 1612, and on the death of his father in 1626 became earl of Montrose. He was educated at the University of St. Andrews; and after having married a lady who lived only four years before death separated them, leaving him a child, he went abroad and travelled for several years in France and Italy, devoting much of his time to study in general literature and army tactics. Introduced on his return to England to king Charles, he was so coldly received that he at once left for his native country, and there allied himself with the Covenanters, who were just then arrayed against the king. It was the year 1637 when the tumults broke out in Edinburgh on the attempt to introduce the Prayer-book. Montrose, to all appearances, became heart and soul enlisted in the movement to resist the introduction of episcopacy in the Scottish Church, and was one of the four noblemen selected to compose the "table" of the nobility, which, along with the other tables of the gentry, of the burghs, and of the ministers, drew up the famous National Covenant, *SEE COVENANT* and *SEE COVENANTERS*, sworn to by all ranks at Edinburgh in the spring of 1638. He was likewise sent on a mission to Aberdeen, to secure the support of its citizens also; was instrumental in bringing many of them to join the national cause, and in 1639 went there with an army to overawe those who had refused to join his side. Encountering finally the army of king Charles, he gave it battle at Meagra Hill, near Stonehaven (June 15), and obtained a complete victory. When the temporary peace of Berwick was made, Charles invited several of the

Covenanting nobles to meet him at Berwick, where he was then holding his court, and to consult with him about Scottish affairs. Among those who went was Montrose, and his party dated what they regarded as his apostasy from that interview. Be that as it may, his political position was certainly much modified after his return. In the General Assembly which met August 13, 1639, under the presidency of the earl of Traquair as royal commissioner, he showed symptoms of toleration towards the Royalists, and was the object of much popular obloquy. One night he is said to have found affixed upon his chamber-door a paper bearing these words, *Invictus armis, verbis vincitur.* The dissolution of the Parliament, in June, 1640, led to an open rupture between the king and the Covenanters, and both parties prepared to decide their quarrel by force of arms. The former assembled at York an army of 21,000 horse and foot; the latter another of 26,000, which, under the command of Leslie, crossed the Tweed August 21,1640. Montrose was the first man who forded the stream. The successes of the Scots, as is well known, soon forced Charles to summon a new Parliament for then settlement of the national grievances. But though Montrose had fought, he had, along with several other influential nobles, entered into a secret engagement at Cumbernauld, for the purpose of frustrating what they regarded as the factious designs of *extreme* Covenanting leaders. His conduct in England, too, had been questionable. It was accidentally discovered that he had been communicating with the king; and when the Parliament assembled (November, 1640), he was cited to appear before a committee. The affair of the Cumbernauld Bond, discovered by the ingenuity of Argyle, was brought up; but Montrose defended his conduct and that of his colleagues, and nothing came of it, though some fiery spirits among the clergy, says Guthrie, "pressed that their lives might go for it." In the following June, Montrose and some others were accused of plotting against Argyle, and were confined in Edinburgh Castle, where they remained till the beginning of 1642, when they were set at liberty in return for the concessions which Charles had made his Scottish subjects. Although they had frequently been examined, nothing definite had been proved against them. The accusation that Montrose had proposed to the king to assassinate Argyle is not historically substantiated, and is intrinsically improbable. During the next year or two Montrose kept aloof, at least outwardly, from public affairs, and became alienated from the Covenanters. He went to York to wait on the king some time in 1643, but failed to meet him. He finally joined the queen, but did not secure any open alliance with the king; the Covenanters all this time trying to win him over

to their side again. The civil war which had broken out in England determined Charles and his advisers to crush the Presbyterian leaders in Scotland, who were abetting the efforts of the English Parliamentarians. In the spring of 1644 Montrose finally entered into the king's service, and was raised to the rank of marquis. He left Oxford, where he had been residing with his sovereign, and proceeded to Scotland to raise the Royalists in the North. The battle of Marston Moor for a moment paralyzed him, but his resolution speedily returned. He threw himself into the Highlands, and, after skulking about the hills for some time in disguise, met at BlairAthol some Irish auxiliaries and a body of Highlanders, who had forced their way thither from the Western Isles in hopes of joining him, and with these enforcements he marched south, fell suddenly (September 1) on the Covenanting army commanded by lord Elcho at Tippermuir, near Perth, and gained a complete victory. Not a single Royalist was slain. After a three-days' stay at Perth, he set out for the North, defeated a force of Covenanters under lord Burleigh at Aberdeen (September 13), and took possession of the city, which was abandoned for four days to all the horrors of war. The approach of Argyle, at the head of 4000 men, compelled Montrose, whose forces were far inferior in numbers and discipline, to retreat into the wilds of Badenoch, whence he recrossed the Grampians, and suddenly appeared in Angus, where he wasted the estates of more than one Covenanting nobleman. With fresh supplies, he then once more returned to Aberdeenshire, with the view of raising the Gordons; narrowly escaped defeat at Fvvie in the end of October, and again withdrew into the fastnesses of the mountains. Argyle, baffled in all his attempts to capture or crush Montrose, returned to Edinburgh and threw up his commission. His opponent, receiving large accessions from the Highland clans, planned a winter campaign, marched southwestward into the country of the Campbells, devastated it frightfully, drove Argyle himself from his castle at Inverary, and then wheeled north, intending to attack Inverness, where the Covenanters were posted in strong force under the earl of Seaforth. The "Estates" at Edinburgh were greatly alarmed, and, raising a fresh army, placed it under the command of general Baillie, a natural son of Sir William Baillie of Lamington. After consulting with Argyle, it was arranged that he should proceed by way of Perth, and take Montrose in front, while Argyle should rally his vast array of vassals and attack him in the rear. The Royalist leader was in the great glen of Albin — the basin of the Caledonian Canal — on his way to Inverness, when he heard that Argyle was following him. He instantly turned on his pursuer,

fell upon him unexpectedly at Inverlochy, February 2, 1645, and utterly routed his forces. Fifteen hundred of the Campbells were slain, and only four of Montrose's men. He then resumed his march northwards, but did not venture to assault Inverness — his wild mountaineers being admirably fitted for rapid irregular warfare, but not for the slow work of beleaguerment. Directing his course to the east, he passed, with fire and sword, through Elgin and Banff into Aberdeenshire, which suffered a similar fate. On the 9th of May he attacked and routed Hurry at Auldearn, near Nairn; and after enjoying a short respite with his fierce veterans in Badenoch, again issued from his wilds, and inflicted a still more disastrous defeat on Baillie himself at Alford, in Aberdeenshire (July 2). There was nol nothing to prevent his march south, and about the end of the month he set out with a force of from 5000 to 6000 men. He was followed by Baillie, who picked up reinforcements on his way, and on the 15th of August again risked a battle at Kilsyth, but was defeated with frightful loss — 6000 of the Covenanters being slain. The cause of Charles was for the moment triumphant, and Montrose, who was virtually master of the country, was made lieutenant-governor of Scotland, and commander-in-chief of the royal forces. All the principal cities in the west hastened to proclaim their fidelity, and laid the blame of the recent troubles on the unfortunate Presbyterian clergy. But gradually affairs took a turn. Great numbers of the Highlanders, having become restless, returned home, and Montrose was obliged to seek safety near the borders. On the 4th of September he broke up his camp at Bothwell, and marched for the eastern counties, where Charles had informed him that the earls of Traquair, Home, and Roxburgh were ready to join him. In this he was disappointed, and on the 13th of the same month he was surprised at Philiphaugh, near Selkirk, by David Leslie, who fell upon the relics of Montrose's army and his raw levies with 6000 cavalry, and completely annihilated them. Escaping.from the field of battle, he made his way to Athol, and again endeavored, but in vain, to arouse the Highlands; and at last Charles, now beginning to get the worst of it in the civil war, was induced to order him to withdraw from the kingdom. On the 3d of September, 1646, Montrose sailed for Norway, whence he proceeded to Paris, where he endeavored, but unsuccessfully, to enlist queen Henrietta Maria in aid of her husband; and at last Montrose, in despair, betook himself to Germany, in hope of service under the emperor. He soon after returned to Holland, and entered into communication with the prince of Wales, afterwards Charles II. It was here that news of Charles I's execution reached him. Montrose fainted on receipt of the dreadful

intelligence, and gave way to the most passionate regrets. Charles II reinvested him with the dignity of lieutenant-governor of Scotland, and Montrose undertook a fresh invasion on behalf of the exiled monarch. In March, 1650, he arrived at the Orkneys with a small force, and after the lapse of three weeks proceeded to Caithness; but neither the gentlemen nor the commons would rise at his call. He forced his way as far south as the borders of Ross-shire, where his dispirited troops, not over 1500 strong, were attacked and cut to pieces at a place called Corbiesdale, near the pass of Invercarron, by a powerful body of cavalry under colonel Strachan. Montrose fled into the wilds of Assynt, where he was nearly starved to death, when he fell into the hands of M'Leod of Assynt, who delivered him up to general Leslie, by whom he was brought to Edinburgh. Condemned to death as a traitor to the Covenant, he was executed May 21, 1650. His demeanor in his last moments was dignified, but that of the Covenanters open to condemnation, for they were cruel, and heaped indignities upon him even on the gallows. His head was placed on the Tolbooth, and his limbs were sent to different parts of Scotland. After the Restoration his remains were collected and given a public funeral. See Napier, *Montrose and the Covenanters* (Lond. 1838, 2 volumes, 8vo); Grant, *Life of Graham, Marquis of Montarose* (1859); Wishart, *Memoirs of Graham,* etc.; Sir Edward Cust, *Lives of the Warriors of the Civil Wars* (1867); Clarendon, *Hist. of the Rebellion,* volume 2; Hetherington, *Hist. Ch. of Scotland,* pages 175,178,191; Russell, *Hist. Ch. of Scotland,* volume 2, chapters 12, 13; Stephen, *Hist. Ch. of Scotland* (Anglican view), 1:576, 641; 2:6, 17, 34, 44, 50, 61, 63, 96, 111, 144, 156, 167, 316, 317; and the works referred to under COVENANTERS.

Mon(t)serrat

one of the smallest of the West India Islands, belonging to Great Britain, situated 43 miles N.W. of Guadeloupe, and at a similar distance from Antigua and St. Kitts, about 11 miles in length and 7 in breadth, contains an area of 47 English square miles, with a population of a little over 8500, the females exceeding the males by 735. About two thirds of the surface is mountainous and barren; the rest is well cultivated. The chief products are sugar, rum, and molasses; but cotton, arrow-root, and tamarinds are also exported. The island forms a portion of the government of the Leeward Isles, and is directly ruled by a president, aided by a council and house of assembly. The chief town is Plymouth, on the south coast. The revenue of Montserrat in 1860 amounted to £3333, and the expenditure to £3243. In

the same year 203 vessels of 7825 tons entered, and 194 vessels of 7450 tons cleared its port; and the total values of imports and exports were respectively £20,060 and £17,043. The religion of the country is Christian, Protestants predominating now; though many Roman Catholics have sprung from those Irish settlers who entered the island in 1632, and the French, who owned it from 1712 till 1746.

Montyon

SEE MONTHYON.

Monument

is the incorrect rendering in ²⁶⁵⁰Isaiah 65:4 for rⅡⅹⁿ; *nzatsur',* a *guarded* place (" hidden thing," as in ²⁸⁰⁶Isaiah 48:6; elsewhere "besieged," etc.), such as *caves* (so the Sept. σπήλαιον), or the adyta or shrines of heathen temples (so the Vulg. *delubra),* as places of idolatrous or illicit devotion. It was anciently a practice in most nations for persons to resort to the sepulchres for the purpose of magic or necromancy, and this still holds its ground in India and other Oriental countries. *SEE SUPERSTITION*.

In the Apocrypha, "monument" is the correct rendering in Wisd. 10:7 for μνημεῖον, but inexactly in 1 Macc. 13:27 for ὦκοδόμησε, and in 2 Macc. 15:6 for τρόπαιον. *SEE TOMB*.

For the monuments of Egypt and Assyria, see those countries respectively.

Monumental Theology

a term of late employed to designate the scientific presentation of the notions and doctrines of theology as they are found in and taught by monuments. It aims to interpret the life and thought of the Christian Church as these are *unconsciously* recorded in monumental remains. It goes out of the ordinary course of historic investigation, and searches for the isolated and fragmentary. Indeed, wherever Christian peoples have left a monumental trace of their life this discipline directs its inquiries.

Relation to other Departments. — Since these monumental remains are mostly of the nature of art-works, monumental theology is very intimately connected with Art Criticism, Art History, Archaeology, Epigraphics, and Numismatics. What have usually been regarded as only auxiliaries to Historical Theology have been recently elevated to an independent science.

Art and written language differ entirely, both in their scope and in their modes of expression. Art appeals to the *whole race;* not, indeed, through the faculty of the understanding, but through the higher faculty of the intuition, to which physical sight is only a medium or instrument. The difference is this: while in thought the subject under consideration is resolved into its constituent elements by the discursive faculty, and, therefore, such knowledge is connected with a *series* of elements that are apprehended successively, an art-work, as an object in space, may be understood at once in the totality of its elements, without division and without succession. In this respect the theology of art differs from dogmatics, for example, since the former would have to do chiefly with *intuitive* truth, the latter with results of the exercise of the *discursive faculty.*

But since the Christian Church was founded in the midst of two great opposing systems of religion and philosophy — viz. Heathenism and Judaism — these so-called Christian monuments will often appear of a *mixed* character. Likewise, in the course of the history of the Church she has been subjected to various attacks of error from within and without. Heresies within the Church, the hostile spirit of philosophy, and the persecuting spirit of the temporal powers, have been potent moulding influences. Hence the complete discussion of "Monumental Theology" would demand a careful estimate of the reciprocal influence of these opposing elements. It would therefore include the examination of those heathen monuments that testify, by their monotheistic character, either of lingering traces of an original divine revelation, or of an expectation of an approaching deliverance, as well as that class of monuments that clearly show the presence and influence of heretical systems in the Church itself.

Chronological Limits. — The principles of Christianity, from its institution to the present time, have evidently exerted a most powerful influence on human thought and life. Art has likewise been affected. While at different periods (e.g. in the Western Church during the invasion of the Northern tribes, and in the iconoclastic struggle of the East) art has suffered terrible catastrophes, it has, nevertheless, ever had a more or less intimate connection with the Christian Church. Hence it is with no sufficient reason that a class of writers (Bingham, Rheinwald, Bohmer, Guericke, and Neander) have limited ecclesiastical monuments and Christian archanology to the chronological bounds of Patristics, i.e., to the first six centuries. More scientific is the view of another class of writers (Baumgarten,

Augusti, etc.), who regard the Reformation of the 16th century as a modern boundary; since by the revival of classical studies, and the introduction of new elements of life, Art was liberated from its servitude to the Church, and found its subjects and inspiration more in nature and the affairs of common life. Nevertheless the highest art must ever find its truest inspiration in the Christian religion, and therefore art monuments must continue to embody much of the Christian thought and spirit of an age. Hence the more recent writers on Theological Encyclopedia (Hagenbach, Rosenkranz, etc.) extend the study of Christian monuments to the present time.

Synoptical View of the Science. — Piper, the chief defender of monumental theology as an independent discipline, presents the following scheme in his *Einleitung in die Monumentale Theologie:* Since inscriptions and art monuments are the chief subjects examined by monumental theology, these demand a twofold treatment: *(a.) An ontological; (b.) a historical.* In other words, the subject must be discussed partly according to its *essence,* as it is a product of intellectual activity exerted on a given material; and partly according to its *historical development.* And since Christianity is recognised as the chief inspiring motive of these Christian art monuments, another closely related division is necessary, viz. the systematic arrangement and representation of the ideas that have found expression in Christian monuments. Expanded, there would result the following outline:

A. Of the essential nature of Christian art.

> **1.** Of the art faculty.

> **a.** The relation of the Church to art *per se.* Rise of a Christian art.
> **b.** Relation of Christian art to the art of classical antiquity.
> **c.** Emancipation of art from the Church at the end of the Middle Ages. Relation of Protestantism to art.

> **2.** The artist.

> **a.** Relation of the artist to the Church office:

> **(1)** In Christian antiquity
> **(2)** in the Middle Ages;
> **(3)** since the close of the Middle Ages.

> **b.** The training of the artist:

(1) His relation to the antique;
(2) his relation to nature;
(3) schools and guilds.

c. The individuality of the artist.

3. Art works.

a. The *synthetical* division
(1) The material and its treatment;
(2) the idea and its embodiment.
aa. The language of art. Symbolism.
bb. Art composition.

b. The *analytical* division:
(1) Antoptics;
(2) criticism and hermeueutics of art-works

B. History of Christian art and art-works

1. Chronology and geography of art.
2. The various species of art.

a. History of architecture.
b. History of the graphic arts.

3. Art monuments.

a. Civil monuments with Christian characters
(1) Coins;
(2) consular diptychs

b. Private monuments:
(1) Monuments of domestic life-gems, rings, etc.;
(2) sepulchral monuments

c. Ecclesiastical monuments:

(1) Architecture, cemeteries, churches, cloisters;
(2) vessels of the churches;
(3) ornameutation of churches-mosaics, paintings, etc.

d. Monuments of ideal or free creative art

C. Christian art ideas.

1. In architecture: symbolism of architecture.

2. In the graphic arts.

a. The development of the scope and range of Christian representation.

b. The content of Christian representation:

(1) Monumental exegesis;

(2) monumental history of the kingdom of God;

(3) monumental dogmatics and ethics.

c. Practical utility of Christian representations.

Explanation and Justification of the foregoing Synopsis. —

(I.) In the first branch,

1. If we discuss the harmony of art with the Christian Church, and its realization therein, the first thing to be examined is *the essential nature of that art itself,* both generally as a necessary subject of the activity of the *human mind,* as well as specially how it accords with the *genius of Christianity* itself. However, the problem here is not the same as in the art archaeology of classical antiquity, since early Christianity holds an entirely different relation to art. It is similar to its relation to philosophy. Neither art nor philosophy was originated by the Church, but both had already passed through all stages of a great development. The Church found art already occupying human thought, and its rise and history are presupposed. By this art the early Christians were as much attracted as repelled. This conditions the *dependence* of the earliest Christian art on the antique—most especially in technical treatment, but also to some extent in spirit and motive; so that this comes to be a constitutive element in the discussion, just as in the earliest history of doctrines we must carefully note the influence of the Greek (specially the Platonic) philosophy. On the other hand, the *independence* of Christian art is shown even in the presence of the antique. Specially those peoples who subsequently appeared upon the stage of history, and received contemporaneously their culture with Christianity, have developed from the first a characteristically Christian art; since the final grounds of art antiquity are found in the nature of man itself, and to these we must at last return. This art activity likewise takes direction among a people to that extent that the period of the perfection of Christian art may be delayed by means of its connection with a development so influenced by the models of antiquity. At the same time another sphere of

art life of universal interest will be liberated, and attain to an independent value. According to this view, the subjects that pertain to the essence of Christian art, as springing from a general art susceptibility, demand a preliminary discussion.

2. The essential nature of art from its *objective* side discussed, it is necessary to pass to the *subjective* element, the interest in which part will depend upon the personality — specially the gifts and endowments — of him who devotes himself to the service of art and the Church. In this connection, the first question that meets us is the personal and official relation of the artist to the Church. At the beginning we find the strange contrasts that heathen artists became interested in Christian works of art, while also Christian artists became martyrs. After a period of untrammelled art development had elapsed, at length, during the Middle Ages, both science and art fell under the exclusive superintendence of monks and priests, until the transference of art to the laity introduced the new aera. In this connection must also be discussed the question of the culture of artists, and the diffusion of those important guilds, partly industrial, partly ecclesiastical, by whose means the flourishing period of art in the later mediaeval period was ushered in. Here, as elsewhere, progress is connected with the *individual* and his work, and the measure of this progress is determined by investigation of the condition of the individual. In the study of the development of doctrines and the organization of the early Church an acquaintance with the Christian fathers is of fundamental importance. In monumental theology, the history of artists corresponds to patristics in the history of doctrines and ecclesiastical polity; yet in an inverse chronological order, since the most noted names of the Christian fathers are found at or near the organization of the Church, while the names of the most renowned masters of art are associated with the conclusion of the Middle Ages and the dawning of the modern epoch., With the exception of a few noted architects, the names of artists hardly appear at all in Christian antiquity. So completely was art merged in the *general* interest of the Church that *individual* service is almost forgotten. In the later Middle Ages the guilds effected a like result, so that the names of the architects of those most wonderful works that stand at the very acme of perfection are entirely wanting. Subsequently to the 13th and 14th centuries, however, in the departments of sculpture and painting, the individuality of the artist again asserted itself, and art pursued its high

mission in a most noteworthy union of free endowment and the observance of organic aesthetic laws.

3. The third division has reference to art-creation. An art-work presupposes a *material* as well as an *idea.* Each is to be examined by itself, as well as in its combination in the production of a work of art. On the one side is such a moulding of the material as to breathe into it a living soul, and create in it a spiritual presence. This leads to the discussion of the laws of Technics. On the other hand, there is the projection of the idea into form-its embodiment in the material. This gives rise to questions of art composition. This latter involves the laws of the grouping in space of art representations. The first question pertains to the conception of the idea in space, to the successive stages of the transition from spiritual life to corporeity; or, according to the language of art, through what means, and by what law, art *expresses* thought and feeling. If we examine painting and sculpture, we find this occurs in part *directly* through *historic* composition; in part, *indirectly* through *symbolic* composition. In symbolic representation, the entire visible world is laid under contribution to aid in this transition to the unseen. When this method is practiced, as in delineations within the sphere of the Church, such means are perfectly legitimate. Hence arise the doctrines of Christian art symbolism, that occupies so wide a field, and, theologically considered, is of such vast significance.

Here is also naturally connected a department to which no certain and well-defined position has hitherto been assigned (since notice has only been taken of it in connection with the art archaeology of *classical* antiquity); we refer to Christian archaeological criticism and hermeneutics. This is the very reverse of art composition: the latter treating of the transition from the thought and the person of the artist to the execution of his work; the former leading from the art-work back to the thought, purpose, and character of the artist, and to the discovery of the circumstances under which the work was produced.

(II.) The second chief division of the subject — the history of art — treats of the different kinds of art. It remains an open question whether the subject of monuments should be connected directly with this division of the subject or receive an independent treatment. Authorities are divided. To both, however, must there be a preliminary section that shall describe art as a whole in its *chronological* development. With this also is naturally

connected an account of the *geographical* distribution of monuments. This would include a description of those *in situ,* as well as of those that have been artificially distributed or gathered into art collections, both public and private.

(III.) The third division, that treats of art ideas, corresponds in some extent to that which is embraced in the archaeology of classical art, under the head "Subjects of Formative Arts." For theological purposes this is the chief difficulty, and to illustrate this all the other portions are preliminary and subordinate. Architecture, from its very nature, furnishes to this department but a meagre contribution, since here symbolism has not a wide range or application. Much more copious in materials are painting and sculpture, inasmuch as since the 16th century the history of images has been a subject of theological literature.

For a methodical treatment of this subject we must carefully observe the distinction between the *historical course* that the representation of images has generally taken (in which connection would be discussed the questions what, by what means, and in what spirit such representation has taken place), and the *content* of such representation (in which latter case the whole range of image representation is to be canvassed and carefully estimated). This subject, being Christian in its nature, has reference partly to the sacred history in its entire extension with Church history, and partly to the supersensuous subjects of faith, as well as the phenomena and motives of moral life. Hence would arise two further divisions, viz. 1, the monumental history of the kingdom of God; 2, monumental dogmatics and ethics. For the illustration of these two departments the whole wealth of monuments that have been preserved would be useful, and their connection as well with the course of history as of dogma would be shown.

At this point would arise yet two other themes of discussion:

(1.) The return from this range of Biblical representations to the text of the Holy Scriptures themselves. Since the subjects of the Bible, in whole or in part,, are found in numerous works of art in all periods of the history of the Church. we are thereby furnished a kind of translation and commentary of the same. This pictorial representation frequently proves more impressive than an oral or written exegesis, since the speaker or writer can pass by what is difficult in the Scriptures or let it remain undetermined, while the artist cannot, but must bring whatever topic he treats distinctly before the perception of himself and others. As, therefore, the artist has to practice a

most searching exegetical avocation, monuments of art are exceedingly rich original sources of information for the interpretation of the Word of God, and also for the related questions of Biblical introduction, viz. the doctrines of the canon and of linguistic usage. Here rests the claim of "Monumental Exegesis."

(2.) The other theme has reference to practical theology. Through the contemplation of a sacred subject present to the beholder, and through the interpenetrating genius of a gifted artist, there is doubtless in Christian art representations a grand power to enkindle and exalt devotional feeling. An art-work, equally with the fleeting word, has its language of eloquence, and is able to convince and to inspire. Hence there is in monuments a *practical* power that has been used by the Church in all ages for purposes of moral and religious training. The "Lay-Bible," for example, illuminated as it was most copiously, became a most efficient means of the moral education of the masses, who were unable to read the text of the Scripture; and even the cultured have derived almost equal pleasure and profit from these sources, Practical theology, however, does not receive such helpful and constant illustration from monuments as the other chief divisions of theology.

The foregoing are among the chief reasons urged by Piper in justification of the term "Monumental Theology," and for regarding it as an independent discipline equally with "Patristics," " the History of Doctrines," etc. This claim to independence of treatment has been controverted by many eminent modern encyclopaedists, and the question must be regarded as still unsettled.

Literature. — Since "Monumental Theology" includes under it archaeology, art history, epigraphics, and numismatics, its literature would include the literature of these subjects. Specially, see Piper, *Einleitung in die Monumentale Theologie* (Gotha, 1867, 8vo), who gives the literature from the earliest time; also his article in Herzog's *Real-Encyklopadie,* 15:752 sq., which is a copious summary. See also Bennett, in the *Methodist Quarterly Review* (January 1871), page 5 sq., for a brief estimate of some of the most important works on this subject. One of the most interesting fields of monumental theology is found in the early Christian catacombs of Rome, and the results of explorations have been succinctly presented by Withrow, *The Catacombs of Rome, and their Testimony relative to primitive Christianity* (N.Y. 1874, 12mo). See also *Lond Academy,* October 1, 1873, page 370; *Brit. and For. Ev. Rev.*

January 1874, art. 6; *Bibliotheca Sacra,* volume 94; *Meth. Qu. Rev.* October 1874, art. 4. (C.W.B.)

Moody, Joseph

an American divine of the Congregational Church, was born in 1701. But little is known of his early life. As a minister he was noted for his many eccentricities, but also for his piety, and as a remarkably useful preacher of the Gospel. In his younger years he often preached beyond the limits of his own parish, which was in Maine, and wherever he went the people hung upon his lips. In one of his excursions he went as far as Providence, R.I., where his exertions were the means of laying the foundation of a church. Such was the sanctity of his character that it impressed the irreligious with awe. He also with importunate earnestness pleaded the cause of the poor, and was very charitable himself. It was by his own choice that he derived his support from a free contribution, rather than a fixed salary; and in one of his sermons he mentions that he had been thus supported twenty years, and yet had been under no necessity of spending one hour in a week in care for the world. Some remarkable instances of answers to his prayers, and of correspondence between the event and his faith, are not yet forgotten in York. The hour of dinner once came, and his table was unsupplied with provisions; but he insisted upon having the cloth laid, saying to his wife he was confident that they should be furnished by the bounty of God. At this moment some one rapped at the door, and prevented a ready-cooked dinner. It was sent by persons who on that day had made an entertainment, and who knew the poverty of Mr. Moody. He published several of his discourses. See Sullivan, *Maine,* page 238; Allen, *Biographical Dictionary,* s.v.; Sprague, *Annals of the Amer. Pulpit,* volume 2.

Moody, Joshua

a Congregational minister, was born in Wales in 1633. His father migrated to this country, and settled at Newbury, Massachusetts, in 1635, and Joshua was educated at Harvard College, class of 1653. There had been no regular clergyman in Portsmouth, N.H., previous to 1658, in which year he began to preach, and a church being formed in 1671, he was ordained pastor. In 1684 Cranfield, the governor, had him unjustly imprisoned for nonconformity with the Church of England rites, and after a confinement of thirteen weeks he was set free, but commanded to cease preaching in the province. Going to Boston, he became the assistant in the First Church,

and was also invited to take charge of Harvard University, but he declined the last-named offer, and in 1692 returned to his charge at Portsmouth. During the witchcraft troubles in 1692 he had opposed the unjust and violent measures towards the imagined offenders, and aided Philip English and his wife to escape from prison. His zeal in this matter caused his dismissal from his church, and he retired from the ministry. He died in 1697. He published, *A practical Discourse concerning the choice Benefit of Communion with God in his House, witnessed unto by the Experience of Saints as the best Improvement of Time, being the Sum of several Sermons on* ⟨19840⟩*Psalm* 84:10, *preached at Boston on Lecture Days* (Boston, 1685 and 1746, 12mo): — A *Sermon on the Sin of Fornmality in God's Worship, or the Formal Worshipper proved a Liar and Deceiver, preached on the Weekly Lecture in Boston from* ⟨38212⟩*Hosea* 2:12; and two or three occasional sermons. See Cotton Mather's *Funeral Sermon, Magnolia,* 4:192-199; Sprague, *Annals of the Amer. Pulpit,* 1:160; Drake, *Dict. of Amer. Biog.* s.v.

Moody, Samuel

an American divine of some note, was born at Newbury, Massachussetts, January 4, 1676; was educated at Harvard College, where he graduated in 1697; then entered upon the special study of theology, and December 29, 1700, was ordained to the sacred ministry in the Congregational Church at York, Me., where he died, November 13, 1747. Like his namesake, Joseph, who flourished very near his time, he was eccentric, though also a very useful man. He also refused a stated salary, and(depended altogether upon voluntary contributions, many of which were spent upon the poor and the needy. He published, *The Doleful State of the Damned* (1710): — *Judas Hung up in Chains* (1714): — *Election Sermon* (1721): — *Life and Death of Joseph Quasson, an Indian* (1729). See Allibone, *Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors* s.v.; Drake, *Dict. of Amer. Biog* s.v.; Sprague, *Annals of the Amer. Pulpit,* volume 2.

Moody, Samuel S.

a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South. was born in Powhattan County, Virginia, May 1, 1810; was converted in 1828, joined the ministry in the Tennessee Conference, and held the following appointments: 1831, Lebanon Circuit; 1832, Sandy Circuit; 1833, Nashville Station; 1834, Memphis Station; 1835, Florence Station; 1836,

Montgomery Circuit; 1837, Lebanon District; 1839, Murfreesborough District; was transferred to the Memphis Conference in 1841, and appointed to Jackson District; in 1842 to Memphis Station; in 1843 to Jackson Station; was transferred back to the Tennessee Conference in 1844, and appointed to Murfreesborough Station; in 1845, 1846, and 1847, to Huntsville District, and in 1848 to Nashville District. In the fall of 1850 failing health obliged him to take a supernumerary relation, and, after years of wasting affliction, he died May 5, 1863. "The older members of this Conference will long cherish the memory of his many virtues, and class him among the brightest and best as more universally beloved; indeed, the virtues of this holy man will live in the memories of thousands as long as life shall last. He never had an enemy. Our Church has seldom produced so pure a specimen of our holy religion." See *Min. Ann. Conf. M.E. Church, South,* 2 (1858-65), 546.

Moon

(j רֵַ֫ח, *yare'ach,* so called from its *paleness;* Chald. j רְיַ֫] *yerach',* ⁵¹⁵⁶⁵Ezra 6:15; ²⁷⁰²⁶Daniel 4:26; poetical הנבל] *lebanah',* the *white,* ²⁰⁶¹⁰Song of Solomon 6:10; ²³⁴²³Isaiah 24:23; 30:26; Gr. σελήνη*),* the lesser of the two great celestial luminaries. *SEE ASTRONOMY*.

1. It is worthy of observation that neither of the terms by which the Hebrews designated the moon contains any reference to its office or essential character; they simply describe it by the accidental quality of color. Another explanation of the second term is proposed in Rawlinson's *Herodotus,* 1:615, to the effect that it has reference to *lebenah, "a* brick," and embodies the Babylonian notion of *Sin,* the moon, as being the god of architecture. The strictly parallel use of *yareach* in ²⁹⁰³¹Joel 2:31 and ²⁶³¹⁷Ezekiel 32:7, as well as the analogy in the sense of the two words, seems a strong argument against the view. The Greek σελήνη, from σέλας, expresses this idea of brilliancy more vividly than the Hebrew terms. The Indo-European languages recognised the moon as the measurer of time, and have expressed its office in this respect, all the terms applied to it — μήν, *moon,* etc.-finding a common element with μετρεῖν, *to measure,* in the Sanscrit root ma (Pott's *SEym. Forsch.* 1:194). The nations with whom the Hebrews were brought into more immediate contact worshipped the moon under various designations expressive of its influence in the kingdom of nature. The exception which the Hebrew language thus presents would appear to be based on the repugnance to nature-worship

which runs through their whole system, and which induced the precautionary measure of giving it in reality no name at all, substituting the circuitous expressions "lesser light" (⟨00116⟩Genesis 1:16), the "pale," or the "white." The same tendency to avoid the notion of personality may perhaps be observed in the indifference to gender, *yarmiach* being masculine, and *lebanah* feminine. See below.

2. The moon held an important place in the kingdom of nature as known to the Hebrews. In the history of the creation (⟨00114⟩Genesis 1:14-16) it appears simultaneously with the sun, and is described in terms which imply its independence of that body as far as its light is concerned. Conjointly with the sun, it was appointed "for signs and for seasons, and for days and years;" though in this respect it exercised a more important influence, if by the "seasons" we understand the great religious festivals of the Jews, as is particularly stated in ⟨19419⟩Psalm 104:19 ("He appointed the moon for seasons"), and more at length in Ecclus. 43:6, 7. Hence, as a measure of time among the Israelites. a lunation was the period of their month; and many of their festivals were on the new moon, or on one of its quarterly phases (Ecclus. 43:6 sq.; comp. Sohar *in Gen.* fol. 236). *SEE MONTH*. This was especially the case with the Passover, their chief festival (see Bihr, *Symbol.* 2:639). *SEE PASSOVER*. Besides this, the moon had its special office in the distribution of light; it was appointed "to rule over the night," as the sun over the day, and thus the appearance of the two founts of light served "to divide between the day and between the night." In order to enter fully into this idea, we must remember both the greater brilliancy of the moonlight in Eastern countries, and the larger amount of work, particularly travelling, that is carried on by its aid. The appeals to sun and moon conjointly are hence more frequent in the literature of the Hebrews than they might otherwise have been (⟨06012⟩Joshua 10:12; ⟨19705⟩Psalm 72:5, 7, 17; ⟨21102⟩Ecclesiastes 12:2; 24:23, etc.); in some instances, indeed, the moon receives a larger amount of attention than the sun (e.g. ⟨19003⟩Psalm 8:3; 89:37). The inferiority of its light is occasionally noticed, as in ⟨00116⟩Genesis 1:16; in ⟨22610⟩Song of Solomon 6:10, where the epithets "fair" and "clear" (or, rather, *spotless,* and hence extremely brilliant) are applied respectively to moon and sun; and in ⟨23026⟩Isaiah 30:26, where the equalizing of its light to that of the sun conveys an image of the highest glory. Its influence on vegetable or animal life receives but little notice; the expression in ⟨05314⟩Deuteronomy 33:14, which the A.V. refers to the moon, signifies rather *months* as the period of ripening fruits. The coldness of the night-dews is

prejudicial to the health, and particularly to the eyes of those who are exposed to it, and the idea expressed in ⟨19C06⟩Psalm 121:6 ("The moon shall not smite thee by night") may have reference to the general or the particular evil effect: blindness is still attributed to the influence of the moon's rays on those who sleep under the open heaven, both by the Arabs (Carne's *Letters,* 1:88) and by Europeans. If this extreme (comparative) cold is considered in connection with the Oriental custom of sleeping *sub divo,* out of doors, *a la belle etoile,* on the flat roofs of houses, or even on the ground, without in all cases sufficient precautionary measures for protecting the body, we see no difficulty in understanding whence arose the evil influence ascribed to the moon. In the East Indies similar effects result from similar exposure. The connection between the moon's phases and certain forms of disease, whether madness or epilepsy, is expressed in the Greek σεληνιάζεσθαι (⟨40D24⟩Matthew 4:24; 17:15), in the Latin derivative "lunatic," and in our "moon-struck." The various influences anciently attributed to the moon in her different phases (Pliny, 2:102), not only in changes of the weather (Varro, *R.R.* 1:37; Virgil, *Georg.* 1:275, 427; comp. ⟨28E07⟩Hosea 5:7; ⟨23H13⟩Isaiah 47:13), but also in physical effects upon the human system (Macrob. *Sat.* 7:16; comp. ⟨19C06⟩Psalm 121:6), is a superstition (Horat. *Ars Poet.* 5:454; Virgil, *En.* 4:512) still very prevalent in the East (Rosenmuller, *Morgenl.* 4:108), and has not even ceased among modern Occidentals (comp. Hone, *Every-day Book*, 1:1509; Shakespeare, *Mids. N. D.* 2:2; *Othello,* 5:2), although science has shown that this planet has no specific influence either upon meteorology or health. See Hayn, *De Planetar. in Corp. hum. Influxu* (Frckf. 1805); Kretschmar, *De Astror. in Corp. hum. Imperio* (Jena, 1820); Raschig, *De lunae imperio in valetud. coip. hum. nullo* (Vit. 1787); Krazenstein, *Einfluss des Mondes in d.m. Kirp.* (Halle, 1747); Reil, *Archiv f. Physiol.* 1:133 sq. *SEE LUNATIC*.

3. The clearness of the Oriental atmosphere early led to the worship of the heavenly bodies (Herod. 2:47; Strabo, 12, page 557; Pliny, 8:1, etc.), among which the moon received special honors (⟨18I26⟩Job 31:26; comp. Julian, *Orat. in Salem.* page 90), as the most conspicuous object of the nocturnal firmament (comp. ⟨05D19⟩Deuteronomy 4:19; 17:3; ⟨12I06⟩2 Kings 23:5; ⟨24H02⟩Jeremiah 8:2; see Selden, *Dii Syr.* 1:239 sq.). If the sun "rules the day," the moon has the throne of night, which, if less gorgeous than that of the sun, is more attractive, because of a less oppressively brilliant light, while her retinue of surrounding stars seems to give a sort of truth to her regal state, and certainly adds not inconsiderably to her beauty. There is to the

same effect a remarkable passage in Julian *(Orat. in Salem.* page 90):
"From my childhood I was filled with a wonderful love for the rays of that
goddess; and when, in my boyhood, I directed my eyes to her ethereal
light, I was quite beside myself. By night especially, when I found myself
under a wide, pure, cloudless sky, I forgot everything else under her
influence, and was absorbed in the beauties of heaven, so that I did not
hear if addressed, nor was aware of what I did. I appeared solely to be
engaged with this divinity, so that even when a beardless boy I might have
been taken for a star-gazer." Accordingly the worship of the moon was
extensively practiced by the nations of the East, and under a variety of
aspects. In Egypt it was honored under the form of Isis, and was one of the
only two deities which commanded the reverence of all the Egyptians
(Herod. 2:42, 47). In Syria it was represented by that one of the Ashtaroth
(i.e., of the varieties which the goddess Astarte, or Ashtoreth, underwent)
surnamed "Karnaim," from the horns of the crescent moon by which she
was distinguished. *SEE ASHTORETH*. In Babylonia it formed one of a
triad in conjunction with Ether and the sun, and, under the name of *Sin,*
received the honored titles of "Lord of the month," "King of the gods," etc.
(Rawlinson's *Herodotus,* 1:614). There are indications of a very early
introduction into the countries adjacent to Palestine of a species of worship
distinct from any that we have hitherto noticed, viz. of the direct homage
of the heavenly bodies —sun, moon, and stars — which is the
characteristic of *Sabianism* (q.v.). The first notice which we have of this is
in Job (Job 31:26, 27), and it is observable that the warning of Moses
(Deuteronomy 4:19) is directed against this nature-worship, rather than
against the form of moon-worship which the Israelites must have witnessed
in Egypt. At a later period, however, the worship of the moon in its grosser
form of idol-worship was introduced from Syria: we have no evidence
indeed that the Ashtoreth of the Zidonians, whom Solomon introduced
(1 Kings 11:5), was identified in the minds of the Jews with the moon,
but there can be no doubt that the moon was worshipped under the form of
an image in Manasseh's reign, although Movers *(Phonie.* 1:66, 164) has
taken up the opposite view; for we are distinctly told that the king " made
an *asherah* (A.V. 'grove'), i.e., an *image* of Ashtoreth, and worshipped all
the host of heaven" (2 Kings 21:3), which *asherah* was destroyed by
Josiah, and the priests that burned incense to the moon were put down
(2 Kings 23:4, 5). At a somewhat later period the worship of the "queen
of heaven" was practiced in Palestine (Jeremiah 7:18; 44:17). The title
has generally been supposed to belong to the moon (comp. Horace, *Carm.*

Sac. 35; Apuleius, *Metam.* 2, page 254), but some think it more probable that the Oriental Venus is intended, for the following reasons:

(1) the title of *Urania* "of heaven" was peculiarly appropriate to Venus, whose worship was borrowed by the Persians from the Arabians and Assyrians *(Herod.* 1:131, 199);

(2) the votaries of this goddess, whose chief function was to preside over births, were women; and we find that in Palestine the married women are specially noticed as taking a prominent part;

(3) the peculiarity of the title, which occurs only in the passages quoted, looks as if the worship were a novel one; and this is corroborated by the term *kavvan* (ˆⱲⱩ) applied to the "cakes," which is again so peculiar that the Sept. has retained it *(χαυών),* deeming it to be, as it not improbably was, a foreign word. Whether the Jews derived their knowledge of the "queen of heaven" from the Philistines, who possessed a very ancient temple of Venus Urania at Ascalon *(Herod.* 1:105), or from the Egyptians, whose god Athor was of the same character, is uncertain. *SEE QUEEN OF HEAVEN*.

The moon was regarded in the old Syrian superstition as subject to the sun's influence, which was worshipped as the active and generative power of nature, while the moon was reverenced as the passive and producing power. The moon, accordingly, was looked upon as feminine. Herein Oriental usage agrees with our own. But this usage was by no means universal. The gender of *mond* in German is an exception in modern days, which may justify the inference that even among the Northern nations the moon has masculine qualities ascribed to it. By the people of Carran, in Mesopotamia, the moon was worshipped as a male deity, and called *Lunus.* Spartian tells us these people were of the opinion that such as believe the moon to be a goddess, and not a god, will be their wives' slaves as long as they live; but, on the contrary, those who esteem her to be a god will ever be masters of their wives, and never be overcome by their artifices. The same author tells us that there were remaining several medals of the Nysaeans, Magnesians, and other Greek nations, which represented the moon in the dress and under the name of a man, and covered with an Armenian bonnet. The Egyptians also represented their moon as a male deity, *Ihoth;* and Wilkinson *(Anc. Egypt.* 5:5) remarks that "the same custom of calling it male is retained in the East to the present day, while

the sun is considered feminine, as in the language of the Germans. Ihoth, in the character of Lunus, the moon, has sometimes a man's face, with the crescent of the moon upon his head supporting a disk." Plutarch says the Egyptians "call the moon the mother of the world, and hold it to be of both sexes: female, as it receives the influence of the sun; male, as it scatters and disperses through the air the principles of fecundity." In other countries also the moon was held to be hermaphrodite. Another pair of dissimilar qualities was ascribed to the moon — the destructive and the generative faculty — whence it was worshipped as a bad as well as a good power. The Egyptians sacrificed to the moon when she was at the full. The victims offered to her were swine, which the Egyptians held to be impure animals, and were forbidden to offer them to any other deities but that planet and Bacchus. When they sacrificed to the moon, and had killed the victim, they put the end of the tail, with the spleen and fat, into the caul, and burned them on the sacred fire, and ate the rest of the flesh on the day of the new moon. Those whose poverty would not admit of the expense of this sacrifice moulded a bit of paste into the shape of a hog, and offered up that (Herodotus, 1:2). In India this goddess bore the name of *Majra;* among the Syrians, *Mylitta;* among the Phoenicians, *Astarte* or *Ashtoreth;* among the Greeks, *Artemis;* and among the Romans, *Diana* (see Bithr, *Synbol.* 1:436 sq., 478; 2:222, 232). In these nations, however, the moon was usually the representative of the benign or prolific power of nature. See Carpzov, *Apparat.* page 510; Frischmuth, *De Melecheth Cceli* (Jen. 1663); A. Calov, *De Selenolatria* (Vit. 1680). SEE ASTROLOGY.

In the Western world also the moon has been, and continues even now to be worshipped or superstitiously regarded. In Europe there are several countries in which untold superstitious acts are performed, depending upon the moon's rotation (see Brand, *Popular Antiquities of Great Britain,* Index in volume 3). In Great Britain and the Northern wilds the moon is placed highest in the scale of nature-worship. In America the wild man, like other heathen, both of civilized and barbarous races, has been long accustomed to the thought that all the heavenly bodies are possessed of animation, and even gifted with some measure of intelligence. To each, accordingly, has been ascribed an independent, vitalizing soul. The sun-god, for example, is the living sun itself, and worship is never paid to it symbolically, as if it were the representative of some invisible or absent spirit, but because it is an actual depository of the supersensuous, an embodiment of the divine. As the sun stands for the Creator, so the moon

is connected, as in Babylonian mythology, with the thought of some evil principle. Says Miller *(Anzerikanische Urreligionen),* "The rude American was haunted by the thought of some co-equal and coordinate array of hostile deities, who manifested their malignant nature by creating discord, sickness, death, and every possible. form of evil. These were held in numerous cases to obey the leadership of the moon, which, owing to its changeful aspects, have become identical with the capricious. evil-minded spirit of American Indians" (page 53; comp. 170, 272; comp. also Brinton, *Myths of the New World,* pages 130-140). In Africa moon-worship prevails to a considerable extent, and is spoken of by Livingstone *(Travels in South Africa,* page 235).

4. In the figurative language of Scripture the moon is frequently noticed as presaging events of the greatest importance through the temporary or permanent withdrawal of its light ([23130]Isaiah 13:10; [29031]Joel 2:31; [41029]Matthew 24:29; [41324]Mark 13:24): in these and similar passages we have an evident allusion to the mysterious awe with which eclipses were viewed by the Hebrews in common with other nations of antiquity (comp. [24316]Jeremiah 13:16; [26327]Ezekiel 32:7, 8; [66812]Revelation 8:12). With regard to the symbolic meaning of the moon in [66120]Revelation 12:1, we have only to observe that the ordinary explanations, viz. the sublunary world, or the changeableness of its affairs, seem to derive no authority from the language of the O.T., or from the ideas of the Hebrews.

Moon Or Lunette

([20818]Isaiah 3:18). *SEE TIRE*.

Moon, New

SEE NEW MOON.

Moor, Michael

a Roman Catholic divine, who flourished in England from 1640 to 1726, was a native of Dublin, Ireland, and spent some time in France, at one time filling the post of principal of the College of Navarre. In England he was regius professor of philosophy, Greek, and Hebrew. He wrote, *De Existentia Dei et Humana Immortalitate* (Paris, 1692, 8vo): — *Hortatio ad Studium Linguce Grcecae et Hebraicae* (1700, 12mo): — *Vera Sciendi Methodus* (Paris, 1716, 8vo) against the philosophy of Des Cartes. See

Harris's Ware's *Ireland,* s.v.; Allibone, *Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors,* s.v.

Moor, Thoroughgood

a missionary of the Anglican establishment to the "Iroquois or Praying Indians," flourished near the opening of the 18th century, in the vicinity of the place now known as Albany, the capital of the state of New York. Mr. Moor arrived in New York from England in 1704, and, after a stay at Albany long enough to acquire the Indian tongue, he at once set out upon his work, and for many years labored among the Iroquois. His success was limited because of the opposition manifested by lord Cornbury, at that time governor of the New York and New Jersey colonies. Moor for some time braved all opposition, but, encountering the ill-will of the governor, he was incarcerated, and after his escape from prison went to sea, and was lost on his homeward voyage. See Anderson, *Hist. Col. Ch.* 3:415 sq.; Hawkins, *Hist.* page 264 sq., 271, 281.

Moore, Aaron

a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, was born in Ohio April 2, 1813; joined the Church when about twenty years old, was admitted into the Louisville Conference in 1846, and remained a regular minister of the Gospel, filling many important appointments with great acceptability until the fall of 1859, when, his health failing him, he accepted a superannuated relation, and retained it till the time of his death, which occurred in Madisonville, Kentucky, October 15, 1863. See *Min. Ann. Conf: M.E. Church, South,* 1 (1858-65), 481.

Moore, Benjamin, D.D.

a bishop of the Protestant Episcopal Church, was born at Newton, N.J., and was educated at King's (now Columbia) College, New York, where he graduated in 1768, and then devoted his time to the study of theology, supporting himself by private instruction in Greek and Latin. In May 1774, he went to England to enter into holy orders, and in June of that year was ordained deacon and priest by the bishop of London, and on his return to America officiated in Trinity Church, New York, of which he became rector, December 22, 1800. The extent of Dr. Moore's labors, and his popularity in this position, were beyond all precedent, and when, in 1801, the diocese needed a bishop, he was elected and consecrated. He was also

made president of Columbia College in this year, and so remained until 1811, continuing all the while the duties of his ministry, and even until his death, February 27, 1816. From 1811 to the hour of his death, Dr. Hobart, who afterwards succeeded him, acted as his assistant bishop, bishop Moore having been struck with paralysis, and thus disabled from discharging any longer the duties of his office. Bishop Moore was an accomplished scholar and an able pulpit orator. He was, with one single exception, the last of the venerable men in the diocese of New York who had derived their ordination from the parent Church of England. He published two sermons in the *American Preacher* (volumes 1 and 2, 1791): — *A Sermon before the General Convention* (1804): — A *Pamphlet in Vindication of Episcopal Services* (2 volumes, 8vo). His *Posthumous Sermons* were published under the direction of his son, Clement C. Moore, LL.D. (N.Y. 1824, 2 volumes, 8vo). See Sprague, *Annals of the Amer. Pulpit,* 5:299; Bishop White, *Memoirs of the Episcopal Church* (1836), page 32; Moore, *Hist. of Columbia College;* Anderson, *Hist. of the Colonial Church,* 3:611 sq.; Drake, *Dict. of Amer. Biog.* s.v. (J.H.W.)

Moore, Charles

a clergyman of the English Establishment, eldest son of archbishop Moore, was educated first at Westminster School, and next at Trinity College, Cambridge, where he took his degrees and obtained a fellowship. He flourished in the second half of the last century, first as rector of Cuxton, in Kent, then as vicar of St. Nicholas at Rochester, and latex as one of the six preachers of the cathedral of Canterbury. He wrote, *A Visitation Sermon preached before his Father* (1785, 4to): — *A full Inquiry into the Subject of Suicide* (1790, 2 volumes, 4to): — The *good Effects of a united Trust in the Arm of the Flesh and the Arm of the Lord a Sermon* (1804, 8vo): — *Female Compassion illustrated, a Sermon* (1806, 8vo): — *Personal Reform the only effectual Basis of National Reform, a Sermon* (1810, 8vo). See *Biog. Dict. of Living Authors* (Lond. 1816, 8vo), page 239.

Moore, Clement Clarke, LL.D.

an American scholar, noted for his knowledge of exegetical theology, son of Benjamin Moore, was born in New York July 15, 1779; was educated at Columbia College, class of 1798; then entered on the special study of Hebrew, and after a while secured the appointment as professor of Biblical literature in the Protestant Episcopal Seminary, New York; in 1821 was

transferred to the chair of Hebrew and Greek literature, and later to Oriental and Greek literature. While in connection with the "General Seminary" of his Church, as it came finally to be known, he donated to it the large plot of ground upon which its buildings now stand. In 1850 he received the title of: emeritus professor, and lived to take an interest in the institution he had served so many years, and so acceptably, until July 10, 1863, his death occurring at Newport, R.I., whither he had gone to spend the summer recreating. To Dr. Moore belongs the honor of having published the first American contributions to Hebrew philology, viz. a *Hebrew Lexicon, with Notes, a Grammar, and a complete Vocabulary of the Psalms* (N.Y. 1809, 2 volumes, 8vo). He also published his father's sermons, and contributed valuable works to the department of belles-lettres (for which see Allibone, *Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors,* s.v.). See Drake, *Diet. of Amer. Biog.* s.v.

Moore, Franklin, D.D.

a minister of note of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born February 14, 1822, in Beaver, Pennsylvania. In quite tender years he was converted and though his father, who was a lawyer and eminent at the bar, wished him to choose the legal profession as his life-calling, his mind drifted beyond all persuasion towards the ministry. In preparing for this work he studied at Washington College, in Washington, Pennsylvania, and also at the Presbyterian Theological Seminary in Alleghany City, and graduated from both institutions with honor. In 1845 the Pittsburgh Conference held its annual session in the place of his nativity, and during the session he, having shortly after his conversion joined the Methodist Church, was received into the travelling connection, and appointed to Chartiers Circuit. The next year he was sent to Steubenville, and in 1847 he was received into full connection and ordained deacon. He was stationed at New Lisbon, Ohio. In 1849 he was ordained elder, and stationed at Uniontown, Pa.; in 1851 and 1852 he was in Washington, Pennsylvania; and in 1853 and 1854 on Uniontown District. He was transferred in 1855 to the West Virginia Conference, then called Western Virginia Conference, and stationed for two years at Fourth Street, in Wheeling. At the close of his term of service in that station he was transferred to the Philadelphia Conference, and there filled the following appointments: in 1857 and 1858, Trinity Church, Philadelphia; in 1859 and 1860, Wharton Street Church, Philadelphia; in 1861 and 1862, Harrisburg; in 1863 and 1864, Union Church, Philadelphia; in 1865 a supernumerary, but doing work a part of the year; in 1866 in

Thirty-eighth Street Church, but still a supernumerary; in 1866 and 1867, Pottsville; and in 1869 he was finally placed on the superannuated list, his failing health making further duties in the ministry impossible. He was suffering from *laryngytis,* and was counselled by physicians to go South. He visited Florida, but, finding no relief, then went to California, and died there Jan. 22,1870, in the city of Sacramento. Dr. Moore was widely known among Methodists for his sweetness of spirit, his devout and genial life, and his earnest services in the ministry of the Church. "His life," says the *Pittsburgh Christian Advocate,* "embraced more of excellences than usually falls to the lot of man. Unassuming, gentle, loving, true as steel, thoroughly conscientious, he moved through society a centre and source of the very best Christian influences. Around him grew up, as one result, some of the most enduring affections." During his travels he wrote for the Church papers, and filled the place of corresponding editor of the *Philadelphia Home Journal.* His letters were largely circulated, and much admired for their beauty of description. His love of nature was such that he levelled in woodland scenes, in quiet dells and unbroken forests, in towering hills and mountains, in broad and picturesque valleys, in the changing hues of foliage and flowers; and no weariness did he ever seem to know in descanting upon these themes. See *Minutes of Annual Conferences,* 1870, page 48; *Methodist Home Journal,* January 29, 1870; *Pittsburgh Christian Advocate,* February 5, 1870. (J.H.W.)

Moore, George C.

a Presbyterian minister, was born in Barre,Vermont, in 1832. He was educated in the State University, Burlington, Vermont, and became a member of the legal profession. In 1858 he removed to Texas, commenced teaching at Goliad, and soon after was called to take charge of Aranama College in that city. Becoming very much impressed with the spiritual desolation of Texas, he removed to Clinton in that state, and entered upon the study of theology under the care of the Reverend Joel T. Case; was licensed and ordained in 1865, and became pastor of the churches in Victoria and Lavaca, Texas. He was a member of the General Assembly which met in Memphis, Tennessee, in 1866. On his return he continued his labors until his death, September 3, 1867. Mr. Moore was remarkable for his piety, general intelligence, and impressive manner of preaching. His sermons were rich in thought and unction, and he was quite successful as an educator. See Wilson, *Presb. Hist. Almanac,* 1868, page 345.

Moore, George W.

a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, was born in Charleston, S.C., September 27,1799. He was converted in 1819, was licensed to preach in 1823, and continued in the itinerancy until about 1855, when he entered the mission-field, and labored among the colored population of South Carolina. He died in the Anderson District, S. C., Aug. 16, 1863. See *Min. Asnn. Conf. M.E. Church, South,* 2 (1858-65), 449.

Moore, Hannah

SEE MORE, HANNAH.

Moore, Henry (1)

SEE MORE, HENRY.

Moore, Henry (2)

a Wesleyan preacher and writer of considerable note, and an associate of the founder of Methodism, was born in Dublin, Ireland in 1751. He had heard Wesley in his childhood, and had at once become impressed with the preacher's bearing and earnestness. On removing to London he often attended the preaching of Madan and Charles Wesley, and the religious impressions of his early childhood were renewed; yet he failed to identify himself with the Methodists until, after his return to Ireland, he heard Smyth, a nephew of an archbishop, who had left friends and position to preach the simple Methodist theology. This "good man," as Moore himself delighted to call him persuaded Moore finally to cast his lot with the Wesleyans. His family opposed the step, but Moore persisted, and he was even permitted to introduce domestic worship among them. He at once gave himself to the work. He visited the prisons, braving fever and pestilence, and the still harder trial of agonizing sympathy with felons condemned to the gallows. After a while he was induced to exhort, and in a short time to preach, His audience gathered in a deserted weaver's shop, which was furnished for the purpose with seats and a desk. He soon gathered the masses, and in a very brief period had an organized society of twenty-six members. He was zealous in good works, and rich in his personal religious experiences. Wesley's attention was called to Moore, and in 1780 he ordered him to take the field as an itinerant of the Londonderry

Circuit. He soon progressed in his work, and finally Wesley called him to London, where he became the constant companion of the great religious reformer of the 18th century. The two men of God met together in the morning at five o'clock to answer letters; they travelled together, and Moore became the counsellor of the Connection. Wesley himself had so high an estimation of Moore's talents and character that he endeavored to procure him ordination in the national Church; and, when disappointed in this, he himself set Moore aside for the sacred work, assisted by two presbyters of the establishment, Peard Dickinson and James Creighton. Visiting Ireland now and then, he helped to build up the interests of Methodism in that country. Indeed, one of the principal Methodist chapels in Dublin now stands a monument of his successful labors in the Irish capital. Like the other Methodist preachers, Moore frequently addressed the people in the open air, and shared the usual persecutions of his ministerial brethren. When the controversies arose in the Wesleyan Connection on Church polity, Moore proved himself worthy of the trust reposed in him by Wesley. Conservative by nature, he had so carefully cultivated his judgment as to make a competent counsellor for the Methodist body, and to his untiring efforts the successful issue of the conferences and controversies from 1791 to 1797, resulting in the definite outlines of a Wesleyan polity, are largely due (see *Wesleyan Magazine,* 1845, page 314; Smith, *History of Wesleyan Methodism,* volume 2, Append. 9; *Life,* by Mrs. Smith, ann. 1794, page 164). Wesley's estimate of Moore is especially manifest in the fact that he suffered Moore to be a witness to his conference with the lady of his early affection, who, when the Christian laborer in his eightyfifth year happened to be near her, had sent word for his presence (Stevens, *Hist. of Methodism,* 2:406); and also in his appointment of this companion of his youth as one of the trustees of his manuscripts and books. Moore's love for Wesley is manifest in the biography which he furnished of the founder of Methodism in conjunction with Dr. Coke (q.v.). Henry Moore lived to be "the last survivor of the men whom Wesley had ordained;" and by his pen and his preaching " promoted Methodism through nearly seventy years, and died in his ninety-third year April 27,1843, its most venerable patriarch" (Stevens). Besides a *Life of John and Charles Wesley and the Family* (1824, 8vo), Moore published, *Private Life and Moral Rhapsody* (1795, 4to): — *Reply to a Pamphlet entitled "Considerations on a Separation of the Methodists from the Established Church"* (1794, 8vo): — *Memoir of Henry Fletcher.* See *Life of Rev. Henry Moore,* by Mrs. Richard Smith (daughter of Adam

Clarke) (Lond. 1844, 8vo); Stevens, *History of Methodism,* 2:190 sq.; 3:52, 56, 75; Smith, *History of Wesleyan Methodism,* volume 1, book 2, chapter 5-7; Tyerman, *Life of Wesley,* volume 3 (see Index). (J.H.W.)

Moore, Henry Eaton

an American composer of music, both sacred and secular, was born at Andover, N.H., July 21, 1803, and took up the study of music while engaged in the printing business. In 1826 he began to teach it, and then published several valuable contributions to the science of this fine art, among which are of interest to us, *N.H. Coil. of Ch. Music: — Collect. of Anthems, Choruses, and Set Pieces: — The Northern Harp, a Collection of Sacred Harmony.* He died at East Cambridge, Massachusetts, October 23, 1841. A brother of his, John Weeks Moore, who was born at Andover April 11, 1807, has published *A Cyclop. of Music: — Sacred Minstrel;* etc. See Drake, *Dict. of Amer. Biog.* s.v.

Moore, Humphrey, D.D.

a Congregational minister, was born in Princeton, Massachussetts, about the year 1779; graduated at Harvard College in 1799; in 1802 was ordained pastor of the Congregational Church in Milford, where he preached for a period of more than thirty years. He died April 8, 1871. Dr. Moore was a man of more than ordinary ability, and his influence extended widely throughout the southern portion of iNewv Hampshire. Appleton's *Annual Cyclop.* 1871, page 572,

Moore, Jacob

a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born in Sussex Co., Del., in 1791; was converted while young; entered the Philadelphia Conference in 1815; was presiding elder of the West Jersey District in 1823-4; on Chesapeake District in 1825-6; and died at Dover, Del., April, 1828. He was a pious and exemplary minister, a vigorous and successful student, and abounded in labors and usefulness, in spite of ill-health and great discouragements. See *Minutes of Annual Conferences,* 2:39.

Moore, James

an early minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born in Tyrone County, Ireland, in 1760; joined the Methodists in 1786; migrated to America in 1792, and joined the Philadelphia Conference in 1794. For

forty-eight years he was a faithful and useful minister, particularly gifted in exhortation. He died at Medford, N.J., May 11, 1842. See *Minutes of Annual Conferences,* 3:355.

Moore, James G.

a Presbyterian minister, was born near Johnsonburg, N.J., November 30, 1813. At the age of eleven years he was apprenticed to a tailor in Newton, N.J.; during his apprenticeship was converted, and, through the influence of his pastor, was persuaded to turn his attention to the ministry. He graduated at Lafayette College, Easton, Pennsylvania; studied theology at Princeton, N.J.; was licensed and ordained pastor of the church at Beaver Meadow, Pa., in 1845; shortly after resigned this charge for a Dutch Reformed Church at Montague, N.J., where he remained until 1849, when he took charge of the academy at Blairstown, N.J., under the patronage of the Presbyterian Church. Close confinement broke down his health, and in 1851 he removed to Croton Falls, N.Y., and took charge of a small select school. In 1853 he moved West, to try a change of climate, but all in vain; he died near Philadelphia, Marion County, Missouri, May 28, 1858. Mr. Moore was a man of decided piety. The great desire of his soul was to preach the Gospel. See Wilson, *Presb. Hist. Almanac,* 1860, page 76.

Moore, James Lovell

a clergyman of the Church of England, who flourished near the beginning of this century, was successively master of the free school at Hertford and vicar of Benger, in Hertfordshire, also incumbent of the perpetual curacy of Denham, Suffolk. He wrote, *View of the External Evidence of the Christian Religion* (1791, 8vo): — *On the Plenary Inspiration of the New Testament* (1793, 8vo): — *The Columbiad, a Poem* (1793, 8vo): — *Commentaries on the Corruptions of the Roman Catholic Religion* (1811,12mo). See *Biog. Dict. of Living Authors* (London, 1816,12mo), page 239.

Moore, John (1), D.D.

a noted prelate of the Anglican communion, was born at Market Harborough, Leicestershire, near the middle of the 17th century. He was educated at Clare Hall, Cambridge, where he graduated in 1665, and became a fellow of the college. Afterwards he was appointed chaplain to the earl of Nottingham, whose interest secured Moore the first prebendal

stall in the cathedral church of Ely. His next preferment was the rectory of St. Austin's, London, to which he was admitted in 1687. Two years later he was presented by William and Mary (to whom he was then chaplain in ordinary) to the rectory of St. Andrew's, Holborn, vacated by Dr. Stillingfleet's promotion to the episcopate; and in 1691, on the deposition of the bishop of Norwich, Dr. Moore was appointed to that see, from which he was in 1707 transferred to the see of Ely. He died in 1714. Debary *(Hist. of Ch. of Engl. from the Accession of James II* [Lond. 1860, 8vo], page 235) speaks of Dr. Moore as "a man of considerable celebrity in his day, but now better remembered for his connection with the fortunes of Dr. Samuel Clarke and Bentley than for his once famous discourses from the pulpit." His *Sermons,* which were published after his death by his chaplain, Dr. Samuel Clarke (Lond. 1715-16, 2 volumes, 8vo; 2d ed. 1724), were translated into the Dutch. His library, which was a very valuable collection, was purchased by king George I and presented to the University of Cambridge. See Burnet, *Reformation;* id. *His Own Times;* Bentham, *Ely;* Birch, *Life of Tillotson; Blackwood's Mag.* 28:455; Hook, *Eccles. Biog.* s.v. (J.H.W.)

Moore, John (2), D.D.

a noted prelate of the Church of England, was born of very humble parentage, at Gloucester, in 1733, and was educated at Pembroke College, Oxford. He took holy orders; and after filling various minor appointments in the Church, he became chaplain to the duke of Marlborough, and tutor to one of his sons, and obtained by that interest a prebendal stall in the cathedral of Durham; in 1771 he was installed into the deanery of Canterbury; in 1776 was awarded the bishopric of Bangor; and in 1783 was raised to the metropolitan see, recommended to this great distinction by bishops Lowth and Hurd, both of whom had been offered the place, but preferred that it be assigned to bishop, Moore, whom they esteemed as a superior man, particularly fitted "by his business-like habits and affable manners." It does not appear, says Perry *(Hist. of Ch. of Engl.* 3:444, 445), that he possessed any special literary or theological claims, nor yet can it be believed that his advancement was due to strong family interest, for he had none to commend him. He died in 1804 or 1805. He published several *Sermons* (Lond. 1777, 4to; 1781, 4to; 1782, 8vo). (J.H.W.)

Moore, John (3)

a clergyman of the Church of England, who flourished about the opening of this century, was minor canon of St. Paul's, lecturer of St. Sepulchre's, rector of St. Michael Barrisham, London, and of Langdon Hills, Essex. He in vain endeavored to secure public aid for the publication of an edition of bishop Waldon's *Ecclesiastical History of London.* He was a learned man and an excellent preacher. He published, *Case of the London Clergy* (1802, 8vo): — *Attempt to Recover the Reading of* [9130]*1 Samuel 13:1, with Inquiry of the Duration of Solomon's Reign* (1797, 8vo): — *Prophetiae de LXX Hebdonadis ap. Danielumn explicatio* (1802, 8vo): — *Prophecy of* [20714]*Isaiah* 7:14, 15 (1809, 8vo). See *Biog. Dit. of Living Auth.* s.v.

Moore, John Weeks

SEE MOORE, HENRY EATON.

Moore, Martin

a Congregational minister of some note as a religious journalist, was born at Sterling, Massachusetts, April 22, 1790; was educated at Brown University, where he graduated in 1810; and for nearly thirty years served in the ministry at Natick, Massachusetts, and afterwards at Cohasset; and then was for some twenty years editor of the *Boston Recorder.* He was also from 1861 to 1866 vice-president of the "New England Historical and Genealogical Society." Moore died at Cambridge, Massachusetts, March 12, 1866. — He wrote *Life of John Eliot* (1842): — *Hist. of Natick* (1817). See Drake, *Dict. of Amer. Biog.* s.v.

Moore, Nathaniel F., LL.D.

an American educator of note, was born at Newtown, Long Island, December 25, 1782, and was the nephew of bishop Benjamin Moore (q.v.). Educated at Columbia College. class of 1802, he turned to the bar as his life-work; but in 1817 was induced to take the adjunct professorship in Greek and Latin, and in 1820 was given the full chair, which he held until 1835, when he went to Europe. On his return, in 1837, he was made librarian. In 1839 he again went to Europe, and this time travelled also in the Orient. In 1842 he was made president of his alma mater; and he served in that capacity until 1849, when he retired to private life. His works are of a secular character, and do not concern us here; but his life-work was

eminently Christian and greatly enriched American Christian culture. He died April 27, 1872. Dr. Moore was a man of rare scholarly attainments, and was greatly beloved for his gentle nature and purity of character. See Duyckinck, *Cyclopedia of American Literature,* 1:380-383.

Moore, Philip

a clergyman of the Anglican communion, noted for his pulpit oratory and his scholarship, flourished in the second half of the 18th century. He was born about 1709, was for some time rector of Kirkbridge, and chaplain of Douglas, Isle of Man, and died January 22, 1783. He is noted as the reviser of the translation of the Bible into Manks, in which task he had the counsel of bishop Lowth and Dr. Kennicott, and also as the translator of the Book of Common Prayer, and several theological works. See Butler, *Memoirs of Bp. Hildesby,* page 186; *General Biog. Dict.* (Lond. 1798), 11:61.

Moore, Richard Channing, D.D.

an early bishop of the Episcopal Church in America, was born in New York August 21, 1762; was educated at King's College, and then practiced medicine for four years, when he suddenly turned towards the ministry, and was ordained by bishop Provoost of New York in 1787. He preached at Rye, Westchester County, N.Y., and then at St. Andrew's, Richmond, Staten Island (the parish embracing the whole of the island), where he labored successfully for twenty-one years. In 1808 he represented the diocese of New York at the General Conference in Baltimore, and aided in making a selection of hymns for the Church. In 1809 he succeeded to St. Stephen's Church, New York; in 1814, to the rectorship of the Monumental Church at Richmond, and to the episcopate of Virginia, for which he proved himself preeminently qualified. "Bishop Hobart hesitated not to express the conviction of his thankful heart that the 'night of adversity had passed, and that a long and splendid day was dawning on the Church" (Anderson, *Hist. Ch. of Engl. in the Colonies,* 3:277). The efforts of bishop Moore were "unremittingly exerted to build up the nearly exhausted diocese committed to his care; and so well directed were his labors, and so beneficial his example and influence, that at the time of his death the number of the Episcopal clergymen in Virginia had increased to upwards of one hundred. During the last twelve years of his life his episcopal duties were shared by bishop Meade, who had been appointed his assistant, and who succeeded him in office. He was a prominent leader in

the evangelical branch of the Church." He died November 11, 1841. He published many *Charges*: — *A Sermon on "the Doctrines of the Church"* (1820). A *Memoir* appeared shortly after his death, by Reverend J.P.K. Henshaw (1843, 8vo). See also Sprague, *Annals of the Amer. Pulpit,* v, 367; Bishop Wilberforce, *Hist. Am. Ch.* pages 286, 293; Hawks, *Eccl Hist. of Virginia,* page 251-260. (J.H.W.)

Moore, Sir Thomas

SEE MORE, THOMAS.

Moore, Thomas Jefferson

a minister of note of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, was born in Franklin, Kentucky, March 2, 1824. His parents were useful and devoted members of the Methodist Church. His father died when Thomas was but twelve years of age, and he was obliged to shift for himself. He learned the art of printing, and thus earned a livelihood. In his eighteenth year (1841) he was converted and joined the Church, and soon after felt that his calling was to preach the Gospel. He was licensed, and appointed to the Owensboro Circuit in 1843. In 1845 he was ordained deacon, and appointed to Litchfield, and the next year to Henderson Circuit. In 1847 he was ordained elder, and appointed to Salem Circuit. The next year he travelled on the Lafayette Circuit, and the following year on the Hopkinsville Circuit. After a year's rest he resumed his labors on the Lebanon Circuit, where he remained for two years; he then went to the Jefferson Circuit for one year, and afterwards preached two years with great success on the Logan Circuit. He was next appointed agent of the Southern Methodist Book Concern and Tract Society, and he so ably discharged the obligations of his office as to largely increase the influence of the institution. He met with great success — preaching, raising funds, or circulating books. The next year he was appointed to the Franklin Circuit, and the following year he was made presiding elder of the Glasgow District. His last work was on the Logan District. He died September 14, 1867. Mr. Moore was a preacher of no ordinary ability. He was a diligent student, possessing a clear perception and a retentive memory. He was well versed In the doctrines and history of the Bible and of the Church. See *Min. Ann. Conf. M.E. Church, South,* 1867, page 163.

Moore, Zephaniah Swift, D.D.

a noted American educator and Congregational minister, was born November 20, 1770, in Palmer, Massachusetts; graduated at Dartmouth College in 1793; entered the ministry February 3, 1796, and was made pastor at Leicester, Mass. He was elected professor of languages at Dartmouth College in 1811, and president of Williams College in 1815. In 1821 he was chosen first president of Amherst College, then just founded, and he occupied this position until his death, June 30, 1823. He published an *Oration at Worcester,* July 5, 1802: — An *Address to the Public in respect to Amherst College* (1823); and two occasional *Sermons.* See Sprague, *Annals of the Amer. Pulpit,* 2:392; Drake, *Dict. of Amer. Biog.* s.v.

Mooring, Christopher S.

an early Methodist Episcopal minister, was born in Surrey County, Virginia, in 1767; entered the Virginia Conference in 1789; and died September 30, 1825, having preached with excellent success until called to his future home. He was distinguished for modesty, gravity, and faithfulness; always ready to teach and to preach, and many souls were converted through his labors. See *Minutes of Annual Conferences,* 1:507.

Moors

(Lat. *Marui,* meaning *dark;* Span. *Moros),* the original designation of the inhabitants of the ancient *Mauritania* or *Morocco* (q.v). The Arabs, who entered and conquered this country in the 7th century, denominated the native population *Moghrebins,* i.e., "Westerners," or "men of the West," but they called themselves *Berbers,* while to the Europeans they were known as *Moors.* The Arabic language, customs, and manners soon came to prevail among the Berbers; and the Arab conquerors, who gave them the Mohammedan faith, freely amalgamating with them, their character was totally changed, and they became hardly distinguishable from their conquerors; and under Moors we now generally understand the mixed races that arose in the 7th century, when the Saracens wrested North Africa from the Byzantine empire, and incorporated it with the caliphate of Damascus. The Moors were distinguished by the warlike spirit which was then common among the Mohammedan nations, and at an early period began to make inroads for plunder into Spain. A battle with the Visigoths of that country took place in A.D. 672, in which they were defeated with

considerable loss; but an opportunity which favored their designs occurred when, during a rebellion which in A.D. 710 placed Roderic, duke of Cordova, on the Spanish throne, the defeated party called in the aid of the Moors. A force of them, led by Taric, entered in the following year, and at the battle of Xeres de la Frontera, near Cadiz, July 11, 711, the army of the Goths, under king Roderic, was almost entirely destroyed, while the death of Roderic himself, who was killed in the battle, put an end to the dominion of the Goths. Muza, the governor of North Africa, jealous of the success of Taric, now advanced with a new army, and took Cordova and Toledo, and within five years subdued the greater portion of the peninsula to his power. Receiving re-enforcements from Africa, he even crossed the Pyrenees, twenty years later, and advanced as far as Bordeaux and Tours. Here, however, the invaders were defeated by Charles Martel in the battle of Poitiers, and they recrossed the Pyrenees, never to return. The defeat not only drove the Moors from the Continent, but forever after confined them to the Iberian peninsula; and even here the inhabitants of Asturia. Galicia, and the Basques successfully resisted their dominion. Also in the parts in which the African invaders had successfully established themselves, internal divisions, which soon arose among the chiefs, together with insubordination towards the caliph of Africa, often brought them near an overthrow, until after the extinction of the family of the Ommiades, when Abderahman I, the last representative of the Ommiade caliphs, who had escaped from Damascus on the subversion of that dynasty in A.D. 752, brought about the consolidation of the government with the caliphate of Cordova, and annulled its previous dependence on the caiiphate of Damascus. Under this new government order and prosperity revived. Abderahman changed the laws, regulated the administration, built a fleet, and provided for the instruction of the people. His residence was established at Cordova, where he built a magnificent mosque. His successors, and particularly Abderahman III and Alhakem II, followed his example; and under the dynasty of the Ommiades Spain became the equal in civilization and learning of any country in Europe. It seemed as if the Arabs had only been transplanted to Spain to enable them to acquire the high intellectual culture which was unknown in the East. But while they advanced in civilization, they gradually lost the warlike qualities which had enabled them to make their conquest, and the oppressed Spanish Christians came to look forward to the time when they could throw off the yoke and regain their nationality. The flourishing period of the reign of the Ommiades lasted until the 10th century, the whole period covering the

brightest page of Moorish history. After holding for 282 years the caliphate of Cordova, the Ommiade family became extinct in 1037 in the person of Hesham III, who, on account of the insubordination of his subjects, retired from the government in 1031, to devote himself to science and literature. With his retirement the caliphate of Cordova also ended; and the territory was divided into a number of little states, the governors erecting themselves into hereditary and independent princes, and they severally wasted their strength in internecine wars, interrupted only occasionally by an alliance for mutual defence when the Christians threatened their very existence. The latter had not in the mean time remained stationary. By A.D. 801 Charlemagne had definitely incorporated the territory north of the Ebro with the Frankish dominions, and the Moors were driven out of Catalonia. They then retained simply the provinces of Leon and Castile. But even there the Arab population was greatly diminishing; and when in 1085 the Castilians succeeded in taking Toledo, and the Tagus became the frontier of Christian Spain, the Arabs clearly saw their dominion seriously threatened, and, for centuries broken up and scattered, now became more united, and finally resolved to call Jussuf, of the family of the Almoravides, who had established a great empire in Africa, to assist them against the king of Castile. Jussuf arrived in 1086 with a numerous army, and promptly defeated the Christians at Zalacca, but was obliged to return to Africa to defend his possessions there. He came back soon afterwards, however, and all the Moors of Spain remained united under his government. After his death, in 1106, a second period of internal ruptures followed. Abdelmumen, chief of the Almohades, a family opposed to the Almoravides, came from Africa with a large army, and, taking Cordova and Granada in 1157, established for a while its supremacy. Whenever the Arabs were at peace with each other, the surrounding Christian princes thought it their duty to attack these enemies of the cross. Unity having been in a measure restored by the Almoravides, the archbishop Martin of Toledo invaded Andalusia in 1194, and laid the country waste; the following year king Alphonso III of Castile sent a challenge to Africa to the governor, Jacob Almansor, who, in return, came to Spain with a large army, and defeated Alphonso, July 19, 1195. Thirty thousand Christians, including the most distinguished Spanish knights, were left slain on the field of battle. Almansor fortunately died soon after, and his successors had neither the spirit nor the means to follow up his advantage. The Christians now perceived the necessity of combined action on their part also, and pope Innocent III caused a crusade to be preached against the Moors, both

in Spain and in France. In the wars which ensued the Christians proved successful, and completely routed their adversaries in the battle of Las Naves de Tolosa, on the Sierra Morena, July 16, 1212, and by this result brought about the termination of the rule of the Moors in Spain; so that a tract of land, comprising 430 square miles, in the vicinity of Granada, alone remained free from Christian rule. The Aragonians took Valencia, a part of Murcia, and the Balearic Islands; the Castilians took Estremadura, Cordova, and the remaining part of Murcia; even Granada was compelled in 1246 to surrender to king Ferdinand of Castile. Yet this province retained a sort of independence on account of its position, and its almost completely Moorish population. The position of the Arabs varied greatly in the different conquered provinces; but to the shame of the so-called Christians of the Iberian peninsula be it said that generally it was much worse than had been that of the Christians under the rule of the Moors. The Goths, after the conquest, under Moorish rule, had remained in possession of their lands; their taxes were made no higher than those which rested on the Moors subject to military services; they retained their religion, their worship, their laws, and their judges. The bishops, with their chapters, occupied their former position, and were allowed to call together councils. They were only forbidden building new churches, ringing bells, and having processions. The civil government was intrusted to a civil magistrate appointed by the people, who was to act with the bishop. Lawsuits between Christians were to be adjusted by the cadi according to the Gospel and the Gothic laws, and only disputes between Christians and Arabs were judged by the Koran. The Christians who under these circumstances had endured Mohammedan rule received the name of Mozarabic Christians. *SEE MOZARABIC LITURGY*. The military classes ever remained entirely distinct, and in constant communication with their brethren at the north, acting secretly as their allies whenever they invaded the Moorish provinces, The Arabs under Christian rule, on the other hand, were in quite different conditions, and even the concessions granted them were seldom conscientiously observed. They were generally allowed to follow their own mode of worship, but often excessive proselytizing zeal created exceptions, and converted the mosques into churches. They were allowed to retain possession of their estates, but were seldom permitted to sell them, or to change their residence. They were suffered to elect their own judges, and only disputes with Christians were decided by Christian judges. They were obliged to pay tithes of all their income to the state, besides the poll-tax levied by their feudal lords. They were forbidden

having slaves or Christian servants; but this was the fate only of those who had *submitted* to the Christians. Those whose cities had resisted and been conquered were all reduced into slavery in its severest form. The master could sell, punish, or kill them at his pleasure, and all their earnings were his by law. They could, however, obtain their freedom by becoming Christians; but in after-times even this was restricted to the case when the master was either a Mohammedan or a Jew. By their conversion the Arabs were indeed endowed with all political rights, but by no means could they attain to the same social position as the old Christians; they were everywhere despised, and could seldom enter into other Christian families. A relapse into Islamism was punished with the greatest severity, the penalty being, according to the circumstances, death by fire, spoliation, and inability to inherit. Occasionally, however, the relations between Moors and Christians were more friendly, especially in the country, where landowners fully appreciated the skill and activity of the Arabs as agriculturists. Among the nobility, the Arab nobles, by their courage and skill, as well as by their learning — much superior to that of their Spanish conquerors — knew also how to command respect.

All the Arab learning, art, industry, and fortune gradually centred in Granada, which succeeded in maintaining its political autonomy until about the end of the 15th century. A small sea-coast province of not over 430 square miles, it arrived — partly owing to its situation, and more particularly to the zeal and industry of its inhabitants — at a degree of prosperity which other and larger countries might well have envied. But its principal glory was the city of Granada, its capital, which in the 14th century counted 200,000 inhabitants. It contained the world-renowned palace of the Alhambra — a sort of fortress in which 40,000 people might find refuge. (See a popular and accurate account in Prime, *Ahambra and Kremlin,* 1874, 12mo.) Its principal feature is the so-called Lions' Court, built in 1213-38, which is considered as the finest specimen of Moorish architecture. It was the residence of the kings of Granada, which vied in splendor with those of the most favored European monarchs, and where many a Christian prince was entertained with bountiful hospitality. Next in rank to Granada were the sea-towns of Almeria and Malaga, distinguished for their manufacturing and commercial importance as well as for the beauty and richness of their palaces. There the finest kinds of silken fabrics and steel-work were produced as far back as the 12th century, and from thence exported to Italy and to the East. But its very prosperity only

increased the greed of the neighboring Christian princes, and especially of Ferdinand and Isabella; and, unfortunately for the Moors, one of their own rulers-the reigning king of Granada, Muley-Abul-Hakem -himself voluntarily broke the peace with Castile by refusing to pay the tribute. At first he haughtily declared that the mint of Granada no longer coined gold, but only steel. A few years afterwards he went so far as to seize on the frontier fortress of Zahara by treachery, and took the whole population as slaves to Granada. In reprisal, a Spanish knight, with a determined band of warriors, stormed the city of Alhama, the summer residence of the king of Granada. The king of Granada himself left for Fez, and died soon after ill battle in the service of another prince, showing a courage which he had not exhibited in the defence of his own country. In the mean time a revolution broke out in Granada, occasioned by the jealousy of the queen against a rival, and resulted in Muley's oldest son being called to the throne, while Muley himself was obliged to retire to Malaga. A younger brother of his, El Zagal (the courageous), having surprised the Christian army in a narrow pass and destroyed it entirely, king Ferdinand now determined to wage war for the extermination of both. He improved this opportune moment of their dissensions, and first marched against Granada with all his forces, and in 1487 besieged Malaga, which was compelled by famine to surrender on the 18th of August. El Zagal, looking upon the fall of Malaga as an omen, surrendered Almeria, and left for Africa. The young king, Abdallah (generally named Boabdil), had promised to submit when Almeria was taken. but the inhabitants of Granada would not hear of submitting; they trusted to the strength of their fortifications, consisting of strong walls and 1030 towers. The summer of 1491 was spent by both armies in single combats, which have been the subject of numerous romances and tales. But Granada was destined to fall — the more after the Christians had erected opposite Granada a rival fortified city, Santa Fe. The king, certain of being unable to resist, began secretly to negotiate with the Spaniards, and the terms of surrender were settled November 25, 1491. The conditions were such as might have satisfied the inhabitants of Granada had they been observed. They were to retain possession of their mosques, and to be allowed to follow their own religious worship; their own laws were to be administered by their own cadis, under the oversight of the Spanish governor; they were to retain their own customs, language, and dress, and to have the free and unlimited use of all their property; those who preferred leaving the country were to be furnished ships to take them to Africa. The taxes to which they would be subjected should not exceed those which

they paid under their own government. King Abdallah was to retain his estates, and to administer them under the supervision of the Spanish authorities. The city was on these terms surrendered (January 2, 1492) to the Spaniards, who made a triumphal entry; but shortly after the capitulation the Moors found that they had surrendered their rights to the conquerors, and were in danger of losing much, more than they had granted. The finest houses in Granada were occupied by the Spanish noblemen; a converted Moor (such, according to the terms of surrender, were not to hold any official situation) was made chief alguazil, and the largest mosque was changed into a church. The most zealous members of the Romish Church were advising that the Moors should be made to choose between baptism and banishment. But this unwise counsel did not at first prevail. Count de Tendilla and the archbishop Fernando de Talavera, who were at the time governors of the province, sought by mild treatment to unite the Moors with the Spaniards; the archbishop especially was so successful with them by his kindness that large numbers consented to be baptized by him.

This system of conversion, however, appeared too slow to the fanatical party, and the archbishop of Toledo, cardinal Ximenes (q.v.), obtained from the grand inquisitor an authorization to establish an Inquisition among the Elches (Christians who had embraced Islamism; most of them were baptized Moors), and this gave him the means of gradually monopolizing the work of converting the Moors. He set to work, not only by preaching, but also by bribery, and he was at first so successful that thousands were baptized. But this awakened the opposition of the most earnest believers in Mohammedanism. This opposition Ximenes thought to subdue by imprisonment and other severities against their priests; and, in order to strike at the root, he caused all the copies of the Koran and all Arab works of theology to be seized. It is said that he thus collected 80,000 (?) works. He then caused them to be publicly burned. These proceedings led, as he had expected, to an outbreak, directed chiefly against himself. Count Tendilla and the archbishop of Talavera, however, succeeded in quelling the insurrection by promising that the grievances complained of would be inquired into. A capitulation was drawn up, which needed only the royal sanction. Ximenes, whose conduct had at first been sharply blamed by Isabella, had, however, succeeded in converting both her and the king to his views; and the capitulation, for which count Tendilla had given both his wife and children as hostages, was rejected by the king. A royal edict was

even proclaimed leaving the Moors to choose between being baptized and punishment for high-treason. Some 50,000 of the inhabitants of Granada sought peace by submitting to baptism; others sold their possessions and emigrated to Africa. The Moors who became Christians received now the name of *Moriscoes.* But the manner in which the inhabitants of Granada had been treated led to an insurrection in the mountains of the district of Alpujarras. The energetic measures taken to repress that outbreak seemed at first successful; but an attack, in 1500, on the mountains of Serrena de Bonde, almost entirely inhabited by Moors, proved disastrous to the Spaniards; one of their best generals, Alonso de Aguilar, was killed, and his army destroyed. The Moors, however, were at last obliged to submit. A large number emigrated to Africa; others were baptized, stipulating for nothing of their former rights but their dress, language, and exemption from the Inquisition for forty years. This was granted them, but soon evaded; no tribunal of the Inquisition was, indeed, established at Granada, but that of Cordova extended its jurisdiction over Granada. Nine years later another remnant of Mohammedan Moors were forcibly Christianized in the same manner. and baptized en masse in 1526. In the same year a tribunal of the Inquisition was finally established at Granada, and on the 7th of December a proclamation appeared forbidding the Moors from wearing their national dress, or using their national language and their Arab names. But the very next day the Moors purchased the recall of that decree for a sum of 260,000 ducats; this was subsequently several times renewed. The Moors were also, in spite of the treaties concluded with them, subjected to several heavy taxes; so that, besides paying tithes to the Church, they had to pay tithes to the king, and a tax for breeding silk-worms.

Aside from their outward compulsory profession of Christianity, which the vexatious treatment they experienced at the hands of the Christians did not tend to make them like any the more, they were at heart firmly attached to the old religion, and grew more attached to it in proportion as they suffered for it. They retained the mosque beside the church, had their alfaki as well as their Romish priests, circumcised their children after they were baptized, celebrated their marriages according to Mohammedan customs, etc. At times this was winked at. Thus in the latter part of the reign of Charles V the Moriscoes were left in peace; Philip II expressly commanded the Inquisition to show great mildness and toleration towards them, and even a papal bull was promulgated to that effect. But when, during the war with the piratical Moors of Barbary, it was found out that the Moriscoes

had always remained in communication with their African brethren, they became again the objects of persecution. They were forbidden to carry arms without a special authorization, under a penalty of six years of hard labor in the galleys. This gave rise to numerous insurrections, which finally settled into a war of ambush and assassination, and the government was thereby forced to restore the former more rigorous system. After trying other means, Philip II was finally brought to issue a proclamation (November 13, 1556), in which the use of Arabic either in speaking or writing, that of Arab names, and of the national costume of the Moors, even that of their usual baths, was forbidden them; three years were given them to learn Spanish, and those who after that time should contravene these commands were to be punished, according to circumstances, by imprisonment or banishment. This proclamation, against which the Spanish governor of Granada and many Spanish statesmen (among them the duke of Alba) emphatically protested, was nevertheless enforced by the advice of a cardinal and an archbishop. The first result was an insurrection, organized in secret, with the aid of the Moors of Africa, which broke out in the spring of 1568, and at once assumed the character of a war of extermination. The war continued with various vicissitudes — the Moors rising up again when they were thought to have been thoroughly subjected for several years, until finally, after the assassination of the second leader of the insurgents, Aben-Abi (March 18, 1571), the war ended.

The kingdom of Granada, previously the most populous and richest province of Spain, had now become a desolate desert, with here and there a few bands of Moors supporting themselves by robbery amid the ruins of its former splendor. The greater number of Moors were transplanted into other provinces, where they were strictly watched. The use of the Arabic language or of any article of their national dress, the dancing an Arab dance or playing on an instrument suspected to be of Arab origin, were punished as crimes. Only those Moors more anciently settled in Valencia were allowed a little more liberty. Yet, in spite of oppression and watching, the Moriscoes after a few years began to contemplate again a revolt-the more as Spain was then weakened by her war in the Netherlands, and threatened both by France and England. They opened negotiations with France, and in 1605 a vast conspiracy was organized, relying on the assistance of the French. It was, however, betrayed, and the grand inquisitor now clamored that the Moriscoes should either be sent out of Spain or destroyed by the sword. Although Philip III, who was then on the

throne, did not wish to accede to so general a measure, and even the pope declined to favor it, yet, as this step seemed to be the only possible means of securing tranquillity to the state, the king issued a proclamation (August 4, 1609) banishing the Moriscoes of Valencia to Africa. The landed nobility, who foresaw the loss of their best farmers, and the clergy that of their tenants, protested in vain, and grand preparations were made to secure the execution of the edict. A delay was granted the Moors for the regulation of their affairs; they were not allowed to sell their land, and could only take away so much of their personal property as they could carry off themselves. At first the Moors offered to pay enormous sums to obtain the recall of that edict; but afterwards, when they had time to reflect, and saw that nothing was to be done, their sorrow changed to joy; they looked upon their exile as a liberation from slavery, in which they could cast aside their mask of Christianity. The emigration proceeded well at first, the nobility even helping the poor people by purchasing their property at a fair price. But this did not suit the Viceroy, who forbade such purchases being made. The Moors now became again frightened, and those of the south of Valencia, who had not yet emigrated, rose in arms. Many were killed, the others very cruelly treated. The emigration from Murcia and Andalusia succeeded better, most of the Moriscoes from those provinces taking refuge in Fez. Those of Aragon, Castile, and Estremadura were ordered to Navarre, but on the frontiers were informed by the French that they had strict orders not to allow them to penetrate into the country. Exasperated, they either fought their way through or purchased permission to enter. Those of Catalonia were directed to Africa. A small remnant of about 30,000, who had been permitted to stay on exhibiting certificates from their bishops testifying to their sound Christianity, were also driven away a few years later, and left Spain in 1612 and 1613. The whole number of persons thus forced to emigrate is generally reckoned at about a million, and consisted largely of the most active and industrious among the inhabitants of Spain. Those who had emigrated to Africa were at first well received, but subsequently persecuted also by their own coreligionists, whom their European views and habits displeased, and who were jealous of their skill as workmen; so that they were driven out of Algiers and Fez. Only at Tunis, whose inhabitants were mostly descendants of the Moors of Granada, did they find a really hospitable shelter. A small remnant of Moriscoes, some 60,000 in number, remained concealed in the valleys of the Alpujarras, and have to this day retained their peculiar manners and customs, but they have long since become earnest Roman Catholics. See

Conde, *Historia de la Dominacion de los Arabes enl Espanna* (Madrid, 1820-21, 3 volumes; Engl. transl., *Hist. of the Dominion of the Arabs in Spain,* by Mrs. Jonathan Foster [London, 1855, 3 volumes, 12mo, Bohn's Library]); Moron, *Curso de historia de la Civilizacion de Espanna* (Madrid, 1841-3, 3 volumes); Aschbach, *Gesch. d. Ommajaden in Spanien* (Frankf.-ain-Main, 182,9, 2 volumes); id. *Gesch. Spaniens u. Portugals z. Zeit d. Herrschaft d. Almoraviden u. Almohaden* (Frankf. 1833-7, 2 volumes); Von Rochau, *Die Moriskos in Spanien* (Leips. 1853); Herzog, *Real Encyklopadie,* 9:183 sq.; Wetzer u. Welte, *Kirchen-Lexikon,* 6:933 sq.; Prescott, *Reign of Ferdinand and Isabella;* Dozy, *Gesch. der Mauren in Spanien bis zur Eroberung Andalusiens durch die Almoraviden* (7111110) (Leips. 1873-5); Hallam, *History of the Middle Ages* (student's ed.), pages 237-43; Ticknor, *Spanish Literature,* 3:389 sq.; *Southern Review* (Jan. 1874), art. 2; and especially the seventeen articles by Prof. Coppee on the "Moorish Conquest of Spain," in the *Penn Monthly* of 1873 (Phila.). *SEE MOROCCO*.

Moosi'as

*(*Μοοσίας*, Vulg. *Moosias),* a Graecized form (1 Esdr. 9:31) of the MAASEIAH *SEE MAASEIAH* (q.v.) of the Heb. text (Ezra 10:30).

Moph

SEE MEMPHIS.

Mopinot, Simon

a learned French ecclesiastic, was born at Rheims in 1685; took the vows of a Benedictine in 1703 at the monastery of St. Farom, where he had been educated, and largely devoted himself to literary labors. After having assisted Didier in his edition of Tertullian, he was summoned to Paris about the year 1715 by his superiors, and was there associated with father Peter Constant in preparing his collection of the *Lettres des Popes.* The first volume of this work was published in 1721 (fol.), with a dedication to Innocent XIII, and a preface by Mopinot; and he was preparing to print a second volume when he was attacked by a violent dysentery, of which he died in 1724.

Mopsuestia, Church Council Of

(Concilium Mopsuestauomi), was held June 17, 550, by order of the emperor Justinian, on account of the troubles excited by the Three Chapters (q.v.). There were in attendance nine bishops. Examination was made whether the name of Theodore of Mopsluestia was to be found in the diptychs of that church, and, if not, whether it had been there within the memory of man. It appeared from the testimony of irreproachable witnesses far advanced in years that his name had either never been inserted, or had been erased before their time. Notice of this was sent to the pope and the emperor.

Moquamo

a designation of the temples or chapels of the inhabitants of the island of Socotra, on the coast of Africa. These islanders are idolaters, and worship the moon as the parent of all things. The moquamos are very small and low. They have three little doors, and in order to enter any one of them a person must stoop almost to the ground. In each of them is an altar, on which are deposited several sticks formed like flower-de-luces, which have something of the resemblance of a cross. Every moquamo has a priest, called *hodanzo,* who is annually chosen, and the general insignia of office are a staff and cross, which he must not presume to give away on any pretence whatever, or suffer any person to touch on pain of losing one of his hands. The usual time set apart for divine service in these chapels is when the moon sets, or when she rises. They then strike a certain number of blows on a long staff with a shorter one, and walk around the chapel three times. This ceremony is accompanied with an oblation of some odoriferous wood, put in an iron basin, which hangs by three chains over a large fire. After this the altar is incensed three times, and the doors of the temple as often, and the devotees make the most solemn vows and earnest supplications to the moon. In the mean time the hodamo sets on the altar a lighted taper made of butter, and besmears the crosses and other utensils with this favorite grease. On certain days they make a solemn procession around the temple, when one of the chief men of the country carries a sacred staff. After the procession is over very singular honors are paid him. See Broughton, *Biblioth. Historica,* s.v. *SEE SOCOTRA*.

Mor

SEE MYRRH.

Moral Ability

SEE INABILITY.

Moral Agency

SEE WILL.

Moral Attributes

SEE GOD.

Moral Faculty

SEE MORAL SENSE.

Moral Inability

SEE INABILITY.

Moral Intuitions

SEE MORAL SENSE.

Moral Law

may be contemplated under three aspects: first, as a branch of the Decalogue, for this, *SEE LAW OF MOSES*; secondly, in a practical point of view, *SEE ETHICS*; and, thirdly, in a metaphysical light, as a department of theology or theosophy, which is the only relation under which we here propose to treat it. Under the head MORAL SENSE, we suggest that a law emanating from a beneficent Creator for the government of responsible intelligences can be essentially no other than a transcript of his own benignant nature, hence the deep philosophy as well as cogent value of the Gospel axiom that love is the one essential requirement of the law (⁴⁰²³⁶Matthew 22:36-40: ⁴⁵¹³⁸Romans 13:8-10; ⁶⁰⁴²¹1 John 4:21); and this applies no less to angelic than to human creatures, and extends through time and through eternity. It is proper to consider more distinctly these questions of the origin, universality, permanence, and sanction of the divine law.

1. *Its Source.* — Some philosophers have been in the habit of representing — either expressly or by implication — the basis of morality as independent of, if not prior to and externally stringent upon the divine

Being himself. They have used such expressions as "the eternal principles of right," "God was absolutely bound to do so and so," "he could not have done otherwise," etc.; and although these phrases are usually accompanied with some caveat of reverence or disclaimer of limiting the Almighty's perfection, they yet savor of fatalism, or at least of dualism, and do not attribute the moral system of the universe to its precise cause. That origin is no other than God himself, simply and purely. To his sovereign will everything that exists owes its being, with all the qualities that relate to it; and this grand postulate includes the Deity himself, with all the laws that he has promulged and now administers. He is *self-existent,* the "I am," the "one that is, and was, and is to be;" and he is what he is and as he is merely because he pleases it himself. In the same absolutely autocratic yet unconstrained manner he has produced the substance, mechanism, organic forces, and mutual relations — which we call *laws* — of the material and spiritual creation; and they are all, therefore, intrinsically copies of his own nature. This view differs essentially from pantheism, which confounds the universe with God himself; and at the same time from atheism, which dissevers it from his being or control. That this is the true doctrine of Scripture may be easily and abundantly proved (⁰⁰⁰⁰Genesis 1:1; ²³⁵⁶Isaiah 45:6; ⁴³⁰³John 1:3; ⁵⁰¹⁶Colossians 1:16, 17, etc.). Both sides of this universal proposition — the self-constitution of the Infinite, and the externality of the finite — are necessarily and impenetrably mysteries to our mind; yet we can sufficiently comprehend them by a comparison with our own microsmic nature — in which our wills are self-conditioned, and our bodies are extrinsic to our spirit — to enable us to receive them as intelligible truth. There is, therefore, no essential difference between the "moral laws" of God and the so-called *laws of nature:* they are both neither more nor less than his own will as expressed in the material and spiritual departments of his dominion. Human nature, in so far as it is a just reflection of this will, is a correct transcript of these laws; and is generally recognised as such, wherever not perverted by the effects of free agency. This latter is but an extension of the externality of creation, adding merely — and a very important increment it is — the godlike productive power, to be exercised within a certain range ever subordinate to the divine agency. It is thus that God retains full jurisdiction, without incurring the responsibility of human conduct. The divine law, of course, continues its claims over the accountable creature, whether he acknowledge or submit to them or not; for it would be the height of absurdity to make his puny rebellion or insolent disregard operate their abrogation. The penalty may be suspended

at the divine pleasure, but it is sure in the end to overtake every transgressor with a complete vindication.

2. *Its Extent*. — This likewise is self-evident. As the "natural" laws of God are coextensive with the universe, so his "moral" laws are obligatory upon all his moral creatures, i.e., those endowed with a capacity for understanding the relations of right and wrong. Hence the enactments of the Decalogue have been essentially accepted in all ages and countries as the foundation of the civil code, and religious usages have generally conformed to the prescriptions of the first table (those relating to God and his worship, the family, etc.), not excepting even the seeming conventionality of a stated day of rest. But the two fundamental principles underlying these Mosaic statutes, so admirably summed up in the New Testament as *fealty to God* and *equity to man,* have never failed to be admitted. theoretically at least, as the only secure basis of social organization. How it is with other worlds, if such exist, we are not called upon to speculate; but this fact of the universality of the divine law on the globe is so emphatically attested by all history and legislation that we need dwell no further upon it.

3. *Its Duration*. — It follows from the above views of the cause and character of moral law that it must forever remain essentially the same, and of permanent obligation on all its legitimate subjects throughout their being. It is a peculiar trait of the divine creations that while *their form* changes to suit the varied circumstances of diversified beauty and harmonious co-operation, their substance ever remains, imperishable except by the fiat which first called it into existence. Annihilation is not God's method; he never absolutely extinguishes any light of his own kindling. Man's works, as they are not real creations, pass away into a nonentity that leaves only their memory; but God builds for eternity. Especially is this true of the divine administration: amid all the variety of his different and successive dispensations the same fundamental principles, as we have seen, prevail; and even in the future world the obligations of supreme allegiance to God and mutual regard for each other will beatify the inhabitants of bliss by their spontaneous and full discharge, or torment the denizens of hell by their relentless and irksome grasp. The joy of conscious rectitude is the greatest bliss of which a rational soul is capable, and the remorse for an irremediable violation of clearly known duty we may well imagine to be the most poignant ingredient in the cup of endless damnation.

4. This brings us, lastly, to the *penalty* of moral law. Statutes without awards attached to their observance or neglect are valueless and ineffectual. The rewards and punishments of moral law are, as its nature implies, and as we have already seen, chiefly and properly of a moral character. Yet we see no impropriety in the current belief — sanctioned by the figurative language of Scripture — that the immunities and penalties experienced in the other world are likewise — at least after the resurrection state (which by its renewed bodily organism furnishes at once the means and the pledge of corporeal enjoyments and sufferings) — of a physical nature, suited to the new conditions of being then entered upon. Precisely what will be the form of either kind of award, beyond the presumed — and indeed promised — emotions from the genial or uncomfortable society and surroundings, we can only conjecture; but this much we may safely argue from the well-known consequences of obedience or transgression in this life, that they will be of the highest pungency of which the human spirit is susceptible; and we may infer from God's justice and impartiality-no less than from the express statements of the Bible ([20605]Proverbs 16:5; [21214]Ecclesiastes 12:14; [43059]John 5:29; [45006]Romans 2:6: Galatians 7:7) — that they will be exactly meted out in accordance with the real merits or demerits of each individual. In this life we know that this retribution or compensation does not in all cases precisely occur — virtue often lies oppressed, and vice stalks about triumphant; hence the greater presumption that in the coming world all this will be balanced ([42625]Luke 16:25), and a necessity indeed arises for such a state in order to the proper adjudication (Psalm 73). There remain under this head three points of much importance to be briefly discussed.

(1.) *Each class of laws is in the main administered separately yet co-ordinately with the rest.* — Thus a violation of or a compliance with any physical law is invariably followed by its corresponding penalty or disadvantage, and this without regard to the religious character of the subject himself ([40545]Matthew 5:45); on the other hand, moral delinquency or exemplariness will ensure its appropriate need or degradation, whatever be the care or negligence of the actor in temporal concerns. A good child is as likely to be burned if it thrust its finger into the flame as a bad one, and a pious traveller is as liable as a wicked one to lose his life by venturing on board an insecure train or vessel. Yet the practice of virtue tends to habits of thrift, economy, and prudence, thus naturally promoting earthly welfare ([54008]1 Timothy 4:8), and a special divine blessing may also be expected

upon the good man's affairs (¹⁹⁸⁷⁵Psalm 37:25). On the other hand, since great prosperity is inimical to piety, the Lord often afflicts his children with temporal reverses for their spiritual benefit (⁴³¹⁶³John 16:33). It thus appears that while physical laws regularly have their own course, and the physical effects duly follow, yet Providence specially watches over those who commit their ways to the divine keeping, and they are accordingly saved from many of the consequences which their own inadvertence might bring upon them. This, however, is not effected by miracle (except in a few anomalous cases), nor by extraordinary interference with the usual operation of law, but by those secret and delicate connections which pervade the whole economy of nature, and perhaps by an unseen touch of the divine hand directly upon the inscrutable springs of human intercourse. Indeed, as it is the same Being who administers both series of laws, we might reasonably expect that he would make them cooperate in harmony for the higher — i.e., moral — ends (⁴⁵⁰⁸⁸Romans 8:28). *SEE PROVIDENCE.*

(2.) *The effects of transgression are not always confined to the individual offender.* — This is evidently true of the violation of physical laws, for the children, friends, and neighbors of the person erring are frequently involved in calamity consequent upon his blunders. How often does a mistake or a careless act spread conflagration, disaster, and even death, in a community. The same takes place to a certain extent with regard to the temporal results from a violation of moral laws, as in cases of inherited disease, murder, and crimes generally, in which the family or victims innocently suffer. Nor is this all: a continued course of immorality is sometimes propagated through successive generations, mostly, no doubt, by the force of vicious example and defective or erroneous training, but partly also perhaps by a certain congenital taint or bias to the same vices. With regard to social sins, these forms of retribution are especially illustrated — for national wrongs and crimes are as certain to be visited by the appropriate penalty as personal ones. But the punishment that falls upon the nation is of course shared by its individual members in common, some of whom, however, and frequently those most guilty, escape in whole or in part by reason of their exalted position and peculiar advantages (¹⁰⁴¹⁷2 Samuel 24:17), while in other instances the blow falls most heavily upon eminent individuals as representative characters (¹⁰²¹⁰2 Samuel 21:1-9). Nor does the retribution always come upon the same generation or the same portion of the community that has sinned (⁴¹²³⁵Matthew 23:35). These are but specimens

of that inequality in the penalty of wrong-doing that prevails in the present life (Jeremiah 31:29); but they do not extend to the other world. There the account will be strictly personal, and the settlement rigidly just. As we have already indicated, it is this final award that vindicates the sentence of the supreme Judge. The vicarious sufferings of the Redeemer as a ransom from this ultimate adjudication have been considered under the article MEDIATION *SEE MEDIATION* .

(3.) We thus finally reach the question of the alleged *disproportion between human guilt and endless punishment.* We do not seek, with many, to justify the everlasting doom of the wicked by magnifying their crime as having been committed against infinite authority, majesty, and forbearance, however much we may conceive these features as aggravating its enormity. We base our theodicy upon simpler and more palpable ground, namely, the continued and hopelessly incorrigible sinfulness of the condemned themselves. We may presume that none are cut off from probation till they have evinced a desperate moral condition (Luke 13:8); but whether this be so or not, it follows inevitably from the above line of reasoning, and from the character of the depraved heart bereft of the probationary aids to reform, that the impenitence, unbelief, and rebellion for which the sentence is at first pronounced will but harden and intensify as the ages of eternity advance. Unless the fable of purgatory be true — and its absurdity is not less than its mendacity — there can be no improvement in the fate of the finally lost, because there can be no amendment in their moral character. Their destiny is eternally fixed, not so much by the arbitrary decree of omnipotent vengeance as by their own determined resistance of sovereign law. Perdition is but another name for self-destruction *(ἀπόλλυμαι* , in the middle voice). See Pye-Smith, *First Lines of Christian Theology,* page 177 sq.; Miller, *Christian Doctrine of Sin;* Howarth, *Abiding Obligation of the Moral Law;* Watts, *Uses of the Moral Law;* Cobbin, *View of Moral Law;* Cudworth, *Eternal and Immutable Morality; Cumberland Presb. Qu.* Jan. 1873, art. 2; *New-Englander,* July 1872; *Academy,* September 1, 1873, page 328.

Moral Obligation

SEE MORAL LAW; *SEE MORAL SENSE*.

Moral Philosophy

Nearly every system of philosophy broached in ancient or modern times has impinged more or less closely upon the domain of morals. Indeed, this part of the field has usually been the most hotly contested, as the theosophical problems which it presents have afforded more occasion for philosophical as well as theological polemics than all other themes. The paramount importance of the subjects mentioned the relation of the finite to the Infinite, and the consequent duties and destiny of man at the hands of God have given the most intense interest to the reasonings, teachings, and controversies respecting them. But as these have been so commonly mentioned in the intellectual or metaphysical branches of the investigation, we will here content ourselves with referring to PHILOSOPHY in general for the history of their development, and to the article ETHICS for their more systematic classification. We shall therefore in the present article discuss, in a brief and practical manner, only a few points upon which every scheme of moral philosophy worthy of the name must hinge.

1. *Human Responsibility.* — Were man a mere animal, endowed with locomotion, instinct, and perception, or could we conceive of him as possessing simply emotion and will, such as brutes seem to evince — nay, even as capable of the boldest stretch of reason and the highest flights of fancy, yet destitute of the power of appreciating the difference between right and wrong, and therefore unable to recognise the fundamental relation of allegiance subsisting on his part toward his Maker, and the common bond of brotherhood between himself and his Fellows, we could not justly hold him amenable for his moral conduct, since this entirely depends upon a due observance of these twofold claims. It is the faculty of *conscience,* sitting as a viceroy of heaven and a representative of earth within his breast, urging the rights of all outside himself, that constitutes him an accountable being; and though this interior light may become dim through the mists of passion and the clouds of ignorance, it yet shines sufficiently clear to show him his essential duties, or, if utterly eclipsed, the fault will generally be found to be his own — the few cases of congenital paralysis being thereby removed from the category of responsibility. *SEE MORAL SENSE.* His first obligation, therefore, and his prime measure of safety, is to cultivate this facility by information and prompt obedience, that it may the more surely guide him through the labyrinths of life to the portals of endless day. The beginning and the termination of his personal responsibility, as well as its boundaries on either hand throughout his

mortal pilgrimage, are exactly marked by the development of this faculty-one peculiar to him of all the occupants of the globe. This accountability is, in the nature of the case, an individual one, each for himself alone, and it is due in the threefold aspect above indicated to the several classes of beings with whom he has here to do in the order and degree named below. This sums up all his duty, even under the perfect code of Christianity, and is the staple — the core and substance — of every ethical system devised for human conduct.

2. *Duty to God.* — This is obviously paramount. In this the Holy Scriptures do but enforce, by an authoritative mandate, what all pagan religions have more feebly demanded — namely, the unconditional and primary obligation of obedience to the divine behests. These have been promulged in different ways — sometimes more expressly, at other times more enigmatically and imperfectly; but when once fairly understood, the commonsense of mankind has declared that they must be unflinchingly and peremptorily obeyed. This claim is universally grounded on an admitted creatorship, supported by the avowed dependence of the creature; the Bible adds a third most touching argument to these of natural religion, namely, redemption, thus forming a triple cord — paternity, providence, and grace. The foremost and generic duty that grows out of this obligation is that of *reverence* — so all the older dispensations conceive it, but Christianity terms it *love,* taking a nearer and more privileged position. *SEE ADOPTION.* This reverential regard is chiefly expressed in *worship,* which accordingly occupies the prominent place in all religions, standing at the very head of the Decalogue. The devotion thus due is unique as well as supreme, because no other being can possibly occupy this relation, nor any higher; worship is therefore due exclusively to our Maker. Idolatry is consequently reckoned as the most odious and damning of all sins, because it virtually overthrows the throne of heaven itself, and thus destroys the very basis of all moral law. Jehovah brooked every transgression of his chosen people but this; and when the captivity had burned away its exterior manifestation, the final excision affirmed his detestation of its still cherished spirit, which incited Israel to the culminating apostasy of the Crucifixion. The same crime in essence has reappeared in the mummeries of Christian churches; and even Protestants may be guilty of it under another name, for any undue love of earthly objects is tantamount to idolatry (^{5100S}Colossians 3:5; ⁶⁰⁰¹⁵1 John 2:15). Under the Christian economy, again, the worship due to God is to assume a purely spiritual form, in distinction from the typical

and ceremonial guise of Mosaism (John 4:24); but this, of course, does not exclude all exterior observances — it rather requires them, at least for congregational concert. *SEE WORSHIP*. We mention here but one other specific duty under this head, because it is inclusive of all others — namely, *regard for God's revealed word*. The respect we show to any one naturally extends to his communications; and in the case of an invisible sovereign or an absent friend, our reverence is often measured chiefly by this mark. How much more highly should we prize and cheerfully heed the words of our God and Saviour! Nor is the Bible to be fondly cherished merely as a memento of dying love, or as a token of kindly concern, nor yet is it to be valued simply as a useful guide-book in ancient lore, but still more as a practical directory to regulate our hearts and our lives: it must become our *vade-mecum* in everyday concerns of the most vital moment, for by it shall we be finally adjudged. As prayer, therefore, is the central act of divine worship, so is searching the Scriptures the most direct method of ordering our behavior aright in all respects; the two are the complete counterparts, internal and external; one fortifies and purifies the heart, the other moulds and directs the life. The devout Bible-student cannot fail of becoming a strong, earnest, consistent fulfiller, of all the claims of God upon him.

3. *Duties to one's Fellow-beings*. — These spring immediately out of the above relation of the common fatherhood of God, and they can never be successfully met except by bearing this thought constantly in mind. Selfishness, the most common and baleful besetment of every association of life, is most effectually counteracted by this consideration; and Scripture, no less than conventional politeness, and even statute law, everywhere holds forth teachings grounded on this principle. We hazard nothing in affirming that all the disorders of society have their root in a violation or neglect of this truth — the universal brotherhood and consequent essential equality of all human beings. We may therefore be spared, after the enunciation of this one general clew to the. multiform and complex duties of life, from entering upon a discussion of these in detail, simply observing that they may all be classified under two divisions: 1, the *domestic,* including the relations of parent and child, of husband and wife, of brother and sister, and of near consanguinity or affinity; 2, the *social,* embracing the relations of neighbor, fellow-citizen, churchmember, and voluntary association for literary, benevolent, or commercial purposes. For all these, see the appropriate titles in this *Cyclopaedia.* We here dismiss this branch of the subject, with the remark that our duty in all these regards

is not fully discharged by the mere rendering *of justice* to these various classes of persons connected with us; we owe them likewise the offices of courtesy, charity, and sympathy. This is true, not only in the family and the Church, but also in the community and the world at large; the twofold obligation extends to every ramification of the social fabric. The question of Cain, "Am I my brother's keeper?" expresses the first and most wide-spread heresy against the mutual rights and well-being of the race. It is here, as everywhere else, that the doctrine of the Gospel shows its transcendent excellence — as wise as it is beautiful — doctrine appropriate to the lips of him who was both God and man; namely, the inculcation of love for all mankind as such, and as the common offspring of the one Being to whom we all owe supreme allegiance. The sublime extension of this precept to our very enemies (Romans 12:14) is a peculiar trait of Christianity (Matthew 5:43-48); not a mere fancy sketch (Matthew 18:23-35), as an offset to our own shortcomings (Matthew 6:14, 15), or as a noble revenge (Romans 12:20), but a lifelikeness (1 Peter 2:19-24) of the heroism of the faultless Master (Luke 23:34), realized (Acts 7:60) by saints (1 Corinthians 4:12): so faithfully are the divine lineaments (Exodus 33:18-23; 34:5-7) mirrored (Hebrews 1:3) in the enduring (1 Peter 1:25) Word (Revelation 19:13), whose command (Luke 6:36) is a promise of performance (1 Thessalonians 5:24). This is the only effectual motive, as well as the sole general bond, in the eager rush of men, each for the maintenance of himself and his. The natural instincts of home affection, and the ties of mutual advantage, may go far to soften the asperities of intimate association; but a wide-reaching and generous philanthropy can never be attained, nor can even the sweetest amenities of closely domestic and social intercourse be steadily Secured, without the habitual recognition of this fellowship in the divine sight.

4. *Duties towards one's Self.* — These are properly and advisedly placed last, although in the perversity and suicidal folly of human nature they are usually promoted to a front rank, and, indeed, enhanced almost to the exclusion of all the preceding. But no maxim was ever more profoundly true in its application to this subject than our Lord's paradox: "He that seeketh his own life [i.e., personal gratification as his foremost aim], shall lose it." There is no joy equal to that of making others happy; and he who is willing to forego his own ease, comfort, and emolument for the sake of blessing, consoling, and enriching his fellow-creatures, will find himself repaid a thousand-fold even in the satisfaction he experiences in this life, to

say nothing of the rewards of that life which is to come. Selfishness always misses its mark, and is therefore sure to be miserable, whereas generosity invariably succeeds in its noble purposes. We need not here enter upon the metaphysical question of purely disinterested benevolence; God has not required us to scan our motives so closely as to detect and eject a thought of the reflex influence of our philanthropy upon our minds in the bliss of doing good and the retrospect of usefulness. On the contrary, he encourages us to a beneficent course by such considerations; and the Son of God himself did not disdain, in his consummate act of self-devotion for the rescue of a fallen world, to contemplate the fruit of his redeeming love (Isaiah 53:11; Hebrews 12:2). We may preliminarily remark, as a confirmation and parallel of this secret of the most successful happiness, that all the proclivities of the heart (especially the passions and the appetites) tend not only to excess, and therefore require, even for their own best ends, to be held in check by counter influences of a higher character, but they likewise are set upon the most *immediate* gratification possible; and as this is not always, nor even usually, the safest or the most complete, the prudent and experienced habitually restrain and defer them till the time and object are ripe for full and wholesome enjoyment. For this reason, all the more do we need to keep the love and pursuit of self in the background, till our nobler sentiments have acquired such strength and discipline that we may securely give to self-love the rein, and guide it to its most successful and harmonious results; otherwise we shall be likely to grasp only the present shadow, and lose the more remote substance. It is precisely this most egregious and irreparable folly of which the mass of mankind are guilty, in pursuing the pleasures of time and sense to the hazard of spiritual and eternal joys. We devote the remainder of this article to a few practical suggestions, under the head of personal duties to one's self, specifically calculated to guard against so lamentable an error, and secure the highest accomplishment of each one's destiny as a subject of moral government.

(1.) *The harmonious development of all one's native faculties*. — The gift of reason, and still more of a moral faculty, carries with it the obligation to exercise and improve it; we owe this no less as a debt of gratitude to the Giver than as a means of extracting the full value for ourselves. Hence, while a sense of self-preservation naturally and justly leads us to care for and cultivate our physical powers, the neglect of our intellect in any of its glorious capacities is a self-stultification that entitles one to the contempt

of his fellows; but the crushing out of conscience or the dwarfing of any of our godlike moral capabilities is a literal suicide of the soul. Such a dereliction defeats the very end of probation, and turns it into a curse forever. Because we are surrounded by and filled with temptation in this scene of trial, all the more diligent do we need to be in rousing and confirming and intensifying every moral power that may aid us in the life-long struggle with our desperate inward and outward foes. Most of all have we occasion to lay hold on the alliance with almighty grace which is proffered us as a restorer to the full image of Deity (Philippians 2:13).

(2.) *The careful culture of any particular aptitude that each may possess.* — Variety within certain limits of uniformity is evidently God's law as expressed in nature, and the same rule is observed in the human constitution — bodily, mental, and spiritual. Hence the obvious propriety, and indeed necessity, of noting and turning to account the peculiar genius of every individual, in order to its perfection by judicious practice. In this way the economy and skill of that ingenious modern contrivance the "division of labor" have their higher results. The idea that all are reduced by piety to the same Procrustean bed, either here or hereafter, is preposterous. The facile dexterity of the expert, as compared with the clumsy slowness of the tyro in art, is but a type of the excellence of one saint above another (1 Corinthians 15:41), or even of the same in successive stages of growth (Luke 8:18); and this superiority on earth furnishes a vantage-ground by reason of which the moral distance must be forever widening in heaven. The same is true in this life of all the human powers, especially of the mind and heart; and doubtless a like perpetually increasing pre-eminence in these endowments, so akin with the spiritual, will hold good in the other world. From this we see the transcendent importance of cultivating in the present state of existence every power of the soul, before eternity shall fix the plastic ductile condition that pertains to probation. This thought again suggests, on the other hand, the mistaken policy of altogether neglecting even the less marked talent; for a feeble indication may lead to the discovery of a precious treasure, many unpromising beginnings having eventuated in brilliant eminence. And it is the common virtues — like the ordinary acquirements — that are most generally useful; as we approve the necessity of teaching every child, however dull, at least the simple rudiments of education, while we deem it worth while to expend years at the piano or the easel only upon those who evince extraordinary artistic tact. Once more, let no one excuse himself

from the everyday duties of life on the ground of his small natural ability (⟨21915⟩Luke 19:15-26), nor plead his peculiar indisposition or special hinderances to any form of morality, for all really experience the same difficulties and insufficiency in one form or another; this very reluctance, arduousness, opposition, calls for redoubled zeal and effort (⟨21000⟩Ecclesiastes 10:10), for it is an omen, or rather symptom, of moral death the more imminent and total.

(3.) *The earnest and constant application to practical results of all one's time, powers, and resources.* — It is not enough to possess, enlarge, and employ wealth, influence, learning, skill, health, or longevity; we have not yet reached the just standard of requirement till we fully direct them towards useful ends — till they positively redound to the glory of God and the benefit of mankind. We should not be so absorbed in the luxury of their acquisition, increase, or exercise as to forget their ultimate design. In short, we must everywhere, at all times, and in all things, bear in mind that we are but *stewards* in the occupancy of these endowments, and hold ourselves constantly in readiness to give to the great Proprietor a satisfactory account of their appropriation (⟨46060⟩1 Corinthians 6:20).

(4.) *The sober but cordial and devout enjoyment of whatever blessings Providence has conferred upon us.* — Asceticism and epicureanism are equally removed from sound godliness (⟨21109⟩Ecclesiastes 11:9,10). A morose piety is next to none at all, but a cheerful moderation is the best recommendation of saintliness, and thankfulness sweetens the homeliest morsel. Stoicism can never teach us to be content with our lot. Distrust of God's mercies is as atheistic as their abuse. The moral philosophy of the Bible is alike guarded against all extremes, because it begins, centres, and ends in a true theism (⟨21213⟩Ecclesiastes 12:13): "He hath showed thee, O man, what is good; and what doth the Lord require of thee, but to do *justly,* and to love *mercy,* and to walk *humbly* with thy God?" (⟨33608⟩Micah 6:8). In our lapsed estate, to regain the lofty completeness we must trace our way back by the same steps; for *penitence* is the fit condition to our restoration to moral rectitude through divine *clemency and fidelity* (⟨62010⟩1 John 1:9).

Literature. — One of the earliest treatises on the subject in English is Paley's *Moral Philosophy* (Lond. 1785; often reprinted with extensive modifications by later editors); but it essentially ignores conscience, and has generally been reprobated by sound moralists. See Blakey, *Hist. of*

Morals (4 volumes, 8vo); Garve, *Different Principles of Moral Philos.* (from Aristotle to 1798); Channing's Jouffroy, *Introd. to Moral Philos.* (includes a critical survey of modern systems); Doddridge, *Lectures;* Belsham, *Moral Philos.;* Gisbourne, *Principles of Moral Philos.* (1789); Grove, *Moral Philos.;* Pearson, *Theory of Morals* (1800); Beattie, *Moral Science* (Edinburgh, 1816, 2 volumes); Taylor (J.), *Sketch of Moral Philos.;* Turnbull, *Principles of Moral Science;* Smith (J.S.), *Lectures on Moral Philos.;* Stewart, *Outlines of Moral Philos.;* and his *Active and Moral Powers;* and *Progress of Ethical Philos. in Europe;* Merivale, *Boyle Lectures,* 1864; Calderwood, *Hand-book of Moral Science* (Lond. 1872, 8vo); Gillett (E.H.), *The Moral System* (N.Y. 1874, 8vo), the latest and best work on the subject. Among express treatises on the general subject, we may name, as being best known and most accessible in this country, Wayland, *Elements of Moral Science* (Bost. 1835, 12mo); Whewell and Henry, *Morals* (Bost. 1839); Alexander, *Outlines of Moral Science* (N.Y. 1852); Hickock, *Moral Science* (N.Y. 1853); Upham, *Moral Philos.* (N.Y. 1857, 12mo); Winslow, *Elements of Moral Philos.* (N.Y. 1857, 12mo); M. Hopkins, *Lectures on Moral Science* (Bost. 1862, 12mo); ibid., *Law of Love* (N.Y. 1869, 12mo). The periodicals which contain valuable articles on this topic are: *Christian Examiner,* 8:265; 18:101; 19:1, 25; 28:137; 29:153; 30:145; 41, 97; 49, 215; 52, 188: *Christian Rev.* 7:321; *Princeton Rev.* 5:33; 7:377; 18:260; 20:529; *Meth. Qu. Rev.* 5:220; *New-Englander,* October 1870, page 549; *Brit. and For. Ev. Rev.* January 1874, page 183; *Lond. Qu. Rev.* 3:1; 6:407; 11:494; 48, 83; October 1873, art. 5; *Bib. Sacra,* April 1873, art. 9; *Edinb. Rev.* 7:413; 61, 195; 91, 86; *Prospect. Rev.* 2:577; 2:400; *North Brit. Rev.* 14:160; *Westm. Rev.* 1:182; 2:254; 12:246; *North Amer. Rev.* 9:293; *Contemp. Rev.* July 1872, art. 7. *SEE MORALS*.

Moral Science

SEE MORAL PHILOSOPHY.

Moral Sense

is a term frequently used to designate the *conscience.* It is believed to have originated with lord Shaftesbury, who contended for the existence of disinterested affections in man, as against Hobbes (q.v.), and in anticipation of what Hutcheson (q.v.) afterwards advocated. Whatever we may think of the principles involved, the term *Moral Sense* itself is incorrect, however,

in at least two essential particulars in which that faculty differs from the characteristics of the senses. In the first place, these latter are exercised upon *external* objects, whereas the conscience συνείδησις, *consciousness,* or self-knowledge) is exclusively introversive or subjective, and passes in review only the acts or states of the individual himself. Secondly, the senses give us absolute and invariable information of the real properties or relations of things, and when acting normally they never mislead or deceive any one as to the facts in the case; while conscience is so subjective that it conveys to us intimation only of a relative character, and hence affects different persons quite variously in respect to the same act or condition of things, according to the habit of mind, or education, or preconceived notions. In short, conscience is a *sense* only in the general signification of an impression or influence of an emotive nature. It has usually been defined as that faculty of the mind by which we become aware of the moral quality of an act (purpose, sentiment, etc.), and are suitably (i.e., agreeably or painfully) affected by it. Only the latter part of this definition is accurate; for the apprehension of the agreement or contrariety between the given subjects of thought (the act, purpose, etc.) is a purely intellectual exercise of the judgment, comparing the thing contemplated or reviewed with some previously acquired or adopted standard or principle of right. Hence the importance of a correct and true rule by which to try all moral questions; and hence, too, the exceeding diversity and even opposition of views on moral points between persons of different religions and associations. The tendency of the passions, moreover, to warp the judgment is proverbial; and as human nature is constitutionally corrupt, the unaided and untrained conscience cannot be relied upon to give a just verdict. It is chiefly at this point that a divine revelation becomes necessary in order to furnish a perfect norm to the erring judgment, as well as to reinforce the sanction of the conscience in its conflict with the depraved inclinations. On the other hand, the emotional function of conscience, which is benumbed by nature as well as by habitual sin, needs quickening, so that it may become a clearer and more emphatic monitor in advance, as well as a more effectual penalty or reward after the performance of a praiseworthy or the commission of a guilty act, and thus stimulate by its twofold action to virtue in the future. It is revelation, again, that furnishes this aid, not only by the motives which the light that it sheds upon the rewards and punishments of a future state supplies, but likewise by the supernatural influences of the Holy Spirit promised to all who humbly seek and encourage them. As this double culture of the natural conscience — its

habitual exercise in accordance with a heavenly standard of duty, and its alliance with Almighty power — ensures its sound development and steady action, so, on the contrary, the repeated violation of its behests, and the incorrigible rejection of the proffered assistance from above, must eventually lead — as we find to be actually the case with many hardened wretches — to an apparent obliteration of the faculty itself, or at least a total suppression of its admonitions and awards. The latter state is one of hopeless impenitence, *SEE JUDICIAL BLINDNESS*, and the former that of assured salvation. Yet even in an unfallen condition man's conscience was not of itself adequate for his moral guidance, and hence an objective law the prohibition of the single tree as a prescriptive sample only was given to supplement and direct its energy; and still Eve's judgment seems to have been incompetent, under that non-redemptive economy, despite her moral perfection, to detect the mortal error that lurked in the tempter's suggestions: the actual "knowledge of good and evil" by bitter experience alone was effectual to awaken the full power of this faculty. So, on the other hand, in the world of perdition we are wont to imagine that the seared and blunted conscience will rouse itself to chastise the soul with retributive agony. But the pangs of guilt, at least in this probationary existence, are not strictly the measure or criterion of wrong-doing; for then the self-complacent Pharisee would be acquitted, and the tender penitent would be condemned. The most atrocious crimes have been committed under the plea of conscience, and that not hypocritically, but in self-delusion (Acts 26:9); while the first steps in transgression are visited by a-degree of remorse which gradually lessens as the offender progresses in his downward career. This leads us back once more to the main proposition of this discussion, namely, the insufficiency of conscience as a moral light. Nothing is right simply because our conscience approves it. The appeal must be to a higher authority than man's nature affords. He is not an absolute "law unto himself." It is his Creator who retains supreme jurisdiction over him, and who has reserved the prerogative of prescribing what he may innocently do, and what he is morally bound to do. *SEE MORAL LAW*. Yet when an individual has availed himself of the best means within his reach for ascertaining his Maker's will, and has scrupulously followed that light, he is not culpable for any error of faith or practice into which he may fall by reason of his fallible judgment, or for any other consequence of his naturally defective or even depraved condition. He must and he ought to obey his reason and conscience, however imperfect; but if sincere and docile, he will not long remain in serious

misapprehension of moral truth; and in any case his responsibility is exactly proportioned to the measure of light he enjoys or might have attained (⟨2⟩Luke 12:47, 48). While therefore a *mistake,* be it ever so grievous or closely related to moral subjects, is not in itself a sin, yet every man's conduct should be tried — both by himself and others, as it certainly is and finally will be by the unerring Judge — according to that standard of rectitude which the divine law as vouchsafed to him enjoins. To the heathen, walking by the dim light that tradition reflects upon his path from the primeval revelations, supplemented only by the uncertain flickerings of the lamp of experience, or perchance by a few rays that occasionally break through the embrasure of his shrouded pilgrimage from the radiance of more favored dispensations, the office of conscience is all-important in aiding him to grope his way out of the thraldom of nature to a sense of the divine acceptance; and we may charitably hold that in rare examples he has thus been enabled to reach the day of moral purity, and emerge at last into the serene glory of the heavenly abode; but the melancholy facts of past history and present observation seem only to justify the fear that the mass of paganism, even in the cultured instances of Greece and Rome, of India or China, have but grovelled in the mire of sensuality, and quenched their higher aspirations and better convictions in the absurdities of a beastly idolatry. Even Islamism, setting out with much of borrowed truth to reform a polytheistic faith, rapidly degenerated into puerile fanaticism, and aims no higher than a licentious Paradise; while Judaism, disciplined by a direct contact with the supernatural to the sternest regimen that the race has ever known, has generally resulted in heartless Pharisaism and puerile formalism. Under the Redemptive scheme a simpler and profounder maxim — that of universal benevolence — has supervened for the resuscitation and tuition of the believer's conscience, stunned and bewildered by the burdensome technicalities of previous systems; yet we find, alas! a large share of Christendom either reverting to the obsolete methods of salvation by asceticism and ritualism and ecclesiasticism, or abusing the liberty of the Gospel by fanaticism and humanitarianism and rationalism. Yet, amid these vagaries and inconsistencies, the one cardinal principle of "faith that works by love and purifies the heart" must be recognised by the candid and thoughtful of all times and all climes as the sole test of genuine piety and philanthropy. Selfishness is the bane of all morality, and in proportion as the carnal self is crucified the spiritual self is resurrected out of the ruins of the fall, until at length the ideal man — God's own image — becomes transfigured in its permanent beauty; for " God is love" (comp. 1 John 4).

Literature. — Abercrombie, *Philos. of the Moral Feelings;* Brown, *Lect. on the Mind;* Butler, *Analogy of Religion and Nature;* Hutcheson, *Inquiry into Beauty and Virtue;* and his *Essay on the Passions;* Necker, *On Religious Opinions;* Witherspoon, *Lectures,* Lect. 4; Bentham, *Morals and Legislation;* Smith (Southwood), *O Divine Government;* Mackintosh, *Preliminary Dissertation* (1832); Dymond, *Essay on Morality* (1832); Hall (Robert), *Sermon on Mod. Infidelity;* Sedgwick (Adam), *Discourse on the Studies of the University of Cambridge* (1834); Dwight (T.), *Sermon* 99, and many others; Wainwright, *Vindication of Paley's Theory of Morals,* etc. (1830); Edwards, *Works* (see Index); Bautain, *Moral Qualifications of Man;* Furst, *Moral des Evangeliums mit den verschiedenen philos. Moralsystemen;* Knapp, *Christian Theol.* page 31; Pye-Smith, *Outlinee of Christian Theol.* (see Index); Hopkins, *Outline Study of Uman* (N.Y. 1874, 12mo), Lect. 9 and sq.; Ueberweg, *His. Philos.* 2:319 sq., 446, 494; Leckey, *Hist. Europ. Morals* (N.Y. 1870, 2 volumes, roy. 8vo), 1:93, 123; *Contemporary Rev.* Jan. 1872, art. 5 (Savages); Appleton, *Works,* Lects. 15 and 17; Jenkins, *Reasonableness of Christianity;* Law, *Theory of Religion,* part 2; Pearson. *Rem. on Morals;* Liddon, *Bampton Lecture on the Divinity of Christ;* Blackie, *Four Phases of Christian Morals;* Spalding, *Philos. of Morals, with a Review of Ancient and Modern Theories;* Lewes, *Hist. Philos.* volume ii (see Index); *Old and New,* April, 1870; *Brownson's Rev.* January 1853; *Presb. Rev.* April 1870; *Bib. Sacra,* April 1870; *Studien und Kritiken,* Jan. 1866; *Lond. Qu. Rev.* January 1871, page 26; *Westminster Rev.* 42:286 sq.; *Brit. and For. Ev. Rev.* 1843, page 293; 1844, page 412; October 1872, art. 3; *Journal of Speculat. Philos.* January 1870, art. 4; April 1870, art. 7; January 1871, art. v; *New-Englander,* January 1871, page 160; *Princeton Rev.* October 1871, page 634; *Theol. Presb. (Cumberland Presb. Qu.)* July 1871, art. 9; *Univ. Qu.* October 1873, art. 5 (German and Anglo-American Morals); *Revue Chretienne,* January 1867; *Contemporary Rev.* August 1868, art. 7. *SEE MORAL PHILOSOPHY*.

Moral Theology

is only another name for the science of ETHICS *SEE ETHICS* (q.v.). Under the last-named heading we have considered as much of the subject as can be encompassed from a strictly philosophical and Protestant theological stand-point. Only the views of Romanists remain to be treated here. These are in many respects radically different from those of the other classes referred to. The Protestant view, as we have seen in the article

Ethics, is that Christianity is essentially an ethical religion; that, while it is true that other religious favor certain virtues, or give a certain sanction to all virtues, Christianity is truly morality, for it aims at moral *regeneration,* and that is itself religion. Says Blackie *(Four Phases of Morals),* "It is a religion; by its mere epiphany it forms a Church; in its startingpoint, its career, and its consummation, it is 'a kingdom of heaven upon earth " (page 207 sq.; comp. page 219 sq., 266 sq.). As the sources of this science, we pointed out, "Christ, his person and teaching; also the writings of the apostles as shown in the N.T., as objective and as subjective to the influence of the Holy Spirit in the faithful." The Roman Catholic Church, however, recognises no standard of morality except that of her own construction, and insists upon it that not only the Scriptures, but also the tradition and declarations of the Church must control any effort, even in the domain of speculative philosophy. Says Dr. Fuchs, in the Roman Catholic Cyclopaedia of Wetzer and Welte: "The traditions of the Church, *together* with the Scriptures, constitute the source of ethical knowledge. Tradition serves partly to complement the moral precepts of the Bible by further demands and institutions, and partly to elucidate and more clearly to interpret their sense and purpose." Not even does he rest here. Lest he be misunderstood as to the extent of the domain of ecclesiastical tradition, he continues: "From the domain of ecclesiastical tradition we regard especially as important for moral purposes: (1) the rules and canons of the general ecclesiastical councils; (2) the decisions and declarations of the holy chair; (3) the infallible (?) utterances of the Church fathers." Not content yet, he goes even so far as to declare that "into the circle of moralistic sources we most naturally and properly admit also ecclesiastical customs and the lives of the saints, for in the life of the Church and her saints is reflected the life of our divine Lord and Master." In quoting Dr. Fuchs we do not by any means wish to be understood as citing only one writer; as a contributor to the standard Roman Catholic Cyclopaedia of Germany, he speaks most assuredly the opinions of the Church for which he writes, and his views are those of the Romish Church at large. It is apparent, then, that by an outward law of the Church Romanists have modified the ethics of the N.T., and controlled the ethical consciousness of Christendom down to the period of the Reformation. The Protestant regards this modification as adulterous, and insists that notably sacerdotalism played no unimportant part; the clergy interpreting as they saw fit, and the people being taught by them as they were themselves influenced by the ascetic notions which invaded the Church in the 4th

century, and have ever since continued to exert their authority among papists. *SEE ASCETICISM*; *SEE MONASTICISM*: *SEE SACERDOTALISM*. In our references in the article *Ethics* we have inserted the works of writers who deal carefully with the early teaching of the Church on this subject, and we here give only a brief resume of the views of ecclesiastical writers from the apostolic period down, in order to furnish the names most prominently connected with Roman Catholic ethics from the foundation of Christianity to the present.

1. *Apostolic Period.* — As regards the extent of apostolic ethics, it encompasses pretty much all departments of life, and the duties and virtues corresponding with them. Yet in this province such are made particularly conspicuous and praiseworthy as are natural to the spirit of Christianity. For while all antiquity had made the sovereign good consist in escape from pain, either by virtue or by pleasure, Christianity, by the mystery of the passion, announced the divinity of sorrow, and the most characteristic element in Christian virtue to be love. Hence the apostolic writers gave special prominence to those Christian ideals of faith, hope, love, prayer, mercy, chastity, martyrdom, and the like, which are the characteristic elements of perfect charity, and which, if realized, must absorb like ethics and politics in a higher science. The vacillation on some single moral questions and principles observable in the writings of these early Christian fathers gradually died out as a more profound and comprehensive Christian consciousness spread in the Church. As regards the manner of treatment of this subject, most apostolic writings deal with it in a way serviceable mainly to devotional purposes. "Their basis," it has been well said, "remained from the first rather religious than speculative, notwithstanding the persuasion that in the reason enlightened by the Word there was given a ground of union between objective revelation and subjective knowledge." Even among those contributions to this field, in that period, which rise above the sphere then usually occupied, only a few maintain a strictly scientific character. Earliest among the productions of that age stand the writings of the celebrated disciple of the apostle Paul, Clement of Rome, whose epistle to the Christian congregation at Corinth is one of the finest monuments of Christian antiquity. Its especial object was, however, to reconcile the dissensions and factions which had arisen in that congregation, and it contains therefore mainly admonitions to concord and peace. More noteworthy in this department of Christian ethics are the productions of Ignatius (q.v.), who wrote six epistles to diverse congregations, and one to

Polycarp; they were penned on his way to the lions of the Colosseum, and breathe the spirit of a man who had beheld John, and, full of faith, is ready to meet his Lord and Master. The moral precepts and admonitions of the Ignatian epistles are mostly passages quoted from the N.T., or sentiments in accord with its contents, expressed with fervency as well as simplicity. A remarkable feature in them is the emphasis with which their author insists on the propriety to belong publicly and externally to the Church, though he by no means forgets its value in the sight of God as consisting in the communion with Christ and in the sincere search for union with God. We learn to recognise ecclesiastical consociation, the alliance of so many thousands by unity of faith and love, as something grand, the true obedience to the officers of the Church (elders) as something inseparable from Christian life. This decidedly ecclesiastical disposition is also shared by Polycarp (q.v.) himself in his epistle to the congregation at Philippi. Above all things, he desires that attachment to pure unadulterated faith be strengthened; like Ignatius, he establishes Christian ethics on Christian Church creed. His moral precepts are rightly denominated "apostolic grains of gold." But really the most eminent attempt to reconcile Christian ideas with the forms and views of ancient philosophy, especially those of its latest efflorescence — New Platonism — was made in the mystic speculations of the Areopagite Dionysius, in which the Christian scientific spirit aims at an innermost comprehension of itself, for this end calling in the support of traditional knowledge. No other product of mind has exercised a deeper or more powerful influence upon the development of Christian mystic is the culminating-point of ecclesiastical ethics — than his writings, in which the several dispersed rays of mystical ideas and views, such as here and there glimmer in Clemens Alexandrinus, Augustine, Macarius, and others, converge as in a focus, and form one of the strongest links connecting the period of which we are speaking with the subsequent ones. To these relics of spiritual treasures of the apostolic fathers we join three compositions, two of which plainly show spurious authorship, and a third gives no clew at all. They are the Epistle of Barnabas, the Shepherd of Hermas, and the Epistle to Diognetus. The author of the first-named work calls his moral precepts the road of light, in contrast with the crooked road of darkness, as he designates sinful life. The Shepherd is divided into three sections, the second of which deals entirely with ethics. The letter to Diognetus, as already stated, comes from an unknown hand. The principal interest which attaches to this ancient Christian memorial lies in the excellent description which the author gives of the life and morals of the

early Christians. Here, also, two other writings adorned with the name of apostles deserve to be mentioned-namely, "The Apostolic Constitutions" and "The Apostolic Canons." Both collections, as to their origin, it is true, come far short of reaching up to the apostolic age, but they deserve a place here because Romanists assert "that they exhibit a picture of the most primeval condition of Christian manners and ecclesiastical discipline." They are certainly worthy of attention on account of the treasure of tradition they furnish; still more, the peculiarity of their moral character renders them notable and significant, this character being wholly catholic, mingling severity with mildness, keeping the right medium between laxity and rigor.

2. *Patristic Period.* — We now reach the period in which we deal with the writings of the fathers of the Church. The series opens with Justin Martyr (q.v.), "the evangelist wearing the mantle of a philosopher." It was his mind, trained by ancient ethical philosophy, which placed in the ground of Christian ethics the first seed of scientific treatment. He clothed the Christian ideas in the scientific forms of antique wisdom, and showed that the classic must bend before the higher light of the Gospel. Particularly noticeable is his conception of reason as identical with knowledge and conscience. One of the fundamental Christian ideas — liberty of human will — in contraposition to fatalism, sustained by pagan views, he vindicated by an argumentation as acute as striking. He tried to elucidate the relation of Christian principles to the Mosaic law, and defended the Christian ethics against objections raised both from the Jewish and from pagan stand-points. Next we place the two apologists, Athenagoras (q.v.) and Theophilus (q.v.), bishop of Antioch. Their writings furnish a rich store for ethics. After them we meet that great disciple of Polycarp, St. Irenieus (q.v.). In opposition to the transcendental speculations of the Gnostics, he urges with emphasis to a practical life. But in thus giving prominence to the practical part of Christianity, he is far from falling into a "moralizing" tendency. Far greater services than those named were rendered in the scientific elaboration of Christian ethics by Clement of Alexandria. His three principal writings form e tripartite entity, in which he successively imparts the Christian doctrine of life in its fundamental features. His first work (Λόγος προτρεπτικὸς πρὸς ῞Ελληναι) is polemico-apologetic; he combats what is morally injurious in popular religions and in the philosophical systems of heathendom, and compares with it the beneficial influence which Christianity exercises on its professors; he shows the absurdity of the pagan legends of gods, and demonstrates how the religious

mysteries of the pagans so often most deeply offend the moral sentiments, while the Christian doctrines and mysteries have the advantage of harmonizing with reason and moral purity; he admits that the writings of pagan philosophers contain seeds of morality, but reminds us that they owe their origin to the Λόγος, the source of all vital truth in the world. The second treatise (ὁ παιδαγωγός) is divided into several books. The first treats of moral life in general; it may be considered an introduction to Christian ethics. The second treats of Christian ethics in its main features. The remaining books, corresponding to special morals, expatiate on the particular duties and virtues, and discuss conduct, in the several relations and occurrences of external life, from the Christian stand-point. The third essay (στρώματα, miscellanies) leads to a higher degree of moral knowledge and action. The difference of the two degrees lies in γνῶσις. On the foundation of the ideas gained by a deeper and increased knowledge a higher religio-moral culture is constructed, the culmination of which is love assimilating and uniting with the Deity. In conclusion of the whole, Clement sketches the image of the γνωστικός, and thus presents the Christian ideal of a moral personage. The γνῶσις Clement deduces from no other source than from the idea of the divine Logos which personally appeared in Christ; an idea which, supporting and illustrating, pervades all his definitions of morality. In his smaller address, Τίς ὁ σωζόμενος πλούσιος ("Who is the rich man saved?"), he discusses a practical question of the time concerning the use of earthly valuables and possessions. It may not be too much to assert that Clement, by his literary activity, is of no less significance for the department of Christian ethics than his worthy disciple Origen, by his celebrated work Περὶ ἀρχῶν, became to that of Christian dogmatics. To these two Alexandrian Christians science is indebted for the most profound and lasting stimulus. The merits of Origen about Christian apologetic ethics we need but allude to here, and can speak only of his two practical treatises — Περὶ εὐχῆς (on prayer) and Εἰς μαρτύριον προτρεπτικὸς λογός (on exhortation to martyrdom). One feature to which we have alluded in the writings of these Church fathers — the leaning on the definitions of the ethics of classical antiquity — need of course hardly excite surprise. For it must be apparent to every wellread student of antiquity that the fathers, in order to be understood, had to speak the language of the then prevailing scientific consciousness; they could not break at one stroke the barriers of the surrounding cultured circle, and they felt the less obliged to do this as they were thoroughly convinced that in reason, enlightened by the *Logos,* was

given a point of intermediation between the classical and Christian consciousness, between the objective basis of revelation and the subjective principle of cognizance. This definition of unity is by no one more emphasized than by Justin Martyr, Clement of Alexandria, and Origen. They agree in the view that reason is the source and measure of morality, consequently that what is rational is moral, what is irrational is immoral or sinful, and therefore that Christian ethics, as the most rational, because derived from absolute reason personified in Christ, must also be the most complete and perfect. The writings of Tertullian (q.v.), which come next. are marked by a dark rigor, growing more prominent in proportion as he inclined to Montanism (q.v.). The moral earnestness of Christianity, under Montanist direction, was aggravated into unnatural severity; the moral advice of the Gospel was made a command, and extended to all Christians. With this theory, if it had prevailed, Christian principle would have failed of its mundane victory, and must have ultimately perished. In the use, then, of Tertullian's moralistic writings we must distinguish the ante-Montanistic period of the author's life from his later. Of the first class are *De Patientia, De Oratione, De Pmnitentia, Ad Mnartyres, Ad Uxorem.* Next stands Cyprian. Though in general he shared the strictly moral view of Tertullian, highly spoken of by him, and though, in contrast with Alexandrian speculation, he was strenuously attached to practical ecclesiasticism, yet he was never carried away to the rigid, excessive severity of his exemplar, and by his more spiritual manner of contemplation he inclined to the ideal, thus offering points for reconciling the Alexandrian and North African schools. (See, however, this *Cyclopedia,* 3:321, col. 2.) Cyprian's writings belonging to the department of ethics are *De zelo et livore,* distinguished by its psychological tenor, the third book of his *Libri testimoniorum,* which gives an outline of moral rules for life; *De Bono Patientiae; De Opere et Eleomosynis; De Oratione Dominica; De Lapsis,* etc. We find in his letters also specimens of casuistry — decisions on difficult cases presented to him by bishops. Next Lactantius (q.v.), the Christian Cicero, spreads over the morals of the Gospel the splendor of rhetoric, and proves by comparison the insufficiency and perversity of pagan ethics. His *Institutiones Divinae*, in which he performs that task, call be looked upon as an exemplar of a development tending to reconcile speculative and practical elements. The Christian religion, which teaches man to find his supreme happiness in God, is pronounced by him the true philosophy of life. If some obliquity and error have crept into his ethical statements, they must be attributed to the circumstance that at the time of his authorship the moral doctrines of

the Church were not yet so fixed as they were after the Pelagian disputes. Of not equal, yet of considerable importance, are the writings of Athanasius, the pillar of orthodoxy in the Arian controversy. One would naturally suppose that he, busy with an attempt to solve the great dogmatic problem, had no time for moralistic discussion; nevertheless we find in his numerous dogmatic writings many moral reflections disseminated. Almost exclusively devoted to moral subjects are the writings of Ephraem (q.v.) the Syrian, whose edifying compositions contain a rich store of moral ascetic thoughts. A condign pendant to the writings of the *propheta Syrorum* are the ethical writings of Macarius (q.v.); they are especially important for mysticism, containing as they do the germs of the ecclesiastic traditional form later represented by the great mystics of the Middle Ages. Cyril (q.v.) of Alexandria is too well known as the zealous advocate of Christian ethics against the assaults of Julian to need special consideration here. Beside him stands Cyril (q.v.) of Jerusalem, who distinguishes between the dogmatic and ethic in the later usual manner, designating what concerns faith, δόγμα, and what has moral action for its purpose, πρᾶξις. Ὁ τῆς θεοσέβειας τρόπος ἐκ δύο τούτων συνέστηκε, δογμάτων εὐσεβῶν καὶ πράξεων ἀγαθῶν. The dogmas he regards as the roots of moral motives. We turn next to that bright triple constellation of Cappadocia — Basil the Great and the Gregories — those great influential theologians of the 4th century. The sublime moral earnestness which animated them, their warm attachment to the Church, the superior culture which they had gained by industrious study, are mirrored in their literary products, spirit, learning, and eloquence. The main merit about Christian ethics is undoubtedly due to Basil the Great; yet also his brother, Gregory of Nyssa (in his writings on the life of Moses, on perfection, on virginity, as well as in his homilies), and his theological friend, Gregory of Nazianzum (in his poems and homilies), labored in the department zealously and successfully. The ἠθικά of Basil contain the main features of Christian moral doctrine continuously based on sentences of Holy Writ. His ἀσκητικά have the higher morality and the perfection of monastic orders for their principal topic. Three of his letters addressed to Amphilochius, the bishop of Iconium, which contain regulations of Church discipline, have acquired canonical authority in the Roman Catholic Church. At the confines of the 4th century we are met by the grave and venerable form of Ambrose, the bishop of Milan, whose writings introduce us into a green and flowery garden of moral meditations. In his three books, *De Officiis,* he furnishes a counterpiece to Cicero's treatise of the same title. It aims to

bring the purity, sublimity, and sanctity of Christian ethics to a conscious and clear recognition. After him we come to three men — (347-407) Chrysostom, Jerome, and Augustine — all more or less connected with the Pelagian controversy. The first of them discourses on the question of free-will and grace, and in a most practical manner. Soon after his death we see the same raised as an issue of controversy full of moral interest by Pelagius, a British monk. Until the commencement of the 5th century strictly doctrinal questions had been the topics of ecclesiastical disputes; now the Pelagian contest, an eminently moral question, engaged public attention. The contrast of liberty and grace must have been recognised at the first awakening of reflection. It found, however, no final equitable solution, and remained in continual vacillation, sometimes grace, at other times liberty, preponderating, at the expense of the adverse. (Compare the view of the Grecian fathers of the Church of ἐκούσιν, Petavius, *De theol. dogm.* tom. 1, lib. 5, cap. 2.) Pelagius, however, asserted the freedom of will to such lengths that the divine influence of grace was nearly reduced to a nullity. Pelagius, in referring man to the power of his will, wished to rouse him to energetic action. This intention is ingenious, and deserving of respect. But, as Neander *(Joh. Chrysostomus u. die Kirche,* 2:134 sq.) correctly observes, man should be brought not only to the consciousness of his originally divine nature, but at the same time to the recognition of his internal corruption unlike it, and to the ideal of sanctity to be obtained: he ought to have cheered man, bowed down, by proclaiming what the infinite love of the Deity has done in Christ to deliver him from this corruption; he ought to have led him to the inexhaustible spring of divine life, by which the faithful may be renewed in heart, in order to impart to him confidence in moral exertions, not liable to be deceived, but rather confirmed, by selfknowledge and experience, which, according to his needs, humiliate and elevate him. Jerome (q.v.) preceded Augustine in coming forth to the conflict; he had already retired when the latter made his appearance, and by the momentum of speculative talent, mental profundity, and Christian knowledge and experience, turned and decided the contest. *SEE PELAGIANISM*. Of the three, however, Augustine deserves by far the most important place. Except perhaps Clement of Alexandria and Ambrose. St. Augustine is certainly the ablest moralist of all the patristic writers. He was among the first to be distinguished by reduction to principles, by clear statement, dialectic progress of ideas, and systematic organization in general. The sovereign genius of Augustine, moreover, succeeded best in emancipating himself from classical influences. Nowhere

is the Christian vital principle of love (caritas) more exactly defined and carried out more consequentially than in his excellent treatise, *De moribus ecclesiae catholicae et Manichaeorum,* c. 15, 21-24 (comp. also his *De civit. Dei,* 14:9, page 54, 167; *Enchirid.* c. 121; *Defide et operibus,* c. 7). It is true he does not exhibit in his writings a strictly ethical system, but wherever and whenever he treats moral subjects, he is always led by a scientific dialectic spirit, and never loses sight of the spiritual ideal unity floating before his clear and comprehensive mind. Among his ethical works, besides the one mentioned above, the following are especially worthy of note: *Enchiridion ad Laurentiunm s. defide, spe et caritate; De fide et operibus; De vita beata; De agone Christiano; De mendacio; De bono conjugali; De sancta virginitate; De continentia; De patientia.* See, however, the article AUGUSTINE. In the further lapse of' this period a number of men, partly of the Greek, partly of the Latin Church, have rendered service to ethics. Among these is Isidore of Pelusium, whose moral writings breathe the spirit of Chrysostom, and plainly show the love devoted by him to this great master, so influential in the Greek Church. Nilus also must be considered as being in spiritual connection with this illustrious exemplar. Both clothed their ethic definitions, precepts, counsels, and casuistic decisions in epistolary form. Even in the Occident we meet with a disciple of the "Gold-mouthed," John Cassian, who was actively engaged in the Pelagian movement by an attempt at mediation, which, however, miscarried. For ethics, not only his *De octo capit. vitiis* is worthy of mention, hut also his *Collationes Patrum,* and his twelve books, *De institutis coenobiorum.* Among the moralistic authors of the Greek Church, the series of the fathers hitherto enumerated is worthily concluded by John the Scholastic, author of that moral-ascetic treatise, *Climax Paradisi,* and by Anastasius Sinaita, whose writings are mainly of an ascetic description. In the Western Church Gregory the Great closes the period by his *Moralia,* a work which he skilfully introduces by some passages from Job, disseminating many suggestive thoughts, the abundant fruits of which will not escape the attentive observer in subsequent periods of ethic history.

3. *Scholastic Period.* — The men whom we meet from the beginning of the 7th until the end of the 11th century, with few exceptions, made it their main task to collect from the patristic mines all moralistic material, and to distribute and group it under definite rubrics and titles. Among these collectors archbishop Isidore of Hispalis deserves first mention. His

principal ethical work is *Sententiarum s. de summo bono libri iii.* The maxims gathered from older fathers treat of virtue and sin in general, the auxiliaries of virtue, and particular duties. The main source from which he draws are Augustine and Gregory the Great. In his *De Differentiis Spiritualibus* also a moralistic tendency predominates, while his *Synonyna* and *Soliloquia* are entirely pervaded by it. With perspicuity he develops in them etymologically moral ideas, and reduces them to logical connection. He is surpassed, if not in learning, in mental productiveness by the abbot Maximus (the Confessor), whose Κεφάλαια on love contain the most profound ideas, and are extremely valuable for scientific ethics. He besides has well deserved by the interpretation of the mystic writings of the Areopagita. Maximus enunciates the proposition that the incarnation of the Λόγος had to be renewed in us spiritually; the human and divine must penetrate vitally. He distinguishes between the law of nature, the written law, and the law of grace, and attempts to develop the three elements in their single and in their interchanging relations. The collections of moral maxims by the Palestinian monk Antiochus in his *Pandects of Holy Writ,* and Beda the venerable in his *Scintillae Patrum,* are surpassed by John of Damascus in his extensive work Ta Epai. This ample collection of materials, surpassing all previous ones as regards completeness, is arranged alphabetically; the single articles are divided into a Biblical and a Patristic part. Also his still more renowned work, Ἔκδοσις ἀκριβὴς τῆς ὀρθοδόξου πίστεως, contains moral sections, the more significant the higher they stand in a scientific point of view. Alcuin's writing, *De Animce Ratione,* is allied to Platonic doctrines, as they are stated by Augustine. It descants on virtue in general, and the cardinal virtues and principal vices. His other work, *De Virtute et Vitiis,* is less scientific, and more remarkable for diligence in collecting. The thread of ethical writings, without enriching its particular sphere, was continued through the darkest times of the Middle Ages by Smaragdus *(Via Regia* and *Diadema Monachorum),* by bishop Halitgar of Cambray *(De Poenitentia libri v),* by Jonas, bishop of Orleans *(Libri iii de Institutione Laicali* and *Libri de Institutione Regia),* by Rabanus Maurus *(De Vitiis, De Poenitentia, De Institutione Clericorum),* by Pascharius Radpertus *(Tract. de Fide, Spe et Caritate),* by Hincmar *(Epp. de Canendis Vitiis et Virtut. Exercend.),* by Ratherius *(A Medit. Cordis libri vi),* and by Peter Damiani. The next writer, Anselm of Canterbury, really opens up the most auspicious outlook of the scholastic field. His writings, which in greater part belong to the department of morals, indicate a decided advance in a well-cultured spirit; and there are

foreshadowed in them the tendencies of the moralists of the latter part of the Middle Ages, by whom were brought forth those extravagances which successively held sway in the theological world under the name of mysticism, scholasticism, and casuistry. We come here upon Bernard of Clairvaux and Hugo of St. Victor, who were truly the coryphaei of Middle Age ethics, and the leading representatives of mysticism (see Helfferich, *Die Christl. Mystik* [Gotha, 1842], 1:349 sq., 430 sq.). Bernard is surpassed by no author in his delineations of the worth and power of love. From him proceeded that passionate inspiration which the monastery of St. Victor perpetuated through the Middle Ages, and which remains embodied in the *Imitation of Christ.* The two pre-eminent Christian sentiments, according to him, are humility and love; both spring from the knowledge of ourselves. A sense of humiliation is the first experience when we duly regard ourselves, and this prepares for intensity of love, which in its highest degree is felt only in reference to God. We come next to the great masters of scholastic theological ethics. These are Peter Lombard, Thomas Aquinas, and Duns Scotus. Their aim is to harmonize Aristotelianism and Christianity. The first completed, in his *Magister Sententairum,* the list of the seven cardinal virtues by adding faith, hope, and charity to the ancient series of justice, fortitude, temperance, and wisdom. His scholars, Alexander of Hales and Albert the Great, still further perfected his system. Thomas's task is to fully develop, in his *Summa Theol.* part 2, the mediaeval philosophy of virtue. He makes the intellect the highest principle, and distinguishes between universal and special ethics, the former being that of perfect beings in heaven, the latter that of imperfect beings on earth. This work is by all critics conceded to be the most magnificent of all ethical structures of the Middle Ages. Duns Scotus, in his *Quaestiones in iv libb. sent.,* opposes the primacy of the will to that of the intellect, and thus introduces a subjective element in place of the objective knowledge to which Aquinas has given prominence. Besides these great writers of this period, there are many others who have greatly distinguished themselves as contributors to the department of ethics. Among these, above all others of the Christian writers of these times whom we have just passed in review, towers the revered Bonaventura, the conciliator of the dialectico-scholastic and mystical forms of the Middle Age spirit. He commented upon Lombard's writings, and wrote in a scholastic manner his *Breviloquium* and his *Centiloguium;* in a mystical tendency he composed his *Itinerarium mentis in Deum,* and smaller works. A pretty exhaustive epitome of Christian ethics was furnished by William Perault (Peraldus) in his *Summa*

de Virtutibus et Vitiis. A still richer and more thorough treatise of moral theology came from the pen of the Dominican Antoninus, archbishop of Florence, who, after Thomas, performed the greatest service in this field. He deserves to stand by the side of Bonaventura, as the author of *Summa Theologiae in iv partes distributa.* The *Speculum Morale* of Vincence of Beauvais stands in intimate relation to Thomas's writings, many regarding Thomas as its. author even, because of the similarity to the *Secunda Secuondc,;* yet there seems to be little ground for this supposition, and Vincence should be counted here as a writer of merit. Gerson also deserves mention here for his valuable contributions to scholastic morals (as contained in volume 3 of the Antwerp edition of his works).

Mysticism during the quarrels of the scholastics, developed and flourished more than ever in the latter part of this (14th) century, and brought forth much valuable fruit. Prominent among those who at this time gave to mysticism a popular, practical tendency were John Tauler (q.v.) and Henry Suso (q.v.). On the borders of the objective ecclesiastical and subjective unecclesiastical mysticism we meet John Ruysbroech, who is by Gerson ruled out of the Church writers as a heretic (see Ullmann, *Reformers before the Reformation).* But the greatest influence by far was exerted by Thomas a Kempis, who, breaking away altogether from speculation, entered the practical popular road in his *Imnitation,* to which we have already referred. But while thus gradually by this new mystical method morality was referred to inner feelings, aspirations, and conflicts, and by the scholastic method it was founded on systems of intellectual principles, prominence was given to the casuistical method, which limits itself to the determination of duty in particular cases (casus conscientie) in practical life. Numerous works on casuistry, some of them designed for the use of the confessional, were produced from the 13th to the 16th century, the principal of which are the *Astesanca,* by a Minorite of Asti; the *Angelica,* by Angelus de Calvasio; the *Pisanella,* also called the *Magistruccia,* by Bartholomeo de Sancta Concorlia, in Pisa; the *Rosella,* by the Genoese Minorite Trouamala; and the *Monaldina,* by archbishop Monaldus, of Benevento. The *Astesanam* treats, in eight books, of the divine commandments, of virtues and vices, of covenants and last wills, of the sacraments, of penance and extreme unction, of ordination, of ecclesiastical censures, and of marriage. The tendency of casuistry is to dissipate the essential unity of the Christian life in the technical consideration of a diversity of works.

4. *Modern Period.* — Casuistry had begun to decline when it was revived and zealously improved by the Order of Jesuits, and became their peculiar ethics. The doctrine of probabilities was developed by them in connection with it. The number of writers who devoted themselves to this task is very large. We can only make room here for the more noted. Though rather a polemic than a moralist, Bellarmine (t 1621) deserves to be first mentioned here because of the Jesuitic moral sentiments contained in his *Disputationes de controversiis Christianae fidei.* He has, moreover, played his part as a mystico-ascetic writer. His *Libri iii de genitu Columbae* (Antw. 1617), and his *De ascensione mentis in Deum per scalas rerum creatarum* (Par. 1606), are greatly valued by Romanists. But little less noted is Peter Canisius (t 1597), author of *Summa doctrinae Christianae,* a work which, though intended as an aid to catechetics, is yet much valued by Roman moralists because of the many important hints which it furnishes them. Other Jesuitical moralists who deserve mention here are Francis of Toledo (t 1596), *Summa casuum conscientie s. Instructorium sacerdotum in libb. viii distinctum* (Rome, 1602); Immanuel Sa (t 1596), *Aphorismi confessariorum ex doctorum sententiis collecti* (ed. ult. Duac. 1627); John Azor (t 1600), *Institutiones Morales* (Rome, 1600 sq.); Gregory of Valentia (t 1603), *Commentt. theol. et disputt. in Summam Thomae Aquinatis;* Gabriel Vasquez (t 1604), *Commentt. et disputt. in Thom.* (Ingolst. 1606); Thos. Sanchez (t 1630), *Opus Morale in praecepta Decalogi* (Mad. 1613); *Disputationes de legibus ac Deo legislatore in decem libros distributee* (Lugd. 1613, et *Opp.* t. 11); *De Triplici virtute theologica, Fide, Spe et Caritate* (Aschaffenb. 1622; *Opp.* 12); *De Ultino hominiis Fine, voluntario et involuntario, humanorum actionunt Bonitate et Malifia, Passionibus, Habitibus, Vitiis et Peccatis* (Mogunt. 1613; t. 6 et 7); Paul Laymann (t 1635), *Theologia Moralis* (Monach. 1625); Vincence Filliatius (t 1622), *Quaestiones morales de Christianis officiis et casibus conscientiae ad formam cursus, qui praelegi solet in Societate Jesu Collegio Rom.* (Lugd. 1622 sq.); Leonhard Less (t 1623), lib. 4, *De Justitia et Jure coeterisque virtutibus cardinalibus ad Secundam Secundae Thomae* (Lugd. 1630); Ferdinand de Castro Palao (t 1633), *Opus Morale de Virtutibus et Vitiis* (Lugd. 1633 sq.); John de Lugo (t 1660), *Disputt. de Sacramentis,* etc.

Pascal, and others with him, though not so ably as he, assailed the indefiniteness and ambiguity of casuistical principles as espoused by many of these Jesuitic moralists, *SEE PROBABILISM*; as the adequate type of

whom it should, however, be stated here that the *Medulla* of Hermann Busenbaum, which is the basis of the *Theologia Moralis* of Liguori, attained the highest reputation. Busenbaum's work is truly the embodiment of Jesuitical ethics. It appeared first in 1645 at Munster, and passed through fifty editions, enjoying a circulation like that of no other moral compend; and yet this was not the end, for its embodiment into the *Theologia Moralis* of Liguori gave it another lease of life, and thus the *Medulla* may be said to have enjoyed a two-hundred-years' rule. See, however, our article LIGUORI *SEE LIGUORI* . The *Medulla* was also used and commented upon by Claude Lacroix and Francis Anth. Zacharia. Of like tendency are the writings of Taberna, Viva, Mazotta, Francolinus, and Edm. Voit. The casuisticomoral treatise of the last named is now, after Liguori's, the great favorite of Romanists, especially of Jesuits and Ultramontanes, and has in recent years been repeatedly published at Rome and Paris.

Among the writers of the Roman Catholic Church who have stood aloof in a great measure from the casuists, as well as the reformers led by Pascal, the first place in this period belongs to bishop Louis Abelly (t 1691), whose *Medulla Theologica* has passed through several editions (last, Regensb. 1839). A favorite text-book for theological students, because of its brevity and clearness, is the *Examen theologice Morale,* by Marianus at Angelis. It has been exceeded in popularity only by Sobiech's *Compend. theologiae Moralis,* and more recently by Liguori's *Homo Apostolicus.*

5. *Recent Period.* — Among those who in more recent days have led the Romanists on moral subjects, none deserve so high a place as Hirscher, whose *Christl. Moral* (Tiib. 1835, 3 volumes, 8vo, and often) is really a work of more than ordinary merit. Perhaps equal merit is accorded to Sailer *(Christkatholische Moral,* Ratisbon, 1831), also a scholar and a clear thinker. These two men were liberal in sentiment, and accommodated themselves to the spirit of the age; but for this reason they are well known only in Germany and among the Gallican clergy of France. Everywhere else Liguori still holds sway. Ambrose Joseph Stapf may in many respects be counted a disciple of Sailer and Hirscher. His *Christliche Sittenlehre* was published at Innsbruck in 1850, edited by J.B. Hofmann. Other works of like tendency and worth are from the distinguished Roman Catholic theologians Filser, Martin, Propst, and especially Werner.. Danzler, Muttschelle, and Schreiber may be pointed out as principal organs of a negative tendency. They are Pelagian in their interpretation of Christianity,

and betray the modern rationalistic leaning in their moral systems. Among those who have closely allied themselves with the sceptical philosophic schools of our day the following are worthy of mention: Aug. Isenbiehl (t 1800), *Tugendlehre nach Grundsatzen der reinen Vernunft u. des praktischen Christenthums* (Augsb. 1795); Jos. Geishtutner (t 1805), *Theol. Moral in einer wissenschaftlichen Darstellung* (Augsb. 1805). The last named is a disciple of Fichte, and, together with Maurus Schenkl (t 1816), who published *Ethica Christiana* (5th ed. Vienna, 1830), indicates a passing over to a more positive tendency. One of the more recent and noted works on the subject is Prof. Paul Palasthy's *Theologia Morum Catholica* (1861, 4 volumes). Though the author is a Hungarian, the work has been brought out in Germany, and there enjoys a wide circulation, and is acknowledged superior to the German works (comp. *Literarischer Handweiser f. d. kath. Deutschland,* September 18, 1867). It is based on the labors of Suarez, Billuart, Less, Laymann, and Leander. Another work of about the same date is Prof. F. Friedhoff's *Allgem. Moraltheoloyie* (Mayence, 1860). Later he wrote another work on the subject, entitled *Specielle Moraltheologie* (1865), but neither of them compares favorably with the Hungarian production. Of greater value even than Palasthy's work, and more recent in origin, is Prof. Simar's *Lehrb. d. kathol. Moral theologie* (Bonn, 1867, 8vo), which is fast gaining ground in the theological schools of Germany. In his introduction he furnishes a valuable resume of the history of Roman Catholic moral theology, which we have freely consulted in writing this article. See Wetzer mi. Welte, *Kirchen-Lexikon,* 7:294-308; Aschbach, *Kirchen-Lexikon,* s.v. Moral Theologie; *Dublin Rev.* October1853; *Brownson's Rev.* January 1853; and for Protestant criticisms, Manning and Meyrick, *Moral Theology of the Church of Ronme, or certain Points in S. Alonso de Liguori's Moral Theology considered, in* 19 *Letters* (1855); *Presbyterian Quarterly,* April, 1873, page 367; *North British Review,* July, 1870, page 266; *Westminster Reviewz,* January 1873, page 118 sq.; *Christian Remembrancer.* January, July, and October 1854.

Morales, Ambrosio

a learned Spanish Dominican, the best authority on early Spanish history, was born at Cordova in 1513. His parents and relatives were people eminent in literary circles, and Ambrosio enjoyed all the advantages his country could afford him. One of his uncles, Fernan Perez de Oliva, who was a professor of philosophy and theology at Salamanca, took a

prominent part in his education, and greatly influenced his tendency to theological study. He was also indebted to Juan de Medina and to Meichior Cano, two great writers and eloquent professors of divinity of that time, the former at Alcala, the latter at Salamanca, where he was the great antagonist of his eminent colleague Bartholomeo Carranza, and a still greater opponent of the Jesuits. This Cano, or Cansus, is the author of the excellent treatise *De Locis Theologicis,* and was a great reformer of the schools, from which he banished many futile and absurd questions. While yet a youth Morales produced a translation of the *Pinax* or *Table of Cebes.* But religious enthusiasm arose far above all his literary aspirations, and pervaded all his actions. At the age of nineteen Morales became a Jeronvmite, when, his religious fervor being no longer controllable, in order to secure himself against temptation, he attempted to follow the precedent of Origen. The excruciating pain inseparable from this self-mutilation drew from him a shriek which brought a brother monk to his cell in time to give him effectual relief. In order to obtain a papal dispensation for his conduct, he set out for Rome, but fell into the sea, and was saved, according to his own account, by a miracle. Considering this accident as a warning not to proceed, he joined his friends at court, and lived thenceforward as a secular priest. After the death of his father he became a professor at Alcala, where he had, among others, Guevara, Chacon, Sandoval, and the first Don Juan of Austria, among his pupils. He sustained the high literary credit of his family by his investigations into the antiquities of Spain. He also devoted himself to belles-lettres, and did much to cultivate among the Spanish of his day a taste for literature. His services were recognised at court, and he was made historiographer to Philip II, king of Spain. Morales died in 1590. He was the author of several works on the secular as well as religious history and antiquities of Spain; but his extreme credulity greatly deteriorates the value of his writings. See Bouterweck, *Hist. of Spanish Lit.* (see Index); Ticknor, *Hist. of Spanish Lit.* 3:129.

Morales, Juan Bautista

a Spanish moralist, was born at Montella, Andalusia, and flourished in the first half of the 17th century. Scarcely anything is known of his personal history. He is, however, noted as the author of *Jardin de Suertes morales y civitas* (Seville, 1616, 16mo). See Antonio, *Bibliotheca Hispana nova,* s.v.

Morales, Luis de

a Spanish artist, noted for his paintings of sacred subjects, was born in Badajoz in 1509. Either from his constant choice of sacred subjects, or (less probably) from the merits of his works, he received the surname of *El Divino,* "the divine." His pictures were nearly all heads, generally of Christ or the Virgin; some authorities believe that there are no instances of his painting the figure at full length. His *Ecce Homo* and *Mater Dolorosa* are the best types of his paintings. in spite of his acknowledged ability, the prices lie received for his works are said not to have been enough to compensate him for the great labor and time he spent upon them; and he lived in the greatest want until his old age, when he was supported by Philip II. His chief works are at Toledo, Valladolid, Burgos, and Granada. He died in Badajoz in 1586.

Moralities

a term used for the theatrical representations made by the monks in the Middle Ages, designed to exhibit virtue and vice, so as to make the former look desirable, the latter detestable. This word is classed with two others of similar *meaning-miracles* and *mysteries. SEE MYSTERIES*.

Morality

is that relation which human actions bear to a given rule of rectitude. Says Whately, "To lay down in their universal form the laws according to which the conduct of a free agent ought to be regulated, and to apply them to the different situations of human life, is the end of *morality" (Lessons on Morals).* It is the opposite of legality, as that expresses only conformity with justice, while morality is applied to the *tendency in the mind or heart* towards harmonious action with the law. It is the doctrine, in short, which treats of actions as right or wrong. It does not cover so vast a field as religion, but is, nevertheless, the outgrowth of it. "Morality," it has been aptly said, "is a studious conformity of our actions to the relations in which we stand to each other in civil society. Morality comprehends only a part of religion; but religion comprehends the whole of morality. Morality finds all its motives here below; religion fetches all its motives from above The highest principle in social morals is a just regard to the rights of men; the first principle in religion is the love of God." While religion, then, covers the whole life both in its present and future relations, morality confines itself virtually to the temporal, or better civil life. "Morality," says

Coleridge, "commences with and begins in the sacred distinction between thing and person. On this distinction all law, human and divine, is grounded" *(Aids to Refection,* 1265). "There are in the world," says Sewell. "two classes of objects, persons and things; and these are mutually related to each other. There are relations between persons and persons, and between things and things; and the peculiar distinctions of *moral* actions, *moral* characters, *moral* principles, *moral* habits, as contrasted with the intellect and other parts of man's nature, lies in this, *that they always imply a relation between two persons,* not between two things" *(Christian Morals,* page 339). Now the Christian Church holds that so much of the glory of man's origin remains in him, that even when farthest from the light and grace of Christ's presence in the Church he retains some spark of that divine conscience which is derived from him — "the true light, which lighteth every man that cometh into the world" (⁴³⁰⁰⁹John 1:9). "Morality," argues Culverwell aptly, "is founded in the divine nature. It is an eternal ordinance made in the depth of God's infinite wisdom and counsel for regulating and governing the whole world, which yet had not its binding virtue in respect of God himself, who has always the full and unrestrained liberty of his own essence that it cannot bind itself" *(Light of Nature).* Hence a knowledge of good and evil, some sense of responsibility to God, and some capacity for practical virtue, may be possessed even by persons not Christians; those of them at least who have not been brought within reach of the Church, with its revelation of truth and its sacraments of grace. Of such St. Paul speaks in ⁵⁰²⁴Romans 2:14; or at least his words respecting the Gentiles who had not the Jewish "law" may be fairly interpreted as extending also to those who have not the Christian law. They may do by nature some of those duties which are extended and heightened by grace, and may thus be "not far from the kingdom of God." To what extent such natural morality now exists (after eighteen centuries of Christianity) it is impossible to say; probably to a very small extent. In his epistle to the Romans, St. Paul clearly distinguishes between that conformity with the letter of the law springing from a Christian heart, and that external conformity prompted simply by a desire to evade the odium or punishment of the transgressor. The latter the apostle does not recognise as true morality; the δικαιοσύνηνομικη is in its simple legality, and for want of a real inwardness of a moral or better spiritual life, only an *apparent* morality. The ἔργα νόμου are not by any means the ἔργα ἀγαθά which the spirit of Christianity elicits; they want that life-giving spirit which is none other than the spirit of divine love, of the fullest,

inmost, and truly unconditional surrender to God and his most holy purposes. The germ, the life or essence, of Christian morality is *love,* itself the principle of union in and with God, the fountain and original of all good. It is to Christian morality, then, that the highest standard and the noblest place must be assigned; indeed, it is Christian morality which must not only precede, but supersede, all other systems of morality. "What the duties of morality are," says Coleridge, "the apostle instructs the believer in full, comprising them under the two heads of negative and positive: negative, to keep himself pure from the world; and positive, beneficence from loving-kindness — that is, love of his fellow-men (his kind) as himself. Last and highest come the spiritual, comprising all the truths, acts, and duties that have an especial reference to the timeless, the permanent, the eternal. to the sincere love of the true as truth, of the good as good, and of God as both in one. It comprehends the whole ascent from uprightness (morality, virtue, inward rectitude) to godlikeness, with all the acts, exercises, and disciplines of mind, will, and affections that are requisite or conducive to the great design of our redemption from the form of the evil one, and of our second creation or birth in the divine image. It may be an additional aid to reflection to distinguish the three kinds severally, according to the faculty to which each corresponds, the part of our human nature which is more particularly its organ. Thus, the prudential corresponds to the sense and the understanding; the moral to the heart and the conscience; the spiritual to the will and the reason, that is, to the finite will reduced to harmony with and in subordination to the reason, as a ray from that true light which is both reason and will, universal reason and will absolute" *(A ids to Reflection,* 1:265, also 22, 23). On the near coincidence of this scriptural division with the Platonic, . See Bishop Horsley's *Charge* (1790); Paley's and Grove's *A Moral Philosophy;* Beattie's *Elements of Moral Science;* Evans's *Sermons on Christian Temper;* Watts's *Sermons on Christian Morals;* Mason's *Christian Morals;* More's *Hints,* 2:245; Gisborne's *Sermons designed to illustrate and enforce Christian Morality;* Meysenburg, *De Christiance religionis vi et effectu in jus civile* (Gott. 1828, 8vo), Hoffbauerr, Das *allgem. oder Naturrecht u. die Moral* (Halle, 1816); Schleiermacher, *Grundlinien einer Kritik der bisherigen Sittenlehre* (Berl. 1813), page 465; Brend, *Difference between the Morality of Jesus and that of the Jews;* Ensor, *Principles of Morality;* Hildreth, *Theory of Morals;* Kames, *Principles of Morality;* Whewell, *Morality,* § 76; Maurice, *Lectures on Social Morality* (1873); Smith, *Characteristics of Christian Morality* (Bampton Lects. 1873);

Contemip. Rev. April 1872, art. 6 and 8; March 1872, art. 5; *Westminster Rev.* April 1871, pages 243, 260, 261; and literature in Malcom, *Theol. Index,* s.v.

Morals

a term usually employed to designate the aggregate of the moral principles of an individual or a community as evinced in its conduct in comparison with the acknowledged rules of morality. The various general relations of this subject are so fully discussed in the articles ETHICS *SEE ETHICS* , MORAL LAW *SEE MORAL LAW* , etc., that we here bring together only some special distinctions under the head of *duty,* the fulfilment of which is the ultimate criterion of public and private morals.

Baumgarten defines duties to be actions which one is bound to perform, and Christian August Crusius coincides with this opinion when he defines duty as the application of the principles of morality to individual cases, and with Opitz, who calls it the inward knowledge of what one must do or abstain from doing in order to lead a religious life. Reinhard defines duty as the moral necessity of doing or not doing a certain thing, resulting from our perception of right *(System d. christl. Moral,* part 2, § 196). This is the view taken by many others, even by Roman Catholic moralists (see Riegler, *Christl. Moral,* part 1, § 124 sq.). This, however, considers only the outward part of duty, as manifested in action; its scope was afterwards enlarged by connecting it with the conscience (*SEE MORAL SENSE*), which Crusius understands to be the inborn impulse by which we recognise the obligation of subjecting all our thoughts and actions to the will of God. Paley stands almost alone in making virtue consist in *utility,* and those who resolve it into "the fitness of things" do but indirectly refer it to the will of God, who has ordained the constitution of the universe. All our duties to God are comprised in the expression, *honor God* (Walch), or *love God.* For to fear God and keep his commandments is the whole duty of man (Ecclesiastes 12:13). It was already presented as such in the O.T., but in the N.T. this is put in the first place, as the one important principle: unlimited love towards God, and to one's neighbor as the image of God, as well as of one's self (Matthew 22:37-40; Romans 13:8-10; Deuteronomy 6:4-9; Leviticus 19:14, 17, 18, etc.). As the Kantian philosophy, abandoning the cognition of a thing *per se,* placed the power of truth entirely in the consciousness of obligation (categorical imperative), duty, as that commanded by it. acquired in that system an extraordinary

significance. Will nothing, and do nothing which it cannot be lawful for entire mankind to do; or, As ye would that men should do to: you, do ye also to them likewise (⁴⁰⁷²Matthew 7:12; ⁴⁰⁶¹Luke 6:31). The total submission to the categoric imperative arising from pure regard for the law is the highest morality; while that arising from love, a sort of subjective satisfaction in it, is less pure, since the motive is akin to egotism. Thus morality resolved itself into the doctrine of law and duty, while previously it was considered as almost exclusively a question of good. Indeed, Paley made morality itself consist in seeking the high-est good, a theory not far removed from the purer form, of ancient Epicureanism. The modern philosophy, however, has justly repudiated this utilitarian text, and thrown the subject back for solution upon the deeper convictions of mankind as expressed in the instinctive discriminations of conscience. *SEE MORAL PHILOSOPHY*.

Morand, ST.

a Clugny monk, was born in Germany, and flourished in the 11th century. He was educated at Worms, and then went to Burgundy, in France, and joined the Congregation of Clugny. Falling in with Hugo of Samur, a severe ascetic, Morand was enlisted in behalf of monasticism, and he preached in its favor wherever he went. He roamed all over France and Switzerland, restoring as far as possible the former interest in monastic institutions, and creating new ones where they had never been. His austerity and piety secured for him a place in the list of saints; and it is claimed by Romanists that he worked many miracles. See *Vita S. Morandi* in *Biblioth. Cluniacensis,* col. 501; Montalembert, *Monks of the West,* volume 3 (see Index).

Morando, Paolo

a Veronese painter, sometimes called Cavazzuola, was born in 1491. He died young, and consequently left but few works to perpetuate his name; these, however, are of a high order of merit. *Christ bearing his Cross,* now in the gallery of Verona, is attributed to him, and is one of the best compositions on the subject which can be found among the old painters. Mrs. Jameson says: "This conception is one of the few which realize the scriptural and historical picture to the mind. Simon is here in his suitable character, and no superadded incident diverts the eye from the chief

figure." See Mrs. Jameson and Eastlake, *Hist. of Our Lord* (Lond. 1864, 2 volumes, 8vo), 2:113.

Morange, Bedion

a French theologian, was born at Paris about 1635, and was educated at the Sorbonne, where he received the doctorate. In 1660 he became canon of Lyons, and later vicar-general of that diocese. He died there in 1703. He wrote, *Libri de preadamitis brevis Analysis* (Lyons, 1656, 8vo): — *Prizatus Lugdunensis Apologeticon* (1658, 8vo): — *Sumna uneiversce Theologiae Catechistae* (1670, 4 volumes, 8vo).

Morant, Philip

a British antiquary and divine, was born in the island of Jersey in 1700; was educated at Pembroke College, Oxford; then entered the sacred ministry, and became, first, rector of St. Mary's, Colchester, afterwards of Aldham, Essex. He died in 1778. Morant edited several works, and wrote a *History of Colchester* (Lond. 1748, fol.); also enlarged, and incorporated in a later work of his, *Hist. and Antiquities of the County of Essex* (1768, 2 volumes). He also wrote all the biographies marked with the letter C and the life of Stilliigh-eet in the *Biog. Brit.* (1st ed. 17 volumes, fol.). See Allibone, *Diet. of Brit. and Amer. Authors,* 2:1359.

Mo'rasthite

(Heb. *Morashti',* יָתִּשְׁרַמ, gentile from *Moresheth;* Sept. Μωραθίτης, Μωρασθεί*),* a native of MOKESHIETH-GATH ([2668]Jeremiah 26:18; [3010]Micah 1:1). *SEE MICAH*.

Morata, Olympia Fulvia

an Italian lady of great genius and learning, noted for her piety and faithful service to Italian Protestantism, and spoken of by the biographer of the duchess Renee as " a woman whose history may be pondered in silent compassion, yet in silent admiration — a saint so tried in life, so blessed in death," was born at Ferrara in 1526. Her father, preceptor to the young princes of Ferrara, sons of Alphonso I, observing her genius, took great pains in cultivating it; and when Olympia was called to court for the purpose of instructing the princess Anna d'Este, daughter of the duchess of Ferrara, and of herself studying belleslettres with the princess of Ferrara, under the tutelage of her father, she astonished the Italians by declaiming in

Latin and Greek, explaining the paradoxes of Cicero, and answering any question that was put to her. The example of Renee de France, duchess of Ferrara, who was much interested in the religious controversies of the times, had a great influence upon Olympia's mind. Men like Jamet, Marot, Peter Martyr, Lalio Giraldi, and Celius Calcagnilli were received at court, and formed a select circle. Calvin, who went in disguise from France to Italy to see her, brought her over to his opinions, and her court became the refuge of all those suspected of heresy. Peregrino Morata, Olympia's father, became himself converted, but Olympia showed little inclination as yet for a devout, religious life. Her whole mind was taken up with her own literary works and the court gayeties. "If Olympia," says Young, the biographer of Paleario, "learned anything at court of true religion, she also found much to distract her attention. The extreme precocity of her talents had early called forth her reasoning and reflective powers, but she herself owns that at this time she did not duly relish the sacred Scriptures. They were to her a holy, but a sealed book; her intellect revelled with greater delight in the mazes of human learning and philosophy." She wrote several essays at this time, the best known of which is a eulogy on Mucius Scaevola. But the year 1548 brought a decided change. Her friend, the princess Anna of Ferrara, married and went to Lorraine, and shortly afterwards her father died. His death, and the ill-health of her mother, withdrew her from court, and she devoted herself to household affairs, the education of three sisters and a brother, and especially to spiritual contemplation and devotion. In communing with her own heart she began to perceive her need, and from that moment resolved to live and die a follower of the Gospel. In this her hour of greatest happiness she made the acquaintance of a young German named Andrew Grunthler, who had studied medicine, and taken his doctor's degree at Ferrara. He was a Protestant, and the day when she was married to him (in 1549) she followed her father's example and embraced Protestantism. Her husband, unprepared to depart at once with his bride, advanced to Germany to prepare the way for her, and over a year elapsed before he was ready to return for her. Together with her little brother and her husband she now left for Germany. They went to Schweinfurt, in Franconia, which was soon after besieged and burned, and they barely escaped with their lives. They suffered many hardships in consequence, until Grunthler in 1554 received a call to Heidelberg as professor of medicine. Now at last it was hoped that better days had come for poor Olympia, but the fearful hardships she had suffered during the siege of Schweinfurt had undermined her health. In

December 1554, she was taken sick, and never left her bed again. She died October 26, 1555. A few months later her husband and brother died also. Several of her works were burned at Schweinfurt, but the remainder were collected and published at Basle in 1558 by Ccelius Secundus Curio. They consist of orations, dialogues, letters, and translations, and are known as *Olympiae Fulviae Morate, mulieris omnium eruditissimae Latina et Graeca, quae haberi potuerunt, monumenta* (Basle, 1558). They are distinguished for a deep religious conviction and great refinement of language and thought. See Bonnet, *Vie d'Olympie Morata* (Paris, 1850; in English, *Life of O. Morata, with a Historical Sketch of the Ref. in Italy* [Edinb. 1854, 18mo]); Turnbull, *O. Morata, her Life and Times* (Bost. 1846, 12mo); Mrs. Smith, *Life, Times, and Writings of O. Morata; Some Memorials of Renee of France, Duchess of Fertara* (2d ed. Lond. 1859,12mo), page 62 sq.; Trollope, *Decade of Italian Women,* volume 2; Colquhoun, *Life in Italy and France in the Olden Time;* Young, *Life and Times of Paleario,* 2:90 sq.; M'Crie, *Hist. of the Ref. in Italy,* page 54; *Littell's Living Age,* March 13, 1852, page 510. (J.H.W.)

Morata, Peregrino Fulvio

an Italian writer, noted as the father of the foregoing, and also for his defence of the Reformatory movement, which made him a Protestant, was born at Mantua near the close of the 15th century. During the early half of the 16th century he was professor of belles-lettres at the university of his native place, and later at Ferrara, whither the fame of his learning and virtue had brought him. He now taught not only in the high schools, but was also employed by duke Alphonso d'Este as preceptor of his two sons. He frequently appeared in the receptions at court, but he remained nevertheless an alien to the gayeties of its surroundings, and devoted himself largely to sacred meditations, in which he was assisted by his pious wife, Lucrezia. As a result of these studies, he brought out finally an exposition of the Lord's Prayer in 1526 *(Expozitione dell' orazione Dominicale della "Pater Noster"),* and shortly after he published a book taking ground favorable to the Reformed opinions (see Calcagnini, *Opera,* p. 156). He was on this account obliged to leave Ferrara in 1533, and only after a six years' stay abroad secured permission to return. He died in 1548. See Young, *Life of Paleario,* 2:96 sq.; Bonnet, *Life of Olympia Morata,* page 69 sq.

Moravia

(German *Mahren,* Slavic *Morawa),* a margraviate of the Austrian empire, especially interesting as being the chief seat of the Church of the United Brethren.

General Description. — Moravia, situated in 480 40'50° N. lat., and 150 10'-183 28' E. long., is bounded N. by Prussian and Austrian Silesia, E. by Hungary and Galicia, S. by the duchy of Austria, and W. by Bohemia, and contains in superficial area about 8555 square miles, with a population in 1882 of 1,997,897, divided about as follows: 450,000 are Germans, upwards of a million and a quarter Slavonians, and 50,000 belonging to other nations. The Slavonians of Moravia are composed of Zechs and Poles, the former of whom are inferior to their brethren in Bohemia, being an incorrigibly lazy, dirty people. The Moravian Poles, although less industrious and cultivated than the Germans, are a physically well-developed, courageous, and enterprising people. Moravia is a very mountainous country, and except in the south, where are extensive plains, the level above the sea is about 800 feet. Not more than half of the territory is arable. The more elevated parts are not fertile, and the climate is severe; but in the mountain valleys and on the southern plains the soil is remarkably rich, and the temperature more genial than in other European countries lying in the same parallel. Moravia produces largely for export fine crops of grain, also hops, mustard, potatoes, clover-seed, beet-root; and in the south, maize, grapes, chestnuts, and many other of the less hardy fruits and vegetables. The breeding of cattle and sheep, and the making of cheese from sheep's milk, constitute an important branch of industry; in the southern districts of the Hanna (a plain famous for its fertility), horses are bred for exportation. Geese and fowls are reared in large numbers for the sake of their feathers, and the keeping of bees is conducted with great success. The mineral products, which include gold, silver, iron, alum, saltpetre, coal, graphite, whetstones, sulphur, vitriol, pipe-clay, marble, topazes, garnets, and other precious stones, have not been made as available as they might have been. Some of the mines have been known since the 8th century. No gold or silver has been extracted since the 16th century, and the iron and coal mines are but little worked. The principal branches of industry are the manufacture of linen and thread, which now enjoy a European reputation, and leather goods, cotton, flannels and other woollen fabrics. Bruinn, the capital, is the chief emporium for the manufacturing trade, and Olmutz the principal cattle-mart.

Religion and Education. — Christianity was introduced among the Slavic nations as early as the reign of Charlemagne, *SEE SLAVES*, but the conversions then made were only transitory. In 863 the Holy Scriptures, the preaching of the Gospel and the service of the Christian religion as then practiced, were introduced to the *Moravians* in the Slavonic tongue by the Greek monks Cyrillus (Constantine) and Methodius, who became connected with Rome, but did not relinquish their peculiar Greek forms of worship. Methodius was consecrated at Rome archbishop of Moravia, and the Slavish forms of worship received the papal sanction (880), on the ground that God understood all languages, and should be worshipped by all nations. The efforts, however, to erect a distinct national Church met with continual opposition on the part of the German bishops, and finally, in 908, the Moravian kingdom was divided by the swords of the Hungarians and Bohemians. The Slavish ritual was kept up under these new rulers in only a few churches, and gradually the Romish practices were here the same as elsewhere (comp. Dobrowsky, *Cyrill u. Methodius, der Slaven Apostel* [Prague, 1823]). The Reformation made some inroads into the country, but as conformity to the Romish worship was enforced by law, many of the people holding the doctrine of the Reformation had to meet secretly for worship, and as opportunity offered fled into the Protestant states of Germany. This was especially the case with the *Moravian Brethren* (q.v.). The bulk of Moravians remain Romanists to this day, the Protestants only counting about 57,000, among whom the Lutherans and Reformed, who are the most numerous, have each a superintendent appointed by the state. There are also about 30,000 Jews, who, since 1848, have been freed from all oppressive obligations and restrictions. The Romanists have an archbishop, who resides at Olmutz, and a bishop, whose episcopal head-quarters are at Brunn. Both of these ecclesiastics are admitted to the provincial diet as members. The educational advantages of the country are exceptionally good. Until recently there was a university at Olmiitz. There are now twelve Catholic gymnasia, besides numerous parish schools, and about ninety-nine per cent. of the children of proper age attend school.

History. — Moravia was anciently occupied by the Quadi, who, on their migration in the 5th century to Gaul and Spain, were replaced first by the Rugii, next by the Heruli and Longobardi, and finally by a colony of Slavonians, who, on their settlement in the country, took the name of Moravians, from the river Morava. Charlemagne, who brought the people

under nominal subjection after they had spread themselves over a territory greater than the present Moravia, constrained their king, Samoslav, to receive baptism. Moravia was made tributary to the German empire before the close of the century; but in 1029 it was incorporated with Bohemia, after having for a time been a prey to the incursive attacks of its Slavonic and Teutonic neighbors. At the close of the 12th century, Moravia was erected into a margraviate, and declared a fief of Bohemia, to be held from the crown by the younger branches of the royal house. On the death of Lewis II, at the battle of Mohacz, in 1526, Moravia, with all the other Bohemian lands, fell to Austria, in accordance with a pre-existing compact of succession between the royal houses. Since then it has shared the fortunes of the empire, and in 1849 was formally separated from Bohemia, and declared a distinct province and crown-land. See Dudik, *Miahren's algem. Gesch.* (Brin, 1860-65, 4 volumes, 8vo); Pilaret Morawitz, *Moravian. Hist. Eccles. et Pol.* (Brin, 1785 sq. 3 volumes, 8vo).

Moravian Brethren

the designation of a body of Christians, will be considered under two heads.

The Ancient Moravian Brethren,

or, more properly, "THE BOHEMIAN BRETHREN," an evangelical Church which flourished before the Reformation of the 16th century, and which was overthrown in the beginning of the Thirty-Years' War of Germany.

I. *History.-John* Huss (q.v.) was the precursor of the Brethren. They originated in that national Church of Bohemia into which the two factions of his followers, the Calixtines and the Taborites, were formed at the close of the Hussite War, and which was based upon the *Compactata of Basle.* These compactata were certain concessions, particularly the use of the cup in the Lord's Supper and of the vernacular in public worship, granted (1433) to the Bohemians by the council which met in that city. In 1456, some members of the Theyn parish at Prague, who recognised the corruptness of the national Church, and wished to further their own personal salvation, withdrew to a devastated and sparsely inhabited estate, called Lititz, on the eastern frontier, by permission of George Podiebrad, the regent of Bohemia, and through the intervention of John Rokyzan, their priest. He had eloquently inveighed against the degeneracy of the age, but

lacked courage to inaugurate reforms such as these parishioners longed for, although they entreated him to do so, and promised their support even to death. Their object in retiring to Lititz was not to found a new sect. but to carry out, on the basis of the Articles of Prague, and of the Compactata of Basle, the reformation begun by Huss, confining their work, however, to their own circle, and forming a society within the national Church, pledged to accept the Bible as the only rule of faith and practice, and to maintain a scriptural discipline. Accordingly, in 1457, they adopted a formal declaration of principles, which was committed to the keeping and administration of twenty-eight elders. The association took the name of the "Brethren and Sisters of the Law of Christ." But as this title induced the belief that they were a new monastic order, it was changed into that of "The Brethren." At a later time the expressive name of "Unity of the Brethren" came into vogue, and was used indiscriminately both in its Bohemian and Latin forms, namely, *Jednotat Bratrska,* and *Unitas Fratrum.* The latter has remained the official denomination of the Moravians to the present day. At the head of the Brethren stood Gregory the Patriarch (q.v.); while Michael Bradacius (q.v.), and some other priests of the national Church, ministered to them in holy things. The association at Lititz soon began to exercise a great influence throughout Bohemia and Moravia. Its elders disseminated its principles, and received hundreds of awakened souls into its fellowship. The first persecution, which broke out in 1461, did not stop its growth; and in 1464, at a synod held in the open air, among the mountains of the domain of Reichenau, three of the twenty-eight elders were chosen to assume a more special management of its affairs. In the discharge of this duty they were guided by a document drawn up at that synod, and containing the doctrinal basis of the society, as well as rules for a holy life. This document, which is the oldest record of the Brethren extant, opens as follows: "We are, above all, agreed to continue, through grace, sound in the faith of our Lord Jesus Christ; to be established in the righteousness which is of God, to maintain the bond of love among each other, and to have our hope in the living God. We will show this both in word and deed, assist each other in the spirit of love, live honestly, study to be humble, quiet, meek, sober, and patient, and thus to testify to others that we have in truth a sound faith, genuine love, and a sure and certain hope." This extract sets forth the tendency of the Brethren, to which they remained true throughout their history. The great object which they had in view was Christian life. They strove to be a body of believers who showed their faith by their works. They tenaciously upheld a scriptural discipline as

an essential feature of a true Church. Although, in the course of time, they defined their doctrines in regular Confessions of Faith, they always made practical Christianity prominent, and required personal piety, and not merely an adhesion to a creed, as a condition of Church-membership. The Synod of Reichenau not only gave expression to this tendency, but also decided a grave question. The Brethren felt the necessity of separating entirely from the national Church, and of establishing a ministry of their own. Yet they were so anxious to avoid a schism, and to do nothing contrary to the will of God, that they spent several years in debating this step, and, in view of it, frequently appointed special days of fasting and prayer. The result to which they were led was to leave the decision to the Lord, by the use of the lot. This directed the Brethren to organize a Church of their own. Three years more were passed in praying to God for his Holy Spirit; and then in 1467, at a synod held in the village of Lhota, on the domain of Reichenau, three men, Matthias of Kunwalde, Thomas of Prelouc, and Elias of Chrenovic, were appointed to the ministry, again by the lot. For the particulars, *SEE MATTHIAS OF KUNWALDE*. Thereupon the subject of their ordination was discussed. The synod believed that presbyterial ordination had been practiced in the times of the apostles, but recognised the episcopacy as a very ancient institution. It was deemed important, moreover, to secure a ministry whose validity both the Roman' Catholics and the national Church would have to acknowledge. On the other hand, a primitive usage must not thereby be condemned. It was therefore determined to remain true both to the practice of the apostolical Church and to that of the Church immediately following the days of the apostles. Hence the nominees were ordained, on the spot, by the priests present at the synod; and then three of the latter, Michael Bradacius and two others, were sent to a colony of Waldenses, who were living on the confines of Austria, and who had secured the episcopal succession. For a history of this succession, *SEE MICHAEL BIADACIUS*. The Waldensian bishops consecrated the three delegates to the episcopacy, who "returned to their own with joy," as the old record says. Another synod was called, at which they, first of all, reordained Matthias, Thomas, and Elias to the priesthood, and then consecrated Matthias a bishop. A well-matured ecclesiastical government was instituted, and the Church soon spread into every part of Bohemia and Moravia. But it had to contend with two evils. The one threatened it from within. This was an extravagant tendency to press the discipline to anti-scriptural extremes. It occasioned disputes which continued for fourteen years, from 1480 to 1494, and which were

finally settled in the interests of the liberal party. For an account of these disputes, as well as of the exploratory journeys of the Brethren, *SEE GREGORY, LUKE OF PRAGUE*, and *SEE MATTHIAS OF KTUNWALDE*. The other evil approached from without. Two terrible persecutions occurred (1468 and 1508). The Roman Catholics and the national Church united in a bloody determination to root out the Brethren from the land. Imprisonment, confiscation, tortures, and death were the means employed. Many of the Brethren suffered martyrdom. But their blood was the seed of the Church. In both instances the persecution gradually came to an end; and the Unitas Fratrum renewed its strength and increased its numbers. A full history of these and subsequent persecutions is found in the *Historia Persecutionum Ecclesice Bohemicce,* published anonymously in 1648. This work was written by Amos Comenius (q.v.) and other exiled ministers of the Brethren, and has been translated into many languages. The English version is very rare. It came out in London in 1650, and was entitled "The History of the Bohemian Persecution." The latest German version is by Czerwenka, with notes: *Das Persekutionsbichlein.* (Giitersloh, 1869).

When Martin Luther began his Reformation, in 1517, the Church of the Brethren was prospering greatly. It counted 400 parishes; had at least 200,000 members, among whom were some of the noblest and most influential families of the realm; used a hymn-book and catechism of its own; had a Confession of Faith; and employed two printing-presses, in order to scatter Bohemian Bibles and evangelical books throughout the land. Hence the Brethren deservedly bear the name of the "Reformers before the Reformation." This position, however, did not prevent them from cordially fraternizing with the movement which Luther inaugurated. They corresponded with him, and sent several deputations to Wittenberg. It is true a personal estrangement between him and bishop Luke of Prague (q.v.) put an end for a time to this friendly intercourse; but it was soon resumed, and extended to the Swiss Reformers. Such fellowship was mutually beneficial. It purified the doctrinal system of the Brethren, who dropped some dogmas that still savored of scholasticism, and defined others more clearly. It gave the Reformers new ideas with regard to a scriptural discipline, and taught them the importance of union among themselves. These were the two points which the Brethren steadfastly urged in all their negotiations with other Protestants. Touching the first, they entreated Luther to apply himself to a reform of Christian life, and not

merely of doctrine; and they gave to Calvin some important principles, which he subsequently introduced in his disciplinary system at Geneva. On the occasion of the last deputation to Luther, bishop Augusta warned him, almost like a prophet, of the evil which would result in the Protestant Church if the discipline were neglected this prediction was fulfilled by the dead orthodoxy into Which the Church was subsequently petrified in Germany, and by the Sociniasism which ate out the vitals of that in Poland. Touching the second point, the Brethren were a standing protest against the controversies which rent Protestantism; they strove to promote peace, and succeeded in bringing about an alliance among the Polish Protestants at Sandomir, where in 1570 the Unitas Fratrum, the Lutherans, and the Reformed conjointly issued the celebrated *Consensus Sadomiriensis.* The Brethren had established themselves in Poland in 1549, in consequence of the fourth great persecution which broke upon them in the reign of Ferdinand I, who falsely ascribed the Bohemian League, which had been formed against him during the Smalcald War, to their influence. In the course of this persecution a large number of them were banished from Bohemia and emigrated to East Prussia. Thence came George Israel to preach the Gospel in Poland, and met with such success that at the General Synod of Slecza, held in 1557, the Polish churches were admitted as an integral part of the Unitas Fratrum. During the reign of Maximilian II (1564-1576) the Brethren enjoyed peace, and united with the Lutherans and Reformed in the presentation of the *Confessio Bohensica* to this monarch (1575). His successor, Rudolph II, was constrained by his barons to grant a charter which established religious liberty in Bohemia and Moravia (1609). An Evangelical Consistory was formed at Prague, in which body the Brethren were represented by one of their bishops. They were now a legally acknowledged Church. But the Bohemian revolution in 1619, caused by the accession of Ferdinand II, a bigoted Romanist, to the throne, brought about a change in the religious affairs of the kingdom. The Protestants and their rival king, Frederick of the Palatinate, were totally defeated at the battle of the White Mountain, near Prague, in 1620; the Bohemian revolution developed into a European war of thirty terrible years; and Bohemia and Moravia fell wholly into the power of the Roman Catholic Church. In 1621, Ferdinand II began the so-called "anti-Reformation" in those countries, after having executed a number of the leading Protestant nobles. Commissioners, accompanied by Jesuits and soldiers, were sent from place to place to force the inhabitants to embrace Romanism. Many were put to death; more than 30,000 families emigrated;

the rest were driven into an outward subjection to the Catholic faith. The Unitas Fratrum, as well as the Lutheran and Reformed churches, were swept from the kingdom (1627). But the Brethren reappeared as a Church in exile. The contingent which they furnished to the emigration was, in proportion to the whole number of members in each body, three or four times larger than that either of the Lutherans or of the Reformed. About one hundred new parishes were organized, chiefly in Prussia, Hungary, and Poland; and the executive council which governed the Church was set up at Lissa, in the country last named. The hope of returning to Bohemia and Moravia at the close of the Thirty-Years' War was generally entertained by the Brethren; but the Peace of Westphalia (1648) painfully undeceived them. Their native land was excluded from the benefits of religious liberty. Eight years later, the colony which had been gathered at Lissa was broken up (1656) in the war between Poland and Sweden. The members of the council scattered; the Polish parishes united with the Reformed Church; while some sort of a superintendence over the rest was kept up by bishop Amos Comenius (q.v.), who had found an asylum at Amsterdam. This eminent divine hoped and prayed for the resuscitation of the Unitas Fratrum. To this end he published its history and a new catechism, republished the *Ratio Discipline* which had been adopted in 1616, and which was an official account of its constitution and discipline, and cared for the perpetuation of the episcopacy. After his death in 1670, the scattered parishes of the Brethren were gradually absorbed by other Protestant churches. But the episcopal succession was maintained in the midst of that union between the Reformed and the Brethren which had been brought about in Poland; while in Bohemia and Moravia a remnant secretly worshipped God according to the custom of their fathers, and never relinquished the hope of a renewal of their Church. This state of affairs continued for half a century; and then their expectations were fulfilled. *SEE MORAVIAN BRETHREN, THE RENEWED* (No. 2 below).

II. *Ministry, Constitution, Worship, Ritual, and Discipline*. — The ministry of the Brethren consisted of three orders: bishops, priests, and deacons. In the course of time assistant bishops were associated with the bishops. These latter were often called *Seniors,* also *Antistites;* and the assistants *Conseniors.* Acolytes were young men preparing for the ministry, who performed certain inferior functions in connection with public worship, but were not ordained. The deacons instructed the young, occasionally preached, baptized, when directed to do so by a priest, and

assisted at but never administered the Lord's Supper. A priest stood at the head of each parish, and exercised all the duties usually connected with the priesthood. In the bishops was vested the power to ordain, to appoint pastors to the various parishes, to hold visitations, to superintend the printing offices, and in general to oversee the Church. Each bishop had a diocese of his own, but all of them together — their number varying from four to six — were associated with from six to eight assistant bishops as a council. Of this council the primate among the bishops was president. He enjoyed certain prerogatives, but could undertake nothing of importance without consulting his colleagues. Another of the bishops was secretary of the council. It was his duty to care for the records of the Church, and to examine and answer, if necessary, the publications which appeared against it. Bishops and assistant bishops were elected by the ministers, and the council was responsible to the General Synod, which met every three or four years. In this synod all the bishops, assistant bishops, and priests of the Bohemian, Moravian, and Polish provinces, into which the Unitas Fratrum was gradually divided, had seats. The deacons and acolytes, as also lay patrons of the churches, likewise attended, but without a vote. The bishops and their assistants constituted the upper house, and the priests the lower. Each house met by itself. Diocesan synods were held in order to legislate for a particular diocese, but their acts were reported to the council, and by it to the General Synod. Owing to the frequent persecutions that occurred, and to the idea that the cares of a family would interfere with the usefulness of the ministers, they were, for the most part, unmarried. There was no law enjoining celibacy; it was a usage, which gradually fell into desuetude. Towards the end of the 16th century an unmarried priest or bishop was the exception.

The membership of a parish was divided into *beginners,* that is, children and new converts from Romanism; *proficients,* or full members; and *perfect,* or such as were "so established in faith, love, and hope as to be able to enlighten others." From this last class were elected the *civil elders,* who constituted the advisers of the priest in spiritual things; the *cediles,* who managed the external affairs of a parish; and the *almoners,* who administered the poor fund. Turning to worship and ritual, we find that four regular services were held every Sunday; the second one in the morning being "the great service," when a sermon on the Gospels was delivered. In the early service the prophets, and in the afternoon service the apostolic writings, were explained; while the evening was devoted to the

reading of the Bible in order, with instructive remarks. Throughout the summer, the young were taught the Catechism at noon. The Holy Communion was celebrated four times a year, but could be held more frequently. Confirmation took place generally at the time of the bishop's annual visitation. The principal festivals of the ecclesiastical year were observed, and special days for fasting and prayer appointed. There were three degrees of discipline. Private admonition and reproof constituted the first, public reproof and suspension from the Lord's Supper the second, and total exclusion from the Church the third. The official account of the constitution and discipline of the Brethren opens with the following general principles: "There are in Christianity some things *essential* (essentialia), some things *auxiliary* (ministerialia), and some things *accidental* (accidentalia). Essentials are those in which the salvation of man is immediately placed," i.e., cardinal doctrines; "auxiliaries are means of grace, the Word, the keys, and the sacraments; accidentals are the ceremonies and external rites of religion." For a more thorough study of this subject, consult Lasitii *Historice de Origine et Rebus Gestis Fratrusn Bohemicorum, Liber Veterus,* edited by Comenius in 1649, and containing a full description of the constitution and discipline — a very rare work; J.A. Comenii *Ecclesiae Fratrum Bohenorum Episcopi, Historia Fratrum Bohemorum, eorum Ordo et Disciplina Ecclesiastica* (republished at Halle in 1702, by Buddaeus); Koppen, *Kirchenordnung u. Disciplin der Hussit. B. Kirche in B.u.M.* (Leipsic, 1845); Seifferth, *Church Constitution of the Boh. and Morav. Brethren, the original Latin, with a Translation and Notes* (Lond 1866).

III. *Schools and Literary Activity*. — The Brethren devoted themselves to education. Their earliest schools were found in the parsonages of the priests. Many of these, instead of families, had classes of young acolytes living with them, whom they trained for the ministry. Next were instituted parochial schools, in which a thorough elementary education was given, including Latin, and which were frequented by large numbers of pupils not connected with the Church. In 1574 a classical school or college, with professor Esrom Riidinger, from Wittenberg, as its rector, was founded at Eibenschttz, in Moravia; soon after another at Meseritsch, in the same country; and in 1585 a third at Lissa, in Poland. Of this last Amos Comenius subsequently became the rector. These colleges were attended by many young nobles, not excepting such as were of the Catholic faith. In 1585 three theological seminaries were opened at Jungbunzlau, in

Bohemia, and at Prerau and Eibenschtitz, in Moravia. The training of acolytes in the parsonages was, however, not given up.

By the side of such efforts to promote education may well be put the literary activity of the Brethren. This was extraordinary, far surpassing that of the national and Roman Catholic churches, and competing even with that of the Reformers. The Unitas Fratrum had four publication offices: three in Bohemia, the first established in 1500, and one in Poland. From these offices, and from several public presses, which were often used, came forth a multitude of publications in Bohemian, Polish, German, and Latin, comprising the Holy Scriptures, hymn-books and catechisms, confessions of faith, exegetical and doctrinal works, books and tracts of a devotional character, polemical writings, and in the time of Comenius schoolbooks, didactic works, and philosophical treatises. In addition to this prolific author, whose works numbered over ninety, the principal writers were Luke of Prague (eighty works), Augusta, Blahoslav (twenty-two works, among them a Bohemian Grammar, still in use), Lorenz, AEneas, Turnovius, Ephraim, Aristo, Rybinski, etc. Their Latin diction was often rough, but their Bohemian style pure, elegant, and forcible. In this respect they reached a standard which has never been surpassed. Excepting the writings of Comenius, the literature of the Brethren was mostly lost in the anti-Reformation, when evangelical books of every kind were committed to the flames. The most important of those works which have been preserved are the Kraliz Bible (q.v.), the catechisms, the confessions of faith, and the hymnbooks. The first Catechism in Bohemian appeared in 1505; the second, in Bohemian and German, in 1522 republished by Zezschwitz in 1863, translated into English by Schweinitz in 1869; the third, in German, by J. Gyrck, in 1554 and 1555; the fourth, the "Greater Catechism," in Latin, in 1616; the fifth, the "Shorter Catechism," in German and Polish; and the sixth, the Catechism of Comenius, in German, in 1611. Several others are mentioned, of which, however, little is known, except that one of them was a tetraglot — in Greek, Latin, Bohemian, and German — published in 1615. There were twelve different confessions of faith, in Bohemian, German, Latin, and Polish. Gindely counts up thirty-four, but of these the majority were merely new editions of the same Confession. The most important are, the Confession of 1533, printed in German at Wittenberg, preface by Luther, presented to the margrave of Brandenburg-very rare, a copy in the Bohemian Museum at Prague; the Confession of 1535, in Latin, with a historical introduction, presented by a

deputation of bishops and nobles to Ferdinand II at Vienna, found in Niemeyer's *Collectio,* pages 771-818, published in a revised form at Wittenberg in 1538, together with a Latin version of the Confession of 1533, both in one volume, under the supervision of Luther, who supplied the work with a preface, found in Lydii *Waldensia,* 2:344, etc.; and the Confession of 1573, in Latin and German, based upon all the previous confessions, giving the matured doctrines of the Church, embracing a historical procemium by Riidinger, and printed at Wittenberg, under the direction of the theological faculty of the university, the Latin Confession found in Lydii *Waldensia,* 3:95-256, and the German in Kocher, pages 161-256. The hymnology of the Brethren was one of the chief means which they used for spreading the Gospel and promoting spirituality. They gave to the national fondness for song a sacred direction. Their hymns were doctrinal; the German versification was hard, the Bohemian soft and smooth; the tunes, which were printed out in the hymn-books, were in part the old Gregorian, in part borrowed from the German, and in part popular melodies adapted. In spite of their roughness, the German hymns, whose simplicity and devotion, fervor and loving spirit, Herder highly commends, found favor in the churches of the Reformation, while the Bohemian expressed, says Chlumecky, "the deep religious feelings of the people, and were a blossom of the national life, showing forth the Slavonic ideal of a sanctified mind." The first Bohemian Hymn-book appeared in 1504; the second, which was the masterpiece of the Brethren's hymnology, containing 743 hymns, in 1661. This latter passed through a number of editions. The first German Hymn-book was published in 1531; the second in 1543; the third and best in 1566. This was dedicated to Maximilian II. contained 411 hymns, and was frequently republished. Polish hymn-books came out in 1554 and 1569.

IV. *Doctrines.* — For an exposition of the cardinal views of the Christian faith, as taught by the Brethren, the reader is referred to the works cited below. These doctrines agreed, in the nain, with those of the Reformers. Gindely (R.C.), Zezschwitz (Luth.), and some other writers, try to show that the Unitas Fratrum did not hold to justification by faith. Gindely asserts that its stand-point in this respect was altogether Romish; but this is disproved by the standards, although some of the private and polemical writings of Luke of Prague produce such an impression. In order to promote holy living, the Brethren strongly insisted on good works; but they taught that men are saved by faith, which they never understood in the

Romish sense, and they utterly rejected an *opus operatum.* In their earlier confessions and catechisms, following Huss, they distinguished between *credere de Deo, credere Deo,* and *credere in Deum.* The first is faith in God's existence; the second faith in his revelation through his Word; the third that faith by which a man appropriates to himself God's grace in Christ, and consecrates himself to Christ's service. Prior to the Reformation, the Brethren accepted the seven sacraments of the Roman Catholic Church; after that, about 1530, they repudiated all but baptism and the Lord's Supper. Up to that time, moreover, their views of baptism were peculiar. They rebaptized converts from the Roman Catholic and national churches, because they deemed both to be idolatrous; and they extended this practice to the young, because they considered personal faith an essential condition of the baptismal covenant. But they did not on this account reject infant baptism. Children were baptized soon after their birth, and thus dedicated to God; then they were rebaptized, after a thorough course of instruction in the Catechism, when old enough to exercise personal faith, and thus brought into full communion with the Church. This practice, however, was relinquished by a formal act of the General Synod of 1534, and confirmation substituted in the place of rebaptism. Touching the Lord's Supper, the Brethren taught that it is to be received in faith, to be defined in the language of Scripture, and every human explanation of that language to be avoided, except in so far that the spiritual, and not the real, presence is to be held. To this view they remained faithful, and were consequently often misunderstood both by the Catholics and the Utraquists on the one part, and by the Lutherans and the Reformed on the other. The great aim of the Brethren was to discountenance speculations and controversies with regard to this point. Finally, from the earliest times, they rejected purgatory, the adoration of the saints, and the worship of the Virgin Mary. For a further investigation of their doctrinal system, the following works are specially important: Balthasar Lydii *Waldensia* (tom. 1, Rotterdam, 1616; tom. 2, Dordrecht, 1617), containing a number of their confessions; Kocher, *Glaubensbekenntnisse der Bohmn. Briider* (Frankfort and Leipsic, 1741); Ehwalt *Alte u. neue Lehre der Bohn. Briider* (Dantzic, 1756); Kocher, *Katechetische Geschichte* (Jena, 1768); Niemeyer, *Collectio Confessionumn in ecclesiis reformatis publicatarum* (Leipsic, 1840); Gindely, *Ueber die dogmat. Ansichten d. Bohsma. Briider,* in the 13th vol. of the *Transactions of the Akademie der Wissenschaften* (Vienna, 1854, from the Roman Catholic stand-point); Zezschwitz, *Katechismen d. Waldenser u. Bohm. Briider* (Erlangen, 1863,

from the ultra-Lutheran stand-point); *The Catechism of the Boh. Brethren,* translated from the old German by E. de Schweinitz (Bethlehem, 1869); *Die Lehrweise d. Bohm. Briider,* by Dr. Plitt, in the *Theol. Stud. u. Krit.* of 1868.

V. *Literature*. — Until comparatively recent times the only sources of the history of the Bohemian Brethren were the following: *A History in Latin, in Eight Books,* by J. Lasitius, a Pole, written in 1560-70, but never published — two MSS. extant. at Herrnhut and Gottingen; *Historica Narratio de Fratrum Orthodoxorum ecclesiis in Bohemia, Moravia, et Polonia,* written between 1570 and 1574, by Joachim Camerarius, published, after his death, at Heidelberg, 1605; Regenvolscii (Adrian Wengersky) *Systema historico-chronologicum ecclesiarum Slavonicarum* (Utrecht, 1652; Amsterd. 1679,); J.A. Comenii *Ratio Disciplince,* etc. (Lissa, 1632; Amsterdam, 1660; Halle, 1702). On these sources were based, Cranz, *Ancient Hist. of the Brethren* (Lond. 1780); *Gedenktage d. alten Briiderkirche* (Gnadau, 1821); Holmes, *Hist. of the Prot. Church of the U.B.* (London, 1825, 2 volumes); Rieger, *Die alten u. neuen Bohm. Brider* (St. Ziillich, 1734); Lochner, *Entstehung, etc., d. Briidergenzeine in Bohmen2 u. Mdhren* (Nirnb. 1832); Carpzov, *Religions-Untersuchung d. Bohnm. Brider* (Leipsic, 1742; a bitter enemy of the Brethren); Bost, *Hist. of the Boh. and A Morav. Brethren* (Lond. 1848). In 1842 a Moravian clergyman discovered, in one of the churches at Lissa, thirteen folio volumes of MSS., which proved to be the long-lost archives of the Bohemian Brethren, and which were purchased by the Moravian Church, and removed to Herrnhut. They are known and cited as the *Lissa Folios.* The 14th volume was subsequently discovered at Prague. About the same time other original records were found: Jaffet's Hist. MSS. in the library at Herrnhut, Blahoslaw's MSS. at Prague, etc. These various documents have thrown an entirely new light upon the history of the Bohemian Brethren, and have been used particularly by Professor A. Gindely, a Roman Catholic, who has produced: *Geschichte der Bodhmischen Bruder* (Prague, 1857, 2 volumes); *Quellen zur Geschichte d. B.B.* (Vienna, 1859; very important, containing many of the documents of the Lissa Folios); *Dekreten d. Bruder Uniatt* (Prague, 1865, being the enactments of the General Synod, in the original Bohemian); *Rudolph II u. seine Zeit* (Prague, 1868, 2 volumes); *Gesch. d. 30 jahrigen Krieges* (Prague, 1869, 2 volumes); *Ueber des J.A. Conenius Leben* (Vienna, 1855, in the 15th vol. of the *Transactions of the Akademie).* Other works based upon the

new sources are: Palacky, *Geschichte v. Bhomen* (Prague, 1844-67,10 vols.); J. Fiedler, *Todtenbuch der Geistlichkeit der Bohm. Bruder* (Vienna, 1863, being the official necrology of the ministers of the U.F., in Bohemian; transl. into German in 1872); H. L. Reichel, *Geschichte d. alten Briiderkirche* (Rothenb. 1850); Croger, *Geschichte d. alten Briiderkirche* (Gnadau, 1865, 2 volumes; reviewed in *The Moravian* February 14, 1867); Benham, *Origin and Episcopate of the Bohemian Brethren* (Lond. 1867); Schweinitz, *Moravian Episcopate* (Bethlehem, 1865); Schweinitz, *Moravian Manual* (ibid. 1869); Benham, *Life of Comenius* (Lond. 1858); Czerwenka, *Geschichte d. Evang. Kirche in Bohmen* (Bielefeld and Leipsic, 1869 and 1870, 2 volumes, containing the best history of the Brethren that has yet been written); Pescheck, *Ref. and Anti-Reformation in Bohemia* (Lond. 1845, 2 volumes, from the German). Consult the following periodicals: *Lond. Qu. Rev.* April 1857, art. 10; *Amer. Presb. Qu.* July 1858; July 1864, art. 2; *Ch. Rev.* July 1865; April, 1866; *Meth. Qu. Rev.* July 1863, page 516; April 1870, page 265; *Princeton Rev.* 7:77; *Christian Exnaminer,* 66:1 sq. Compare also the works cited in the body of this article. Sources for the history of the Brethren in Poland are: Jablonski, *Hist. Consensus Sandomiriensis* (Berlin, 1731); Krasinski, *Reformation in Poland* (Lond. 1840, 2 volumes); Fischer, *Geschichte der Ref. in Polen* (Gratz, 1856, 2 volumes). The article in Herzog's *Encyklopadie,* by Dieckhoff, entitled "Bohmische Bruider," was written without any knowledge of the new sources. It was consequently supplemented by Zezschwitz, in the article "Lukas v. Prag," volume 20, conceived from an ultra-Lutheran point of view. (E. de S.).

The Renewed Moravian Brethren,

SO called because they form the resuscitated Church of the Ancient Moravian Brethren (see No. 1, above). They are commonly known as "The Moravians," and "The Moravian Church," inasmuch as they originally came from Moravia. Their official title is "THE UNITED BRETHREN," or *Unitas Fratrum.*

I. *History*. — At the close of the Bohemian anti-Reformation (1627), a remnant of the Brethren remained concealed in Bohemia and Moravia, and for many years kept up religious services in secret according to the faith and usages of the fathers. This "hidden seed," as it is generally called, was revealed in 1722, when two families, named Neisser, escaped from Moravia under the guidance of Christian David, "the servant of the Lord,"

and settled on the domain of Berthelsdorf, in Saxony, by the invitation of its young owner, count Nicholas Lewis de Zinzendorf (q.v.). In the course of the next seven years (1722-29), about three hundred other Brethren from Moravia and Bohemia emigrated in little companies to the same place, leaving their houses and lands to be confiscated by the Austrian government, and braving the punishments which were inflicted on those refugees who fell into its hands. They built a town called Herrnhut, or "The Watch of the Lord," to which godly men from various parts of Germany were soon attracted, so that its population rapidly increased. In the midst of this colony the Church of the Brethren was renewed, through the introduction of the ancient discipline, preserved in the *Ratio Discipline* of Amos Comenius, and through the transfer of the venerable episcopate, which had been kept up with such care, *in spem contra spem,* even after the ancient Church, as a visible organization, had ceased to exist. This transfer was made at Berlin, March 13, 1735, on which day David Nitschmann was consecrated as the first bishop of the Renewed Church, by Daniel Ernst Jablonski and Christian Sitkovius, the two surviving bishops of the ancient line.

In considering this renewal, two points are important. First, it was not a scheme of man, but altogether a work of God. Hence it bears a reality, and assumes its place in history with an authority, for both of which we would look in vain had a mere human plan been carried out. When Zinzendorf offered his estate as a refuge for the Brethren, he had not the remotest idea of renewing their Church, of which he knew little or nothing. Long before they came to his domain his aims in the interests of the Gospel had received an entirely different direction through the pietism of Spener. Nor did the Moravians themselves, when they began to emigrate, agree to reorganize in some other land. They left the issue of their flight in the hands of God. It was only by degrees that both parties were led to understand the divine will. The failure of his own plans, and other circumstances beyond his control, at last induced Zinzendorf to identify himself with the Brethren, and to labor for the resuscitation of their Church; while the gradual increase of their number at Herrnhut, and the opportunity which they there had to consult and to tell each other of the pious hopes of their fathers, gave them courage to maintain their independence, and to look for a new *Unitas Fratrum.* Secondly, this renewal involved a union of the German element of pietism with the Slavonic element of the ancient Brethren's Church. Thus arose some principles which were not found in the latter, and

a polity of exclusivism that gave a peculiar tendency for more than a century to the Moravians of the modern period. Zinzendorf was a Lutheran by birth, education, and conviction. He was devoted to the system of Spener, who had been one of his sponsors at his baptism, and especially to the project of establishing "little churches in the Church" *(ecclesiolae in ecclesia),* in other words, unions or associations of converted persons within a regular parish, for the purpose of personal edification. Hence the great aim which shaped his course was not to interfere with the State Church, but to develop Spener's idea in such a way that the Brethren would constitute, on the one hand, an independent Church, and yet, on the other, be a union of believers within the ecclesiastical establishments of the various countries in which they might settle. Accordingly, wherever they spread, exclusive towns were founded, in which religion controlled not only spiritual, but also social and industrial interests; from which the vices and follies of the world were banished, and where none but Brethren were allowed to hold real estate. That the Church could not, with such a system, enlarge its borders to any great extent in its home-field is evident. That its avowed purpose was to remain small is equally clear. The Moravian element, indeed, which drew its life from the old *Unitas Fratrum,* struggled for a time to gain free scope and expand. But Zinzendorf's views prevailed in the end, and were consistently carried out. Here and there Moravian villages were planted, as a leaven in Christendom. Such villages were to know nothing of a mere nominal Church-membership. All their inhabitants were to be true followers of Christ; and within their secure retreats they were to cultivate simplicity and lowly-mindedness, to foster holiness and love, to show forth a guileless spirit and a beautiful brotherhood. This constituted Zinzendorf's ideal, which was crowned with wonderful success.

At the time of Zinzendorf's death (1760), the Brethren were established in most of the Protestant states of Germany, in Holland, Great Britain, and North America, and after his decease they spread to Russia, Denmark, and Baden. In all of these countries they were represented by exclusive settlements; in Great Britain and America they had, besides, a number of churches in which their peculiar system did not prevail. The various governments granted them liberal concessions, and made them independent of the State Church; the Parliament of Great Britain, with the full concurrence of the bench of bishops, acknowledged them in 1749 as "an ancient episcopal Church," and passed an act encouraging them to settle in the North American colonies. On the part of the theologians of the day,

however, the same fraternal spirit was not always manifested. Lutheran divines, especially, began to publish bitter attacks upon the Brethren. That these, in this early period of their history, gave just cause of offence, at least to some extent, cannot be denied. In the first place, the controlling influence of the Church was carried to unreasonable extremes, particularly as regards the sacred rights of the marriage relation and of the family. These were interfered with. In order to educate a chosen generation for work in the kingdom of God, the Church Undertook the training of the children almost to the exclusion of parental rule. In the second place, about the year 1745 there began to appear in the churches of Middle Germany a spirit of fanaticism, which spread to some other Moravian' towns on the Continent, and even to Great Britain. Those in America were not affected. It was a fanaticism which grew out of a one-sided view of the relation of believers to Christ. The Brethren spoke of him in a fanciful and antiscriptural style. A new religious phraseology, unwarranted by the Bible, gained the supremacy. The wounds of Jesus, and particularly the wound in his side, were apostrophized in the most extravagant terms. Images were used more sensuous than anything found in the Song of Solomon. Hymns abounded that poured forth puerilities and sentimental nonsense like a flood. This state of affairs, which in Moravian history is designated "the time of sifting," continued for about five years, reaching its climax in 1749. When Zinzendorf and his coadjutors awoke to a sense of the danger which was threatening the Church, they adopted the most energetic measures to bring back the fanatics to the true faith. By the blessing of God they succeeded; the Church was fully restored to sound doctrine and scriptural practice. This is an experience without a parallel in ecclesiastical history, and shows how firmly it was founded upon Christ as its chief corner-stone. This, too, is the sufficient answer to those assaults which were then made upon it by Rimius, by the author of *The Moravians Detected,* and by a legion of other writers, whose publications have been collected by the librarian of the archives at Herrnhut, where they fill up a large book-case, and are examined as literary curiosities by the visitor of the present day.

The best evidence of the entire suppression of fanaticism is the fact that the Moravian settlements, subsequent to 1750, not only continued to be centres of a widely spread influence for good, but also exercised such influence in an ever-increasing degree throughout the world. However exclusive their system, they were not market-places in which the people stood idle all the day; on the contrary, there were various ways in which

these towns made their power to be felt. They gave a direction to chosen men of God, who became illustrious leaders in other parts of Christendom- as, for instance, to John Wesley, to Schleiermacher, and to Knapp; they were cities of refuge for the pure Gospel during the long reign of rationalism in Germany; they educated in their boarding-schools thousands of young people not connected with the Moravian Church; they originated a vast home missionary work, which will be described below, under the head of "'Diaspora;" and they sent out so large an army of missionaries into heathen lands that by common consent the Moravians are recognised as the standard-bearers in the foreign missionary work of modern times.

Since the beginning of the present century various modifications have been introduced in the Church, especially such as set aside any undue interference on its part with the rights of the family. The General Synod of 1857 undertook a thorough revision of the Constitution, on the basis of local independence in the three "provinces" of the *Unitas Fratrum.*

II. *Moravian Towns*. — There still exist fifteen exclusively Moravian settlements on the Continent of Europe, and four in Great Britain. In such settlements the membership is divided into seven classes, called "choirs," from the Greek χορός. These classes are: the married couples, the widowed, the unmarried men, the unmarried women, the boys, the girls, and the little children. Each class is committed to the supervision of an elder. Growing out of this system, we find in every Moravian town a *Brethren's,* a *Sisters',* and a *Widows' House*. In a Brethren's House, unmarried men live together and carry on trades, the profits of which go to support the establishment, as also the enterprises of the Church in general. A Sisters' House is inhabited by unmarried women, who maintain themselves by work suited to their sex. In each house there is a prayer-hall, where daily religious services are held. A common kitchen supplies the inmates with their meals. There is nothing monastic in the principles underlying these establishments, or in the regulations by which they are governed. The inmates are bound by no vow, and can leave at their option. A Widows' House is a home for widows, supplying them with all the comforts which they need at moderate charges, and enabling the poorest to live in a respectable manner. Each house has a spiritual and a temporal superintendent. The settlements in general are governed by two boards: the one, called the 'Elders' Conference," with the senior pastor at its head, attends to the spiritual affairs; the other called the "Board of Overseers," with the "warden" as its president, to financial and municipal matters. On

business of importance, a general meeting of the adult male members is convened. These towns at present count among their inhabitants not a few who are not members of the Moravian Church. Such residents, until recently, were not permitted to own real estate. This fundamental principle is now undergoing a change which will, without doubt, gradually lead to the abolition of the entire system of exclusivism.

III. *The American A Moravian Church.* — The Moravians settled in Georgia in 1735, but left that colony in 1740, on account of the war which had broken out with Spain. In the following year they founded Bethlehem, and subsequently Nazareth, in Pennsylvania. These towns, together with several smaller settlements, not only adopted exclusive principles, but also instituted a communism of labor. "The lands were the property of the Church, and the farms and various departments of mechanical industry were stocked by it and worked for its benefit. In return, the Church provided the inhabitants with all the necessaries of life. Whoever had private means, retained them. There was no common treasury, such as we find among the primitive Christians." This peculiar social system, which bore the name of" Economy," and which has given rise to the erroneous idea that there prevailed at one time a community of goods among the Moravians, existed for twenty years (1742-62). It accomplished great results. Each member of the "Economy"' was pledged " to devote his time and powers in whatever direction they could be most advantageously applied for the spread of the Gospel." Hence, while there proceeded from the Moravian settlements an unbroken succession of itinerants, who traversed the colonies and the Indian country in every direction, preaching Christ Jesus and him crucified, there labored at home a body of farmers and mechanics in order to maintain this extensive mission. After the abrogation of the Economy," the Church for eighty years continued to uphold its foreign exclusive polity. It is true there were a number of organizations not exclusive, but these were looked upon as of secondary importance, and were characterized as mere "city and country congregations." Consequently the Moravians of the United States could expand as little as their brethren in Europe. From 1844 to 1856, however, the old system was gradually relinquished, and has now ceased to exist. There no longer are any Moravian towns in this country. The American Moravian Church now stands on the same footing as the other Protestant denominations of the land, and is pursuing the same policy of extension. In the last twenty years it has nearly doubled its membership, and flourished in other respects.

IV. *The Constitution.* — The *Unitas Fratrum* is distributed into three *provinces,* the German, British, and American, which are independent in all provincial affairs, but form one organic whole in regard to the fundamental principles of doctrine, discipline, and ritual, as also in carrying on the work of foreign missions. Hence we find a provincial and a general government. Each province has a Provincial Synod, which elects from time to time a board of bishops and other ministers, styled the "Provincial Elders' Conference," to administer the government in the interval between the synods. To this board is committed the power of appointing the ministers to their several parishes. It is responsible to the synod. The Provincial Board of the American Province consists of three members, has its seat at Bethlehem, Pensylvania, and is elected every six years. The American Provincial Synod, composed, of all ordained ministers and of lay delegates elected by the churches, meets triennially; and the province is divided into four districts, in each of which a District Synod is annually held. Every ten or twelve years a General Synod of the whole *Unitas Fratrum* is convened at Herrnhut, in Saxony. It consists of nine delegates from each province, elected by the Provincial Synod; of representatives of the foreign missions; and of such other members as are entitled to a seat by virtue of their office. This synod elects a board of twelve bishops and other ministers, styled the "Unity's Elders' Conference," which oversees the whole Church in so far as general principles come into question, and superintends the foreign missionary work. At the present time the same Conference acts as the Provincial Board of the German Province. It has its seat in the castle of Berthelsdorf, the former residence of count Zinzendorf.

V. *Doctrines.* — The Renewed Moravian Church does not, as was the case in the ancient Church of the Brethren, set forth its doctrines in a formal confession of faith, nor does it bind the consciences of its members to any which are not essential to salvation. Such essential doctrines, however, it publishes in its Catechism, its Easter-morning Litany, and its *Synodical Results,* or code of statutes, drawn up and published by each General Synod. From this latter work, as issued by the Synod of 1869, we quote the following extract:

"The points of doctrine which we deem most essential to salvation are:

"**1.** The doctrine of the total depravity of human nature: that there is no health in man, and that the fall absolutely deprived him of the divine image.

"**2.** The doctrine of the love of God the Father, who has 'chosen us in Christ before the foundation of the world,' and 'so loved the world that he gave his only-begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life.'

"**3.** The doctrine of the real godhead and the real manhood of Jesus Christ: that God, the Creator of all things, was manifested in the flesh, and has reconciled the world unto himself; and that 'he is before all things, and by him all things consist.'

"**4.** The doctrine of the atonement and satisfaction of Jesus Christ for us: that he 'was delivered for our offences, and was raised again for our justification;' and that in his merits alone we find forgiveness of sins and peace with God.

"**5.** The doctrine of the Holy Ghost, and the operations of his grace: that it is he who works in us the knowledge of sin, faith in Jesus, and the witness that we are children of God.

"**6**. The doctrine of the fruits of faith: that faith must manifest itself as a living and active principle, by a willing obedience to the commandments of God, prompted by love and gratitude to him who died for us.

"In conformity with these fundamental articles of faith, the great theme of our preaching is Jesus Christ, in whom we have the brace of the Lord the love of the Father, and the communion of the Holy Ghost. We regard it as the main calling of the Brethren's Church to proclaim the Lord's death, and to point to him, 'as made of God unto us wisdom, and righteousness, and sanctification, and redemption. "

An authorized manual of doctrine is bishop Spangenberg's *Exposition of Christian Doctrine as taught in the Church of the U.B.* (Lond. 1784); a systematic work for theologians, although not authorized by the synod, is *Evatngelische Glaubenslehre nach Schrift und Efaciahrung* (Gotha, 1863), by Dr. Plitt, president of the German theological seminary. See also Zinzendorfs *Theologie* (Gotha, 1869-74, 3 volumes), by the same author.

VI. *Ministry, Ritual, and Usages*. — The ministry consists of bishops, presbyters, and deacons. The episcopal office is not provincial, but represents the whole *Unitas Fratrum.* Hence bishops have an official seat, not merely in the synods of the provinces in which they are stationed, but also in the General Synod; hence, too, they can be appointed only by this body, or by the Unity's Elders' Conference, although the American Province has secured the right of nomination. From all this it is evident that the Moravian episcopacy is not diocesan, and that bishops are not rulers of the Church *ex officio,* as was the case among the ancient Brethren. They are, however, almost invariably connected with the government by election to the Unity's Elders' Conference, or to the Provincial Boards. The president of the former is always a bishop; the presidents of the latter are, as a general thing, the same. The contrary is the exception. In the episcopate is vested exclusively the power of ordaining; it constitutes, moreover, a body of men whose duty it is to look to the welfare of the entire *Unitas Fratrum,* in all its provinces and missions, and especially to bear it on their hearts in unceasing prayer before God. At present there are eleven bishops in active service: four in America, two in England, and five in Germany. Of these, seven are members of the governing boards.

The ritual is liturgical in its character. A litany is used every Sunday morning; free prayer is allowed in connection with the litany, and at other times. There are prescribed forms for baptism, the Lord's Supper, confirmation, ordination, marriage, and the burial of the dead; special offices of worship for parochial, boarding, and Sunday schools; liturgical services for the various festivals of the ecclesiastical year, such as Advent, Christmas, Epiphany, etc., which are all observed; and a particular litany for Easter morning, prayed annually at sunrise, and, wherever practicable, amid the graves of them that sleep. Certain days commemorating important events in Moravian history are celebrated, and in those churches in which the division of the membership into "choirs" has been retained, which is the case not only in the exclusive settlements, each class observes an annual day of praise and covenanting, the festival closing with the Holy Communion. *Love-feasts* are held, in imitation of the ancient "agape," preparatory to the Lord's Supper, and on other occasions. At all liturgical services sacred music forms a prominent feature. Foot-washing (pedilavium) was formerly practiced on certain occasions within the limited circles of some of the " hoirs," but has been universally discontinued since the beginning of the present century. The statement in this *Cyclopaedia,*

volume 4, page 616, taken from Herzog's *Real-Encyklopiadie,* 4:630, that the Moravians still practice foot-washing, is therefore incorrect. At one time the lot was employed in the appointment of ministers, and in connection with marriages. Its use in the former case has been greatly restricted, and is left to the discretion of each provincial board. In the American Church it is scarcely ever resorted to, except when a minister receiving an appointment requests its use. Touching marriages by lot, they were abolished, as a rule, by the General Synod of 1818. Since that time they have been almost unknown in the American Province. This usage, which has been so generally misunderstood and ridiculed outside of the Church, was a legitimate result of its controlling influence in all the relations of its members, and constituted, moreover, a wonderful example of the childlike faith of the early Moravians. They gave themselves entirely into the hands of God. He was to lead them in all respects. In view of the loose ideas that prevail in our day with regard to the marriage contract, an intelligent mind cannot but admire such a spirit. That God did not put the confidence of the Brethren to shame is evident from the results of this practice. While it continued, there were fewer unhappy marriages among them than among the same number of people in any other denomination of Christians. This is a well-known fact, which can be established by statistics. Not a single divorce ever occurred. Without going into the details of this usage, we will merely add that any woman was at liberty to reject an offer of marriage even when sanctioned by the lot.

VII. *Schools and Missions*. — The Moravians have 35 flourishing boarding-schools: 17 in the German Province, 14 in the British, and 4 in the American. They are intended for young people not connected with the Church, and educate annually about 2500 pupils of both sexes. The schools in the American Province are the following: Moravian Seminary for Young Ladies, at Bethlehem, Pennsylvania, founded in 1785 (200 pupils); Nazareth Hall, for boys, at Nazareth, Pennsylvania, founded in 1785 (125 pupils); Linden Hall, at Litiz, Pennyslvania, founded in 1794 (75 pupils); Salem Female Academy, at Salem, N.C., founded in 1802 (200 pupils); Hope Academy, for girls, founded in 1866 (75 pupils). This province, moreover, has a flourishing theological seminary, with a classical department. at Bethlehem. It was founded in 1807; reorganized in 1858. The British theological seminary is located at Fulneck, Yorkshire, England; and the German seminary at Gnadenfeld, in Silesia. The German Province has a prosperous college at Nisky, in Prussia.

The work of foreign missions was begun in 1732, only ten years after the first house had been built at Herrnhut, and when that settlement counted but 600 inhabitants. Leonhard Dober and David Nitschmann were the pioneers, and established the first mission among the negro slaves of St. Thomas. Since that time the home Church has sent out 2171 missionaries, male and female. The following missions proved unsuccessful: Lapland (1734-35); among the Samoyedes, on the Arctic Ocean (1737-38); Ceylon (1738-41); Algiers (1740); Guinea, West Africa (1737-41, and 1767-70); Persia (1747-50); Egypt (1752-83); East Indies (1759-96); among the Calmucks- (1768-1823); Demerara, South America (1835-40). At the present time the work embraces the following fields, called "Mission Provinces:" Greenland (begun 1733); Labrador (1771); Indian Country of North America (1734); St. Thomas and St. John (1732); St. Croix (1732); Jamaica (1754); Antigua (1756); St. Kitt's (1775); Barbadoes (1765); Tabago (1790, renewed in 1827); Mosquito Coast (1848); Surinam (1735); South African Western Province (1736, renewed in 1792); South African Eastern Province (1728); Australia (1849); Thibet (1853). This extensive work is supported by the contributions of the members of the Church, by the interest of funded legacies, by the donations of missionary associations, and by such revenue as the missions themselves can raise through voluntary gifts and the profits accruing from mercantile concerns and trades. The annual cost of the foreign missions is about $250,000. On retiring from the field in consequence of sickness or old age, missionaries are pensioned. Their widows also receive a pension, and their children are educated at the expense of the Church. In other respects they are satisfied with a bare support. The converts are divided into four classes: *New People,* or applicants for religious instruction; *Candidates for Baptism; Baptized Adults; Communicants.* The principal missionary associations are the following: *The Society of the United Brethren for Propagating the Gospel among the Heathen,* founded in 1787, at Bethlehem, Pennyslvania; *The Wachovia Society of the United Brethren for Propagating the Gospel among the Heathen,* founded in 1823, at Salem, N.C.; *The Brethren's Society for the Furtherance of the Gospel among the Heathen,* founded in 1741. in England, supporting the mission in Labrador, and owning "The Harmony," a missionary ship annually sent out to supply the missionaries with the necessaries of life; *The London Association in Aid of the Missions of the United Brethren,* founded in 1817, and composed chiefly of members not connected with the Moravian Church; *The Missionary*

Society of Zeist, in Holland, founded in 1793; and *The Missionary Union of North Sleswick,* founded in 1843.

In addition to these foreign missions, the last General Council inaugurated a work in Bohemia (1870), in the midst of the ancient seats of the Brethren, which promises to be successful. It already numbers four churches.

Independently of the other provinces, the German Province carries on its *Diaspora.* This is a mission which receives its name from the Greek διασπορά in 1 Peter 1:1, and which has for its object the evangelization of the European state churches, without depriving them of their members. Hence missionaries itinerate through Protestant Germany, Switzerland, Denmark, Norway, Sweden, Poland, Livonia, Estonia, and some other parts of Russia, and organize "societies" for the purpose of prayer, of expounding the Scriptures, and of edification in general. The members of such societies do not leave the communion of the state churches. In the event of their disestablishment, however, which seems to be approaching, it is more than probable that the members of such "societies" will fully join the Moravian Church, whose membership will thus be increased by thousands. Indeed such a change is now taking place in Switzerland, where, since the adoption of the new ecclesiastical laws (1873), three independent Moravian churches have grown out of the Diaspora.

VIII. *Statistics.* — German *Province:* churches, 26, of which 15 are in Moravian towns; ministers, 113; members, 8067. *British Province:* churches, 38; ministers, 55; members, 5575; number in Sunday-schools, 3994. *American Province:* churches, 70; ministers, 80; menbers, 16,698; number in Sunday-schools, 8212. *Foreign Missions:* mission provinces, 16; stations, 114; out-stations, 8; preaching-places, 307; ordained missionaries from Europe and America, 161; female assistants from Europe and America, 172; total of laborers from Europe and America, 333; native ordained missionaries, 41; native assistants, 1575; normal schools, 7; day-schools, 217; scholars, 16,590; teachers (natives), 290; monitors, 623; Sunday-schools, 92; scholars, 13,604; teachers, 944; total number of converts, 79,021. *Bohemian Mission:* stations, 4; missionaries, 4; members, 259. *Diaspora:* central stations, 61; ordained missionaries, 33; unordained missionary assistants, 32; members, about 100,000. *Totals in home provinces of the Unitas Fratrum:* ministers, 248; members, 27,906.

Totals in missions: laborers, 1454; members, 69,473. *Totals in Diaspora:* laborers, 65; members of societies, 100,000. The *Unitas Fratrum* therefore has in all 1767 laborers engaged in the work of the Gospel, numbers 110,130 members, and has besides 100,000 souls in its Diaspora societies.

IX. *Publications and Literatures.* — Periodicals of the German Province: *Herrnhut* (weekly); *Der Bruder Bote* (every alternate month); *Nachrichten aus der Brudergemeine* (monthly); *Journal de l'Unite des Freres* (monthly); *Berigten uit de Heiden-Wereld* (monthly); *Missionsblatt* (monthly); *Brudermissionsblatt fur Kinder* (monthly). British Province: *The Messenger* (monthly); *The Missionary Reporter* (monthly); *Periodical Accounts* (quarterly). American Province: *The Moravian* (weekly); *Der Bruderbotschafter* (weekly); *The Little Missionary* (monthly). South African Mission Province: *De Bode* (monthly); *De Kinder-Vriend* (monthly). Besides these periodicals, there is an annual published by the Unity's Elders' Conference, entitled *The Text-book,* containing two passages from the Bible — one from the Old, the other from the New Testament — each with a corresponding stanza from the Hymn-book, and arranged for every day in the year. This annual has appeared since 1731; it is published in German, English, French, Swedish, Esquimau, and Negro-English; and thousands of copies are circulated every year outside of the Moravian Church.

The denominational literature is very extensive. We mention only the most important works: Cranz, *Accident and Modern History of the Brethren* (Lond. 1780); Holmes, *History of the United Brethren* (Lond. 1825, 2 volumes); *A concise History of the Unitas Fratrum* (Lond. 1862); *The Moravian Manual* (Bethlehem, Pa., 2d ed.), giving a short but complete account of the Church; Bp. Croger, *Geschichte der Erneuerten Briidderkirche* (Gnadau, 1852-54, 3 volumes); Schrautenbach, *Zinzendosf und clie Buiidergemeine* (Gnadau, 1851); Burckhardt. *Zinzendosf und die Briidergemeine* (Gotha, 1865); *Memorial Days of the Renewed Church of the Brethren* (Lond. 1822); *Results of the General Synod* of 1869 (Lond. 1870); Plitt, *Gemeinei Gottes in ihrem Geist u. ihren Formen* (Gotha, 1859). The principal works relating to the foreign missions are: Holmes, *Missions of the United Brethren* (Lond. 1827); Cranz, *Greenland* (Lond. 1767, 2 volumes); *The Moravians in Greenland* (Edinb. 1839); Oldendorp, *Mission der Briuder auf den Karaibischen Inseln* (Barby. 1777); *The Moravians in Jamaica* (Lond. 1854); Loskiel, *Hist. of Indian Missions* (Lond. 1794); Heckewelder, *Hist. of the Indian Mission* (Phila. 1817);

Moratvitan Missions among the Indians (Lond. 1838); Schweinitz, *Life and Times of David Zeisberger* (Phila. 1870). Works not emanating from the Church are: Bost, *Hist. of the Moravian Brethren* (Lond. 1848: an abridged translation. of *Hist. de l'Eglise des Freres de Boiheme et Moravie,,* Paris, 1844, 2 volumes); Schaaf, *Evangelische Brudergemeinde* (Leipsic, 1825); Tholuck, *Vermischte Schriften,* 1:433; Muller, *Selbstbekenntnisse merkwurdiger Munner,* volume 3; Schroder, *Zinzendorf und Herrnhut* (Nordhausen, 1857); Bengel, *Abriss d. Brudergemeinde* (1751; reprinted in 1859; written against the Church); Litiz, *Blicke in d. Vergangenheit u. Gegenwart d. B.K.* (Leipsic, 1846); Nitzsch, *Kirchengeschichtliche Bedeutung d. Brudergemeine* (Berlin, 1853); Kurtz, *Text-book of Church History* (Phila. 1862). This last work contains a chapter on the Moravians, dictated by the personal animosity of' the author to their mission in Livonia, where he resides, and full of gross misstatements, as is shown in *The Moravian Manual,* pages 11-14. (E. de S.)

Moravians

SEE MORAVIAN BRETHREN.

Morcelli, Stefano Antonio

a celebrated Italian archaeologist, of the Order of Jesus, was born at Chiari January 17, 1737: studied at Rome, then joined the Jesuits; was sent to Ragusa, and afterwards returned to Rome, and was made professor in the Roman College. After the suppression of the order in 1773, Morcelli became librarian to cardinal Alessandro Albani, and while thus employed wrote his *De Stilo Inscriptionum Latinarum,* libri in (Rome, 1780, 4to). In 1790 he was elected, provost of the chapter in his native town, and so interesting became this work to him that he refused the proffered see of Ragulsa. He died in 1821. Few men lived more unselfishly than Morcelli. He liberally bestowed of his own to the poor, and abounded in philanthropic labors. Among other provisions, he founded an institution for the gratuitous education of young girls. Besides the work mentioned above, he wrote *Inscriptiones Commentariis subjectis* (Rome,1783,4to): — *Parergon Inscriptionum Novissimarum* (Padua, 1818, 4to): — *Kalendarlium Ecclesiae Constaninopolintanae cun Commentariis illustratum* (Rome, 1785, 2 volumes, 4to), from an ancient MS.: anterior to the schism between the Eastern and Western churches. Morcelli

translated the MS. from Greek into Latin, adding his own commentaries, and rendering it a valuable work on Church history: — *Explanatio Ecclesiastica Sancti Gregorii.* This Gregory was one of the earliest bishops of Agrigentum: — *Africa Christiana* (Brescia, 1816, 3 volumes, 4to). This is another ,important work on Church history, from A.D. 197 till A.D. 697. It may be styled the Fasti of the Christian churches in Northern Africa. Morcelli's works on inscriptions have been collected and published together*: Opera Epigraphica* (Padua, 1818-25, 5 volumes). Professor Schiassi has added to them a *Lexicon Epigranphicum Morcellianum,* in Latin and Italian. Morcelli wrote also a book of epigrams — *Electorum Libri ii* — and various dissertations on Roman antiquities. See Baraldi, *Notizia di a Morcelli* (Mod. 1825); Tipaldo, *Biogrs. degli Ital.* 10:102.

Mor'decai

Picture for Mordecai

(Heb. *Mordekay',* ykDrm*;* either from the Persian, *little man,* see Gesenius, *Thes. Heb.* p. 818; comp. Benfey, *Monatsnamnen,* page 201; or from MERODACH, i.q. *worshipper of Afars,* Simon, *Onom.* page 558; Sept. Μαρδοχαῖος v.r. in Nehemiah Μαρδοχέος), the name of one or two men during the Babylonian exile.

1. One of the principal Israelites who returned from Babylon with Zerubbabel (Ezra 2:2; Nehemiah 7:7). B.C. 536. He was perhaps identical with the following.

2. The son of Jair, of the tribe of Benjamin, and of the lineage of king Saul; apparently one of the captives transported to Babylon with Jehoiachin (Esther 2:5). B.C. 598. He was resident at Susa, then the metropolis of the Persian empire, and had under his care his niece Hadassah, otherwise Esther, at the time when the fairest damsels of the land were gathered together, that from among them a fitting successor to queen Vashti might be selected for king Xerxes. Among them was Esther, and on her the choice fell; while, by what management we know not, her relationship to Mordecai, and her Jewish descent, remained unknown at the palace. B.C. 479. The uncle lost none of his influence over the niece by her elevation, although the seclusion of the royal harem excluded him from direct intercourse with her. He seems to have held some office about the court, for we find him in daily attendance there; and it appears to have been through this employment that he became privy to a plot of two of the

chamberlains against the life of the king, which through Esther he made known to the monarch. This great service was, however, suffered to pass without reward at the time. On the rise of Haman to power at court, Mordecai alone, of all the nobles and officers who crowded the royal gates, refused to manifest the customary signs of homage to the royal favorite. Some think that this refusal arose from religious scruples, as if such prostration *(προσκύνησις)* were akin with idolatry (see Thenne's two monographs, Sorau, 1747, Brieg, 1750). It would be too much to attribute this to an independence of spirit which, however usual in Europe, is unknown in Eastern courts. Haman was an Amalekite; and Mordecai brooked not to bow himself down before one of a nation which from the earliest times had been the most decided enemies of the Jewish people. The Orientals are tenacious of the outward marks of respect, which they hold to be due to the position they occupy; and the erect mien of Mordecai among the bending courtiers escaped not the keen eye of Haman. He noticed it, and brooded over it from day to day: he knew well the class of feelings in which it originated, and, remembering the eternal enmity vowed by the Israelites against his people, and how often their conquering sword had all but swept his nation from the face of the earth, he vowed by one great stroke to exterminate the Hebrew nation, the fate of which he believed to be in his hands. The temptation was great, and to his illregulated mind irresistible. He therefore procured the well-known and bloody decree from the king for the massacre of all the Israelites in the empire in one day. When this decree became known to Mordecai, he not only felt impelled to exert himself to save his countrymen, as he was himself the cause of their meditated destruction, but he found his own safety involved, as well as that of his royal niece. Accordingly he covered himself with sackcloth and ashes, and rent the air with his cries. This being made known to Esther through the servants of the harem, who now knew of their relationship, she sent Hatach, one of the royal eunuchs, to demand the cause of his grief; through that faithful servant he made the facts known to her, urged upon her the duty of delivering her people, and encouraged her to risk the consequences of the attempt. She was found equal to the occasion. She hazarded her life by entering the royal presence uncalled, and having by discreet management procured a favorable opportunity, accused Haman to the king of plotting to destroy *her* and her people. His doom was sealed on this occasion by the means which in his agitation he took to avert it; and when one of the eunuchs present intimated that this man had prepared a gallows fifty cubits high on which to hang Mordecai, the king at once said,

"Hang him thereon." This was, in fact, a great aggravation of his offence, for the previous night the king, being unable to sleep, had commanded the records of his reign to be read to him; and the reader had providentially turned to the part recording the conspiracy which had been frustrated through Mordecai. The king asked what had been the reward of this mighty service, and being answered, "Nothing," he commanded that any one who happened to be in attendance without should be called. Haman was there, having come for the very purpose of asking the king's leave to hang Mordecai upon the gallows he had prepared, and was asked what should be done to the man whom the king delighted to honor? Thinking that the king could delight to honor no one but himself, he named the highest and most public honors he could conceive, and received from the monarch the astounding answer, "Make haste, and do even so to Mordecai that sitteth in the king's gate!" Then was Haman constrained, without a word, and with seeming cheerfulness, to repair to the man whom he hated beyond all the world, to invest him with the royal robes, and to conduct him in magnificent cavalcade through the city, proclaiming, "Thus shall it be done to the man whom the king delighteth to honor." After this we may well believe that the sense of poetical justice decided the perhaps till then doubtful course of the king. when he heard of the gallows which Haman had prepared for the man by whom his own life had been preserved (Esther 3-8). B.C. 474. *SEE HAMAN*. Mordecai was invested with power greater than that which Haman had lost, and the first use he made of it was, as far as possible, to neutralize or counteract the decree obtained by Haman. It could not be recalled, as the kings of Persia had no power to rescind a decree once issued; but, as the altered wish of the court was known, and as the Jews were permitted to stand on their defence, they were preserved from the intended destruction, although much blood was, on the appointed day, shed even in the royal city. The Feast of Purim was instituted in memory of this deliverance, and is celebrated to this day (Esther 9:10). *SEE PURINI*. He was probably the author of the book of Esther, which contains the narrative. His name is freely introduced into the apocryphal additions to that book, to which, however, it is unnecessary to pay attention. *SEE ESTHER, BOOK OF*. There are some questions connected with Mordecai that demand further consideration.

1. His *date*. This is pointed out with great particularity by the writer himself, not only by the years of the king's reign, but by his own genealogy in Esther 2:5, G. Most interpreters, indeed, have understood this

passage as stating that Mordecai himself was taken captive with Jehoiachin. But that any one who had been taken captive by Nebuchadnezzar in the eighth year of his reign should be vizier after the twelfth year of any Persian king among the successors of Cyrus is not very easy to believe. Besides, too, the difficulty of supposing the ordinary laws of human life to be suspended in the case of any person mentioned in Scripture, when the sacred history gives no such intimation, there is a peculiar defiance of probability in the supposition that the cousin-german of the youthful Esther, her father's brother's son, should be of an age ranging from 90 to 170 years at the time that she was chosen to be queen on account of her youth and beauty. But not only is this interpretation of Esther 2:5, G excluded by chronology, but the rules of grammatical propriety equally point out, not Mordecai, but Kish, as being the person who was taken captive by Nebuchadnezzar at the time when Jehoiachin was carried away. Because, if it had been intended to speak of Mordecai as led captive, the ambiguity would easily have been avoided by either placing the clause הָגְלָה אֲשֶׁר etc., immediately after בִּבְנִי־יְמִינִי and then adding his name and genealogy, שְׁמוֹ מָרְדֳּכַי, or else by writing הַהוּא instead of אֲשֶׁר at the beginning of verse 6. Again, as the sentence stands, the distribution of the copulative ו distinctly connects the sentence אֹמֵן הָיָה in verse 7 with הָיָה in verse 5, showing that three things are predicated of Mordecai: (1) that he lived in Shushan; (2) that his name was Mordecai, son of Jair, son of Shimei, son of Kish the Benjamite, who was taken captive with Jehoiachin; (3) that he brought up Esther. This genealogy does, then, fix with great certainty the age of Mordecai. He was great-grandson of a contemporary of Jehoiachin. Now four generations cover 120 years and 120 years from B.C. 598 brings us to B.C. 479, i.e., to the sixth year of the reign of Xerxes; thus confirming with singular force the arguments which led to the conclusion that Ahasuerus is Xerxes. *SEE AHASUERUS.* This carrying back of the genealogy of a captive to the time of the captivity has an obvious propriety, as connecting the captives with the family record preserved in the public genealogies before the captivity, just as an American would be likely to carry up his pedigree to the ancestor who emigrated from England (see Bertheau, *Exeg. FIctndb.* ad loc.). Furthermore, it would seem entirely possible (though it cannot be certainly proved) that the Mordecai mentioned in the duplicate passage, Ezra 2:2; Nehemiah 7:7, as one of the leaders of the captives who returned from time to time from Babylon to Judaea, *SEE EZRA*, was the same as

Mordecai of the book of Esther. It is not unlikely that on the death of Xerxes, or possibly during his lifetime, he may have obtained leave to lead back such Jews as were willing to accompany him, and that he did so. His age need not have exceeded fifty or sixty years, and his character points him out' as likely to lead his countrymen back from exile if he had the opportunity. The name Mordecai not occurring elsewhere makes this supposition the more probable. We may add that in a passage of Josephus *(Ant.* 11:4, 9), which gives an account of troubles excited by the Samaritans against the Jews about that time, as they were rebuilding the Temple, the names of Ananias and Mordecai (Μαρδοχαῖος) are given along with that of Zerubbabel as ambassadors from the Jews to king Darius.

2. As regards Mordecai's place in *profane* history, the domestic annals of the reign of Xerxes are so scanty that it would not surprise us to find no mention of this Jew. But there is a person named by Ctesias, who probably saw the very chronicles of the kings of Media and Persia referred to in [1702]Esther 10:2, and whose name and character present some points of resemblance with Mordecai, viz. *Matacas* or *Natacas* (as the name is variously written), described by him as Xerxes's chief favorite, and the most powerful of them all. His brief notice of him in these words, ἡμιαῤῥένων δὲ μέγιστον ἠδύνατο Νατακᾶς, is in exact agreement with the description of Mordecai ([1704]Esther 9:4; 10:2, 3). He further relates of him that when Xerxes, after his return from Greece, had commissioned Megabyzus to go and plunder the temple of Apollo at Ilelphi (perhaps, rather, the temple of Apollo Didlymnus, near Miletus, which was destroyed by Xerxes after his return, Strabo, 14, cap. 1, § 5), upon his refusal, he sent Matacas the eunuch to insult the god and to plunder his property; which Matacas did, and returned to Xerxes. It is obvious how grateful to the feelings of a Jew, such as Mordecai was, would be a commission to desecrate and spoil a heathen temple. There is also much probability in the selection of a Jew to be his prime minister by a monarch of such decided iconoclastic propensities as Xerxes is known to have had (Prideaux, *Connect.* 1:231-233). Xerxes would doubtless see much analogy between the Magian tenets of which he was so zealous a patron and those of the Jews' religion; just as Pliny actually reckons Moses (whom he couples with Jannes) among the leaders of the Magian sect, in the very same passage in which he relates that Osthanes the Magian author and heresiarch accompanied Xerxes in his Greek expedition, and widely

diffused the Magian doctrines (lib. 30, cap. 1, § 2); and in § 4 he seems to identify Christianity also with Magic. From the context it appears highly probable that this notice of Moses and of Jannes may be derived from the work of Osthanes, and, if so, the probable intercourse of Osthanes with Mordecai would readily account for his mention of them. The point, however, here insisted upon is that the known hatred of Xerxes to idolworship makes his selection of a Jew for his prime minister very probable, and that there are strong points of resemblance in what is thus related of Matacas and what we know from Scripture of Mordecai. Again, that Mordecai was, what Matacas is related to have been, a eunuch, seems not improbable from his having neither wife nor child, from his bringing up his cousin Esther in his own house (to account for this, the Targum says that he was seventy-five years old), from his situation in the king's gate, from his access to the court of the women, and from his being raised to the highest post of power by the king, which we know from Persian history was so often the case with the king's eunuchs. With these points of agreement between them, there is sufficient resemblance in their names to add additional probability to the supposition of their identity. The most plausible etymology usually given for the name *Mordecai* is that favored by Gesenius, who connects it with Merodach the Babylonian idol (called Mardok in the cuneiform inscriptions), and which appears in the names Mesessi-Mordacus, Sisi-Mordachus, in nearly the same form as in the Greek, Μαρδοχαῖος. But it is highly improbable that the name of a Babylonian idol should have been given to him under the Persian dynasty (Rawlinson *[Herod.* 1:2701 points out Layardt's conclusion *[Ain.* 2:4411, that the Persians adopted generally the Assyrian religion as "(quite a mistake"), and it is equally improbable that Mordecai should have been taken into the king's service before the commencement of the Persian dynasty. If, then, we suppose the original form of the name to have been Matacai, it would easily in the Chaldee orthography become Mordecai, just as אסקרא is for אסכרא, אפוברא for פבורא, קומרדי for קומדי, etc. In the Targum of Esther he is said to be called Mordecai because he was like מירא דכיא "to pure myrrh."

3. As regards his place in *rabbinical* estimation, Mordecai, as is natural, stands very high. The interpolations in the Greek book of Esther are one indication of his popularity with his countrymen. The Targum (of late date) shows that this increased rather than diminished with the lapse of centuries. There Shimei in Mordecai's genealogy is identified with Shimei the son of

Gera, who cursed David, and it is said that the reason why David would not permit him to be put to death then was that it was revealed to him that Mordecai and Esther should descend from him; but that in his old age, when this reason no longer applied, he was slain. It is also said of Mordecai that he knew *the seventy languages,* i.e., the languages of all the nations mentioned in Genesis 10, which the Jews count as seventy nations, and that his age exceeded 400 years *(Juchasin* ap. Wolf, and Stehelin, *Rabb. Liter.* 1:179). He is continually designated by the appellation אקיDאx, "the Just," and the amplifications of [17815] Esther 8:15 abound in the most glowing descriptions of the splendid robes, and Persian buskins, and Median scimitars, and golden crowns, and the profusion of precious stones and Miacedonian gold, on which was engraved a view of Jerusalem, and of the phylactery over the crown, and the streets strewed with myrtle, and the attendants, and the heralds with trumpets, all proclaiming the glory of Mordecai, and the exaltation of the Jewish people. Benjamin of Tudela mentions the ruins of Shushan and the remains of the palace of Alasuerus as still existing in his day, but places the tomb of Mordecai and Esther at Hamadan, or Ecbatana (page 128). Others, however, place the tomb of Mordecai in Susa, and that of Esther in or near Baram in Galilee (note to Asher's *Benj. of Tud.* page 166). With reference to the above-named palace of Ahasuerus at Shushan, it may be added that considerable remains of it were discovered by Mr. Loftus's excavations in 1852, and that he thinks the plan of the great colonnade, of which he found the bases remaining, corresponds remarkably to the description of the palace of Ahasuerus in Esther (Loftus, *Chaldnea,* ch. 28). It was built or begun by Darius Hystaspis. The socalled tomb of Esther and Mordecai at Hamadau has no claim, as Flandin remarks, to a very remote antiquity, for the dome and the general style of architecture correspond with those commonly found in Mussulman sepulchres in Persia. Although the tomb now standing is more ancient than that of Ezra, it is on essentially the same plan, both in its exterior and interior appearance, with such differences as proceeded from the difference of situation, one being in the midst of a town, and the other on the borders of the desert. The bell-shaped dome is also in an older taste than that which the other tomb exhibits. The stork's nest by which it is surmounted frequently appears upon the highest points of public buildings in that country. The tomb stands on ground somewhat more elevated than any in the immediate neighborhood, and is in rather a decayed condition. It occupies a small space in the midst of ruins, in the quarter appropriated to Jewish families. The entrance to the building is by a stone door of small

dimensions, the key of which is always kept by the chief rabbi. This door conducts to the antechamber, which is small, and contains the graves of several rabbies. A second door, of still more confined dimensions than the first, leads to the tomb-chamber, which is larger than the outer apartment. In the midst of this stand the two sarcophagi of Mordecai and Esther, of dark and hard wood, like that of Ezra. They are cenotaphs, standing beside each other, distinguished only by the one (Mordecai's) being a little larger than the other. They are richly carved, and have a Hebrew inscription along the upper ledge, taken from Esther 2:5, and 10:3. The wood is in good preservation, though evidently very old. The present building is said to occupy the site of one more magnificent, which was destroyed by Timur Beg, soon after which this humble building was erected in its place, at the expense of certain devout Jew's; and it is added that it was fully repaired about 160 years since by a rabbi named Ismael. If this local statement be correct, some of the inscriptions which now appear must, as the resident Jews state, have belonged to the preceding building, which, however, could not have been the *original* mausoleum, since one of these inscriptions describes it as having been finished posterior to the Christian era (see, I.K. Porter's *Travels in Persia,* 2:107). *SEE ACHMETHA*.

Mordecai Ben-Hillel

of Austria, a pupil of the famous Meir of Rothenburg (q.v.), son-in-law of R. Jechiel of Paris, and brother-in-law of R. Jacob of Corbeil, flourished towards the end of the 13th century, and was martyred in 1310 at Nuremberg. He is the author of the book ykdrm, *Mordecai,* also called ypseykDrjhi, the *Book of Mordecai;* a treatise on the legal code (twkl hhirpse, embodying all the laws of the Talmud, which was compiled, revised, corrected, annotated, and supplemented by Isaac Alfasi (q.v.). The *Sepher A Mordeci* has been printed with the *Sepher Hallalachoth* (Constantinople, 1509; Venice, 1521-22; Sabionetta, 1524, etc.). It has also been published separately (Venice, 1558; Cracow, 1598, etc.). — Furst, *Bibl. Jud.* 2:324 sq.; De Rossi, *nizionazrio* (Germ. transl.), p. 234; Steinschneider, *Cataclogus libr. Hebr. in Bibliotheca Bodleiana,* 1659, etc.; Basnage, *Hist. des Juifs* (Taylor's transl.), page 685; Ginsburg, in Jacob ben-Chajim ibn-Adonijah's *Introduction to the Rabbinic Bible* (Lond. 1867), page 76 sq.; Cassel, *Leitfadenfiir jiid. Gesch. u. Literatur* (Berlin, 1872), page 87; Grutz, *Gesch. d. Juden* (Berlin, 1873), 7:252 sq.;

Zunz, *Literaturgeschichte der synagogalen Poesie* (Berlin, 1865), page 364; *Die Monatstage des Kalendejahres* (Berlin, 1872), page 44. (B.P.)

Mordvins

is the name of a people inhabiting Eastern Russia. They form a subdivision of the Bulgaric or Volgaic family of the Finnic branch of the Suranian, Uralo-Altaic, or Mongolian races, and are related to the Tcheremisses and Tchuvashes. Their number has been estimated at 400,000, and their territory lies principally between the rivers Oka and Volga, in the Russian governments of Nishni No-vgorod, Tambov, Pensa, Simbrisk, and Saratov, extending also into Samara and Astrachan. Dialectically they may be subdivided into Mokzhas, chiefly dwelling on the banks of the Sura and Mokzha, and Ersas, occupying the shores of the Oka.

More, Alexander

a very noted preacher of the French Protestants, who flourished in the 17th century in France and Switzerland, was born at Castres, Languedoc, September 25, 1616, of Scottish parents. He received his preparatory training under his father at Castres, and went from home at the age of twenty to study divinity at Geneva. But it so happened that the chair of Greek was vacant at this time, and though so young a man and a stranger, More was chosen to fill it. He promptly accepted the proffered honor, and three years later had the pleasure of being promoted to a professorship in divinity, he having improved his time in the study of that department. His rapid advance made him many enemies, and he was accused of heresy. But, notwithstanding much and able opposition, More advanced, and in 1645 was made rector of the high school with which he was connected. He was, however, destined soon to decline, for he was very arrogant and proud, and some even dared to assert that he was immoral. He was wise enough to perceive the near approach of his fall, and he therefore decided to quit Geneva. In 1649 he secured the divinity professorship and pastoral office at Middleburg, in Zealand, and there also he won a reputation for his learning and ability, which opened to him in 1652 the university at Amsterdam. He had been proffered before a position in that noble high school, but had refused it; now he accepted, and removed thither. In 1654 he vacated his chair, and went on a visit to Italy, and became well acquainted with the men of note and of rank in that country. He enjoyed a personal intercourse with the duke of Tuscany, and was a favorite at Venice. Returning to his

charge, he encountered decided opposition, many of his congregation doubting his sincerity, and declaiming against the unholiness of his life. Charges were brought against him, and he was condemned by the Synod of Torgau. He quitted his parish, and accepted a call from a Church in Paris, and though there was great variety of opinion as to his trustworthiness, he was confirmed in the position. He had not, however, occupied it long before he was openly attacked. Though his manner of preaching procured him applause from a crowd of hearers, his character was generally acknowledged to be ambiguous, and he had the mortification to see his reputation attacked by persons of merit, who accused him anew to the synod. He escaped further condemnation by quitting France in December 1661. He returned again in the summer following, and, finding that the opposition had not subsided, he sickened at heart, as it is generally believed, declined rapidly in health, and died at Paris in September 1670. By the confession of his friends, he was proud, vindictive, imperious, satirical, contemptuous; not to say that his character was not quite unblemished in point of chastity, although there is no occasion to believe all that Milton has said of him. Milton had had a quarrel with More, and this may have provoked much that was far from the truth, though the great English bard was not given to falsifying. The trouble had been produced by a publication of More in 1652, addressed under the printer's name to the king of Great Britain, entitled *Regii sanguais clamor ad coelum adversus parricides Anglicanos.* It is a very violent invective against the Parliament party; and Milton, in particular, is extremely abused in it. He is no better used in the epistle dedicatory than in the book itself. Milton therefore wrote a reply, in which he considered More as the author as well as the editor of the book. He is treated upon the footing of a dog, or rather of a goat; for he is accused of a thousand lewd tricks, particularly of several acts of debauchery. He was also charged with having been convicted of heresies at Geneva, and of having shamefully abjured them with his lips, though not with his heart. Milton accused him of having for many months been deprived of his salary at Geneva, and suspended from his offices as a professor and a minister on account of a process of adultery which had been entered against him; and for which, says he, he would have been condemned, if he had not avoided the decisive sentence by declaring that he would leave the place. But, whatever Milton's opinion, the pious Huetius favored More, and wrote in his be half. He even praised him in song *(Pcenat* p. 30 and 77, ed. 1700). More published some works: there is a treatise of his, *De gratia et libero arbitrio* (Geneva, 1644, 4to;

Middleburg, 1652); and another, *De Scriptura Sacra, sive de causa Dei* (Middleburg, 1653, 4to): — A *Comment on the 53d Chapter of Isaiah: — Notae ad loca quaedam Novi Faederis* (Lond. 1661, 8vo): — a reply to Milton, with the title of *Alexandri Mori fides publica* (La Haye, 1654, 12mo): — some *Orations and Poems in Latin.* See Senebier, *Hist. litter. de Geneve;* Haag, *La France Protestante,* 7:543 sq.; Bayle, *Hist. Dict.* s.v. (J.H.W.)

More, Hannah

Picture for More, Hannah

one of the most brilliant female ornaments of Christian literature, was born at the village of Stapleton, in Gloucestershire, February 2, 1745, and was the daughter of a clergyman of the Church of England, a man eminent for his classical attainments, and at that time employed as a village schoolmaster in charge of a charity school. Some time after the birth of his daughter Hannah he removed to Bristol, where he kept a private school. There were other daughters, and the family soon began to be taken notice of as one in which there was a display of talent that was unusual; so that some exertions were made by persons to whom they were known, and the sisters became early in life established in a school for the education of girls, which continued for many years the most flourishing establishment of the kind in the west of England. Hannah was from the beginning the most remarkable of the group. She wrote verse at a very early age, and though these compositions were highly thought of in the family circle, they were never allowed to go beyond the precincts of their own house. And vet, in ways and by circumstances almost unnoticed, the fame of her literary talent was widely spread, and in 1773 she was prevailed upon to publish a pastoral drama, which was entitled *The Search After Happiness.* It was brought out under the direction of her pastor, Dr. Stonehouse, a learned clergyman of the Church of England. He it was also who introduced Hannah to the great literati. In 1774 she published a regular tragedy on the story of Regulus, and two tales in verse; and her turn being then thought by her friends to incline to the drama, means were taken to obtain an introduction for her to Garrick, by whom she was very kindly received. He, in turn, introduced her to Dr. Johnson, Burke, Sir Joshua Reynolds, and other persons, who at that time formed what was considered the best literary society of London. Her manners and conversation confirmed the good impression elicited by her talents, and the position in society

originally conceded as a favor was soon acknowledged as a well-established right. During this period of her life she produced two tragedies, *Percy* (1777) and *The Fatal Falsehood* (1779), and other poems. These attempts at dramatic composition, and the consequent connection with the stage, seem to indicate that she was then, in a great measure, if not altogether, a stranger to evangelical views of Christian duty. But the death of David Garrick (1779), to whom she had become very much attached, produced a great change in her character. Educated as she had been with a deep impression of the truths of the Christian religion, the life which she now led began to appear to her as unbefitting a creature with the glorious prospects which Christianity opens to man. She therefore determined on forsaking the drama and retiring from the gay circles of fashion and of literature, and even quitted London in order the better to devote herself to the life befitting, as she thought, a child of God and an heir of immortality. She established her residence at a little rural retreat in the vicinity of Bristol, named Cowslip Green, where she enjoyed a freshness of feeling and a sweet mental tranquillity to which she had previously been a stranger. In her transitive state she had produced her *Sacred Dramas* (1782), a publication more favorably received perhaps than her former works. But she finally resolved to devote herself to a treatment of subjects surer of good results, and to write with careful preparation. She felt obliged to confess, to quote her own words from the Preface of the third volume of her works, that she did not "consider the stage in its present state as becoming the appearance or countenance of a Christian; on which account she thought proper to renounce her dramatic productions in any other light than as mere poems." Having become sensible of the follies of the world and the reigning defects of modern society, she resolved to embody the results of her observations and experience in the form of earnest and solemn admonitions against them. The first in this series of contemplated works was of a didactic nature, and was entitled *Essays to Young Ladies.* This was almost immediately followed by *Thoughts on the Manners of the Great,* a little volume which was issued in 1788 anonymously, and the object of which was to expose, in order to amend, the low morality — the loose and licentious principles — of fashionable society. Having excited a considerable degree of interest and curiosity, the work was attributed to the pen of more than one person of official dignity in the Church as well as the State. But the real author was ere long discovered, and the eclat which the discovery gave to her name encouraged her to persevere in the course of moral instruction she had contemplated. Almost every successive year

brought out some new production from her pen; and such was the power as well as the charms of her eloquent composition that her works were universally applauded, and by none more than by the very classes whose faults many of them were designed to expose and censure. Thus, immediately after the last-mentioned popular work, appeared *An Estimate of the Religion of the Fashionable World* (1791), and this enjoyed as great a measure of success as its predecessor. To counteract the principles of the French Revolution, which had unsettled every European nation, and introduced a wild and turbulent spirit among some classes even of Great Britain, she conferred an incalculable benefit on her country by publishing, first, *Village Politics,* by Will Chipp, and next a periodical work, "The Cheap Repository Tracts" — a series of admirable tales of a moral and religious nature for the common people, one of which is the well-known *Shepherd of Salisbury Plaim.* The influence which both these publications had over the popular mind is almost beyond conception. They were circulated by hundreds of thousands in all parts of the United Kingdom, and were more than anything else instrumental in maintaining the cause of order and of true religion against the torrent of infidel philosophy which had set in so strongly from France. The next work which came from her pen was entitled *Strictures on the Modern System of Female Education* (1799). Exceptions were taken by some to the "high Calvinistic principles" of this work; but it amounted to little after all, for she was known to do so much good that the opposition soon died out. Testimony was borne to its merits by bishop Porteus, in that he recommended the authoress as a competent person to superintend the education of the young princess Charlotte; and although an absurd etiquette, it seems, prevented that responsible office being held by any lady beneath the ranks of the aristocracy, she showed her fitness for the task by the publication of *Hints towards Forming the Character of a Young Princess* (1805). After the lapse of some years she published *Caelebs in Search of a Wife,* one of the best of novels in respect to principle and moral tendency; and this was followed by *Practical Piety* (1811); *Christian Morals* (1812), *The Spirit of Prayer* (1813), *An Essay on the Character and Writings of St. Paul* (1815), and *Modern Sketches* (1819). But though these literary labors demanded much of her time, she yet found a portion for philanthropic labor; and having built a pleasant home and received her sisters there. she devoted herself with them to the people of her vicinity, especially the poor, of whom there were many — it being a mining district — who "had grown up coarse, brutal, ferocious, utterly neglected by their clergy, without any

means of education or hopes of improvement" (Perry). Determined to elevate these downtrodden and forlorn people, the three sisters attempted the appalling task of alleviating all suffering and of educating the laboring classes. They devised various schemes of benevolence and usefulness, not the least of which was the erection of schools, which, though at first confined to the children of their immediate surroundings, soon extended their operations over no less than ten parishes where there were no resident clergymen, and in which upwards of 1200 children were thus provided with the benefits of a moral and religious education. Miss Hannah More's numerous writings, which produced her upwards of $150,000, enabled her to do much, but she was by no means dependent upon her own resources. Her high character had impressed itself on her friends and associates, and these freely poured out their treasures for the promotion of the More schemes. Bibles were distributed, prayer-books given away, and instruction provided for all who came to study, whether adult or child. In short, so unremitting were they in their labors and measures that what had been a moral desert was changed into a garden, which brought forth in rich abundance the excellent fruits of wide-spread intelligence, of elevated morality, and genuine religion. But at last age came upon Hannah More, and brought along some of its infirmities. In 1828 she was moved therefore to quit Barleywood, the place in which many years had been spent, and she now took up her abode at Clifton. Here she continued amid a painful and protracted illness until relieved by death on the 7th of September, 1833, surrounded by many to honor her and many also to love her; who looked up to her as one of the great reformers of the manners of English society; one who had asserted very successfully the right of Christianity, or, in other words, the right of the Christian Scriptures to have a larger share than it had been the wont to allow them in forming the character and directing the course of human beings while in this state of their probation. She bequeathed £10,000 for pious and charitable purposes. The best edition of her works is in 11 volumes, 16mo (Lond. 1853). See *The Memoirs and Correspondence of Hannah More,* by William Roberts (Lond. 1834, 4 volumes, 8vo; N.Y. 1836, 2 volumes, 12mo, abridged in "Christian Family Library"); *Life,* by Reverend H. Thompson (Lond. 1838, 8vo); *Correspondence of Hannah More with Zachary Macaulay* (Lond. 1860); Mrs. Hall's visit to Mrs. Hannah More in *Pilgrimage to English Shrines; Lives of Bishop Wilberforce*; Perry, *Hist. Church of England,* 3:480 sq.; Clissold, *Lands of the Church* (Lond. 1863, 12mo), page 167

sq.; Jamieson, *Cyclop. Religious Biog.* s.v.; and the literature appended to the excellent article in Allibone, *Dict. Brit. and Amer. Auth.* s.v.

More, Henry

an English Arminian divine and moralist, noted as a leader of that class of English philosophers who arose in the 17th century to exorcise the spirit of Calvinism from the English high schools, was born at Grantham, Lincolnshire, October 12, 1614. He was educated at Eton, where, aside from his regular studies, he bestowed much time on the reading of the philosophical works of Aristotle, Julius Scaliger, etc., poring, immature as he was, over the doctrine of predestination. His parents were Calvinists, and they had reared him with like notions, but he early became distrustful as to the real ground of Calvinism, and finally turned sceptic. In 1631 he went to Christ College, Cambridge, and graduated in 1635. More all his years at college was most diligently employed in metaphysical studies. He says himself, "I immersed myself over head and ears in the study of philosophy, promising a most wonderful happiness to myself in it." Dissatisfied with all other systems, he found rest for his mind only when he came to the writings of the Platonic school; whence, as he tells us, he learned that something better and higher than the knowledge of human things constitutes the supreme happiness of man, and that this is attainable only through that purity of mind and divine illumination which raise man to a union with God. But yet, he adds himself, that though the Platonic writings attracted and benefited him, there was "among all the writings of this kind none which so pierced and affected" him "as that golden little book with which Luther is also said to have been wonderfully taken, viz. *Theologia Gernmanica.* This book More prized next to the Bible, and studied it until he could say that he was free from all scepticism, and once more truly devoted to Christian interests. He had taken his M.A. in 1639, and had been made also a fellow of his college. With these honors he contentedly rested, and, insisting upon refusal of all Church preferments, he withdrew to retirement for a course of "spiritual discipline." He in short gave himself up to a life of most devout spiritual exercise, and would suffer nothing to stand in his way to eternal happiness as it had been taught him by the mystical work he so fondly read. "From this time," says More's biographer, "he had a wonderful sense of God, sacred and ineffable, and of his unconceivable attributes, and he soon found all things to his satisfaction, and himself not unsuitable to them. And that there may be a 'turning after righteousness' (as he speaks) as well as a 'running after

knowledge,' More now actually came forward to demonstrate with great care the principles both of revealed and natural religion, and to recommend to all at the same time, with the greatest seriousness possible, the practice of morality and virtue; or, rather, what is justly called the Christian or divine life." 'It would seem, therefore," adds his biographer, "that Henry More was raised by a special Providence in those days of freedom, as a light to those that may be fitted or inclined to high speculations, and a general guide to all that want it, how they are to mix the Christian and philosophic genius together, and make them rightly to accord in one common end, viz. the glory of God with the highest felicity and perfection of man." The depth and originality of his metaphysical theories, and the remarkable combination of great argumentative abilities, extensive learning, and ardent piety with which he set them forth, occasioned his being looked up to as a person of an extraordinary character by the greatest and best of his contemporaries. Indeed, he himself admitted, with frankness and simplicity natural to his temper, that the talents and dispositions lavished upon him were such as brought him into singular responsibilities; that, to adopt his own expression, he had "as a fiery arrow been shot into the world, and he hoped that it had hit the mark." After his election to a fellowship by his college he took charge of several pupils, some of them persons of rank, whose studies he directed with great fidelity and application-his management of them being distinguished from that of ordinary tutors chiefly by unusual gentleness, and by the deep tone of piety which pervaded his instructions. He has recorded his opinion that "the exercise of love and goodness, of humanity and brotherly kindness, of prudence and discretion, of unfeigned religion and devotion, in the plain and undoubted duties thereof is, to the truly regenerate soul, a far greater pleasure than all the fine speculations imaginable." It was life, not notions, which he chiefly valued; and he preferred "a single-heartedness of temper beyond any theories." He had no ambition to play the part of a leader in society, and steadily declined every attempt to draw him into a public position. He was content in the youthful circle which he gathered about himself as private tutor, and preferred to address the masses by his pen. The deanery of Christ Church in Dublin, with the provostship of Trinity College, and also the deanery of St. Patrick's, were proposed for his acceptance, as a step to either of the two bishoprics when a vacancy should occur; but he could not be persuaded to accept these preferments. It is said that after the failure of these attempts, a very good English bishopric was procured for him, and that his friends had actually brought him, on some

pretence or other, as far as Whitehall, designing to introduce him to the king to kiss the hands of his royal master for the appointment; but when More understood on what business he had been brought thither, nothing could induce him to enter the royal grounds. Once, late in life (in 1675), he accepted a prebend in the cathedral of Gloucester; this, however, as the event proved, only with the view of serving his friend, Dr. Fowler, afterwards bishop of that diocese, into whose hands, with the chancellor's permission, he resigned it, refusing at the same time repayment of the expenses he had incurred. In the same manner, he for a short time kept possession of the rectory of Ingoldsbury, in Lincolnshire, which his father had purchased for him, and then presented it to several friends in succession. He had the satisfaction of providing in this way for his friend, Dr. Worthington, when that accomplished divine, in common with many other clergymen, lost his church in the fire of London. When the mastership of his college fell vacant, it was proposed to him, in preference to Cudworth, as a piece of preferment likely, if any could do so, to suit his wishes; he declined it as he had done everything else, "passing otherwise his time within those private walls, it may be as great a contemplator, philosopher, and divine as ever did or will hereafter visit them." In fact, he believed that by a life of contemplation, and by laying the results of it before the world in his writings, he followed the course appointed him by Providence as best suited to his disposition and abilities, and likely to be serviceable to that and succeeding generations. Yet so humble were his notions of what he had accomplished by the employment of many years in earnest pursuit of those august theories which filled his mind, that he would say he "had lived a harmless and childish life in the world." His works, he remarked to a person who was speaking in commendation of them, "were such as might please some solitary men that loved their Creator." In his later years Dr. More was sorely tried by the separation of his friend and former pupil, lady Conway, from the communion of the Church which was his ideal in the form "as it existed before the times of disturbance — the Church of the Reformation and of Hooker." To popery in every form he was violently opposed, as is evinced by a work of his on *The true Idea of Antichristianism* (see below), and also to the sects he was opposed: "Both his reason and his love of quietness and order were opposed to what he considered the excesses of Puritanism — the dismal spectacle of an infinity of sects and schisms." Yet it should not be thought that More loved the ecclesiastical organization of England rather than the cause of Christ. "His main concern," says his biographer, "is that neither

one order of the Church government nor another usurp the place which only religion itself should hold. He is for the 'naked truth of Christianity,' and nothing more; willing even to be called a Puritan, 'if *this* be to be a Puritan.'" Such was his liberality, and yet he sought earnestly to recall lady Conway to the Church communion. She had been a favorite of his in her girlish days, and much of his time he had passed at Ragley, in Warwickshire, her country-seat after marriage to lord Conway. She was a person of enthusiastic piety and great accomplishments, and by her More and his opinions were known to be held in high veneration. Indeed, her husband is said to have been hardly less enthusiastic, and to have treasured everything of More's "with as much reverence as if it were Socrates's." Among such friends it was but natural that More should frequently pass his time, and it was among the shades of Ragley that he composed some of his writings, among them his *Conjectura Cabalistica,* his *Philosophicce Teutonicce Censura,* and his *Divine Dialogues* (see below). He often counselled with lady Conway, and is believed to have been urged into authorship by her. She was particularly attracted by his mystical studies. Her consultations with him ultimately led her to turn aside and make her life one of most intense mystical devotion. She thus came to admire the patient quietude of the Quakers, as well as the opinions of that sect, at that time flushed with all the fervor attendant on novelty, persecution, and success, and finally she was induced to join them. Perhaps the doctor was conscious that his own religious views, characterized as they are by a degree of subjectiveness which unfits them for general reception (when eagerly adopted by a person of her peculiar temperament, not fortified by the counteraction of those healthier and more robust attainments which prevented any very evil consequences in his own case), might have prepared the way to this unfortunate result. At all events, he received the account of it with unfeigned affliction, and labored many years with all the earnestness of a faithful friend to reclaim the fair proselyte for the Church establishment of which he was a most devout adherent. He was thus led into a controversy with William Penn, both by writing and conversation. An admirable letter on *Baptism* and the *Lord's Supper,* addressed on this occasion to Penn, is printed in the appendix to his life. He encountered also George Fox, and has left a description of the interview on his own feelings little flattering to that ill-used religious enthusiast. More failed to reconvert his pupil, but he retained her friendship. He continued to spend much of his time, as before, at Ragley "and its woods," and there composed several of his books at lady Conway's "own desire and instigation." After her death he

drew her portrait under another name, and with so much address that" the most rigid Quaker would see everything they could wish in it, and yet the soberest Christian be entirely satisfied with it." At Ragley, More formed several valuable acquaintances; of these we shall come to speak hereafter. But it is only there that he was surrounded by any associates. In his own "paradise," as he called his home at Christ College, he lived very much alone. Yet if he thus kept himself retired from the world, this life of solitude greatly stimulated his productivity as an author.

More began authorship in 1640 by the publication of his *Psychozoia, or the First Part of the Song of the Soul, containing a Christiano-Platonical Display of Life* (reprinted in 1647, and, together with some additional pieces, published under the title of *Philosophical Poems).* It was a most singular effort in the literary line, for it seeks to turn metaphysics into poetry. It is an early attempt on his part to express in verse the Platonic principles which he afterwards so clearly and forcibly expressed in prose. These poems are now hardly known. His first prose work was published in 1652 — *Antidote against Atheism* (new ed. 1655; also in coll. of philos. writings, 1662). In the following year he sent forth *Conjectura Cabalistica, or Attempt to Interpret the first three Chapters of Genesis in a threefold Manner — literal, philosophical, and mystical, or divinely moral.* His next work of importance appeared in 1659, being an essay on the *Immortality of the Soul* (also 1662), accompanied by a valuable preface on the general subject of his philosophy. The leading principle of More's ethical system is that "moral goodness is simple and absolute, and that right reason is the judge of its nature, essence, and truth; but its attractiveness and beauty are felt by a special capacity, *in boniformi anince facultate,* not unlike the *moral sense* of later writers. Therefore all moral goodness is properly termed intellectual and divine. To affect this as supreme gives supreme felicity. By the aid of reason we state the axioms or principles of ethics in definite propositions, and derive from them special maxims or rules." In his philosophical views More espouses Descartes in the main, stating at great length and with much minuteness the doctrine of innate ideas, and defending it against misconceptions and objections. He qualifies Descartes's opinion that the soul has its seat in the pineal gland, and contends for the extension or diffusion of the soul, at the same time arguing that this does not involve its discerptibility. He contends at times for the reality of space as an entity independent of God, and again makes space to be dependent on God (anticipating the argument of Samuel

Clarke). He argues the existence of God from the moral nature of man. He also ably defends the doctrine of free-will "as the basis of morality." "Against the theological Necessitarians, who deny contingency, More argues clearly that God himself can alone know what events are necessary and what contingent. Prescience of such events either implies a contradiction or not. But to suppose a contradiction is virtually to say that the prescience is not divine. Contradictory objects cannot come within the sphere of the divine omniscience. And if there is no contradiction, we may recognise in this very fact that there is no inconsistency betwixt the divine prescience and free-will. Either way no solid argument can be drawn against moral liberty from the idea of divine prescience. Again, the whole force of the objections as to the will always following what appears for the moment best, More supposes to be met by the simple experience that the good we know we frequently do not do. Our works are not determined by our knowledge of what is best. We may have fine ideas of virtue, and yet never put them in practice. Our freedom in this sense is only too real; and it is the very object of morality to bring the idea and the will into unison, and so enlighten the one and discipline the other that they may attain to the highest good." Hobbes is said to have entertained a very high opinion of More's philosophical views, and to have declared that if his "own philosophy was not true, he knew none that he should sooner like than Henry More's, of Cambridge." In 1660, finally, More came out again, and this time with one of the ablest productions we have from his pen, being an extended treatise on the *Mystery of Godliness,* "written after an illness in which he had vowed, if spared, to write a book demonstrative of the truth of the Christian religion — so far as concerns the person and offices of Christ, he would attempt to construct the Christian theology after those subjective ethical relations and beliefs which were taught by Plato and Plotinus, and at the same time to recognise the reality of the supernatural in the Christian history — to the confusion of fanatics and infidels alike." He here reverently discusses the incarnation of Christ in all its bearings, and illustrates it with many curious and interesting thoughts derived from philosophy and history. Notwithstanding the Platonic dress in which he loves to array everything, More holds firmly and expounds reverently and lovingly all the great doctrines of Christianity. He protests most energetically against the tendency to spiritualize away the reality of the Gospel history. "That the human person of Christ," he says, "is not to be laid aside is evident from the whole tenor of the epistle to the Hebrews. For he that there is said to be a high-priest forever is that very man who

was crucified on the cross at Jerusalem." Again he says, "I have with all earnestness and endeavor, and with undeniable clearness of testimony from reason and Scripture, demonstrated the truth and necessity of both Christ within and Christ without." It would appear that he did not altogether relish the phrase "imputative righteousness," yet his views on justification did not really differ from those of, other divines of the period; but he was perhaps fonder of laying stress upon this, that "the end of the Gospel was to renovate the spirits of men in true and real inherent righteousness and holiness," and he spoke of the phrase in question a aa" great scandal and effectual counterplot against the power of the Gospel, the nullifying and despising of moral honesty by those that are great zealots and high pretenders of religion." "For what an easy thing it is," he exclaims, "for a man to fancy himself an Israelite, and then to circumvent his honest neighbors under the notion of Egyptians." As for the Roman Catholic Church, he says that the economy of that Church "naturally tends to the betraying of souls to eternal destruction;" but adds, nevertheless, "not that it is possible for me (who cannot infallibly demonstrate to myself that all who lived under paganism are damned) to imagine that all who have gone under the name of papists have tumbled down into hell." The *Mystery of Godliness* enjoyed great popularity, and so did his *Inquiry into the mystery of Iniquity,* a work directed chiefly against popery. But of all his writings, the only one which can be said to have retained any lasting popularity, or to be commendable to the modern reader, is his *Divine Dialogues,* which he brought out in 1668, containing "Disquisitions concerning the Attributes and Providence of God." This is pronounced by Tulloch the period which "may be said to mark the apex of More's intellectual activity." Of the book itself, Dr. Blair speaks in his lectures on rhetoric (lect. 36) as "one of the most remarkable in the English language." "Though the style," he adds, "be now in some measure obsolete, and the speakers be marked with the academic stiffness of those times, yet the dialogue is animated by a variety of character and a sprightliness of conversation beyond what are commonly met with in writings of this kind." What is recounted in the *Dialogues* under the name *of Bathynous* is believed to be his own peculiar experience, and gives an admirable picture of his clear, confiding, and enthusiastic spirit. The third dialogue is regarded as the best, for it is strikingly illustrative of the dreamy ideal enthusiasm with which the young Platonist (More) pursued his studies and inquiries. The *Divine Dialogues* are certainly, upon the whole, the most interesting and readable of all of More's works. They possess, moreover, the advantage of condensing his

general views on philosophy and religion. More's authorship continued far beyond this time (to 1687, making a period of thirty-five years in all), and he composed after this his *Manual of Metaphysics* (1671, 4to), and attacked both Jacob Bohme (in *Philosophice Teutonicce Censura* [1670]), and Spinoza *(Duarum praecipuarum, Atheismi Spinoziani columnarum subversio* [1672]) in elaborate treatises. But the elasticity and temper of his philosophical genius are less buoyant in these efforts. "His *Metaphysics,"* says Tulloch, "elaborate though they be, are in the main only a systematic and somewhat desultory expansion of views regarding the nature and proof of incorporeal substances, which he had already more than once expressed; while his cabalistical and prophetical studies have acquired a stronger hold of his mind." Within the next ten years he issued no fewer than five publications taken up with mystical subjects — some of them of the most curious technical character — including a *Cabalistic Catechism.* Two of these writings are addressed to his friend Knorr (q.v.), the learned German Orientalist, whose speculations on the cabalistic art at this time considerably influenced More. After this we find him deeply engaged in prophetical studies. The theosophic elements, already so apparent in his philosophical poems, had been for some time held in check by his higher life of reason and healthy appreciation of natural and moral facts. But gradually they acquired a more marked ascendency, as his mental habits became fixed and the elasticity of natural feeling and thought began to decay. The balance, which had long been trembling began at length to decline on the unhealthy side. *Ezekiel's Dream* and the *Synchronous Method of the Apocalyptic Visions* received elaborate transcendental explanation. He was himself apparently conscious of an undue confidence in this sort of study. Yet he was unable to resist its fascinations. In allusion it is supposed to himself, he makes one of the speakers in his fifth dialogue say: "The greatest fanaticism I know in him is this, that he professeth he understands clearly the truth of several prophecies of the mainest concernment, which yet many others pretend to be very obscure." His latest work, which he left incomplete, is a practical treatise entitled *Medela Mundi, or the Cure of the World.* There is no trace of this work except allusions to it in his correspondence, and it is probably the work which he mentions in one of his letters under the name of *The Safe Guide.* It was, to judge from what can be gleaned from his correspondence, intended to vigorously advocate the rights of reason, and one of its chief objects was to show how the "Christian and philosophic genius" should "mix together." "The Christian religion, rightly understood," appeared to him to be "the

deepest and choicest piece of philosophy that is." It was "the main, if not the only scope" of his long and anxious studies to demonstrate the rationality of the Christian religion throughout. "For to heap up a deal of reading and notions and experiments, without some such noble and important design, had but been to make his mind or memory a shop of small wares." He adopted, therefore, without hesitation the generous resolution of Marcus Cicero — "Rationem quo ea me cunque ducet, sequor." He was proud to adorn himself as a writer with "the sacerdotal breastplate of the Λόγιον, or *Rationale."* "Every priest," he adds, quoting Philo, "should endeavor, according to his opportunity and capacity, to be as much as he can a *rational* man, *or philosopher."* Again, "to take away *reason,* under what fanatic pretence soever, is to dissolve the priest, and despoil him of this breastplate, and, which is worst of all, to rob Christianity of that special prerogative it has above all other religions in the world — viz. *that it dares appeal unto reason,* which as many as understand the true interest of our religion will not fail to stick closely to; the contrary betraying it to the unjust suspicion of falsehood, and equalizing it to every vain imposture. For, take away reason, and all religions are alike true; as, the light being removed, all things are of one color" *(Pref. to Antidote,* page 6).

Though More's strength was displayed rather in what he could elaborate by thought than in the immediate use of his reading, he was nevertheless a laborious student. He devoted himself to the study of the best authors only. "He was wont to say that he was no wholesale man." It was with the weightiest matters that his mind was mostly engaged; though there was no part of learning, laudable and worthy, for which he had not a due esteem. For about a year before his death he was visibly sinking. His mind, sympathizing with his body, was, says his biographer, "'in sort out of tune.' I speak as to that deep and plastic sense (to use his own terms) he had been under usually in divine matters." His progress towards the close of life was nevertheless marked by humble piety and cheerful resignation. "Never," he said, "any person thirsted more for his meat and drink than he, if it pleased God, after a release from the body." "Yet," says Tulloch, " it is pleasant to reflect that his active mind remained full of thoughts for others to the last, and that those great questions in which he had spent all his time — What is good? and What is true? — were apparently as fresh and important with him at the end as, at the beginning." He frequently in his last days expressed the hope that when he was called out of the present life his

writings would be of use to the Church of God and to the world. Shortly before his death he expressed his view of what awaited him by repeating the first words of Cicero's famous exclamation, "praeclarum illum diem," etc.; intimating, as he had also done before, his conviction that at his release from this painful world he would be admitted to converse with blessed and congenial spirits. He expired calmly, and almost imperceptibly, September 1, 1687, and lies buried in the chapel of the college of which he had been for so many years an admired ornament. In person Henry More was tall and thin, but of a "serene" and vivacious countenance — rather pale than florid in his later years — yet was it clear and spirituous, and his eye hazel, and vivid as an eagle's. There is, indeed, as all who have seen his portrait by Loggan will admit, a singularly vivid elevation in his countenance, with some lines strongly drawn around the mouth, but with ineffable sweetness, light, and dignity in the general expression. As he is the most poetic and transcendental, so he is, upon the whole, the most spiritual looking of all the Cambridge divines. He was from youth to age evidently gifted with the most happy and buoyant religious temper. "He was profoundly pious, and yet without all sourness, superstition, or melancholy." His habitual cast of mind was a serene thoughtfulness, while his "outward conversation" — with his friends was for the most part "free and facetious." Religion was in practice with him clearly what he conceived it to be in theory — the consecration and perfection of the natural life — the brightest and best form which it could attain, under the inspiration and guidance of the Divine Spirit. Although he chose for himself a secluded life, and so far suffered in consequence from a lack of that comprehensive experience which is more than all other education to the wise and open mind, he yet was not actuated in doing so by any indifference to the lighter and more active interests of humanity. It was remarked that his very air had in it something angelic. He seemed to be full of introversions of light, joy, benignity, and devotion at once, as if his face had been overcast with a golden shower of love and purity. Strangers even noticed this "marvellous lustre and irradiation" in his eves and countenance. "A divine gale," as he himself said. breathed throughout all his life as well as his works; but, however far it lifted him, it never inflated him. Ward, in his life of this remarkable man, repeats some extraordinary encomiums passed upon him while living by eminent persons who knew him well. One of them averred that he looked upon Dr. More as "the holiest man on the face of the earth;" another that "he was more of an angel than a man." More substantial proofs, however, than words of the respect felt for him by his

contemporaries were offered in the attentions paid to him by the learned world. Yet it would be difficult indeed to name a Christian grace in which he did not excel. His charity and humility were not less conspicuous than his piety. "His very chamber door was a hospital to the needy." Self-denial he regarded as the practical ground of moral virtue; and in his own heart and behavior he evinced his observation that humility is the most precious part of piety. The fervor of his direct approaches to and intercourse with God in prayer could not be surpassed. When the winds were ruffling about him, he made the utmost endeavor to keep low and humble, that he might not be driven from that anchor. So intense were his acts of worship, and accompanied with such a joyful sense of the divine presence, that his friends, when sometimes coming upon him unexpectedly while engaged in prayer, were surprised by indications of peace and joy in his countenance truly angelic. His temper was serene and cheerful, his discourse serious, yet lighted up with playful coruscations of wit and humor. "Few were of a cheer fuller spirit than he; none of a more deep felicity and enjoyment. In short, he possessed in as great purity perhaps as it has existed in any man of modern times the light, sanctity, and blessedness of the divine life." It is truly said by Tulloch that, "while More was no hero, either in thought or in deed — his speculations were too transcendental and his life too retired for this — he yet comes before us a singularly beautiful, benign, and noble character — one of those higher spirits who help us to feel the divine presence on earth, and to believe in its reality." His works were published in 1679, in 3 volumes folio; his philosophical writings in 1662, folio (4th ed. 1712); his theological works in 1675, folio. An analytical catalogue of all his works may be found in Cattermole's *Literature of the Church of England,* and' also in Tulloch's *Rat. Theology,* from which we extract this view of More as a writer: "More, still more than Cudworth, repeats himself, adding prefaces and appendices to what he has already written, and returning again and again upon the same track of thought. The germ, in fact, of most of his speculations may be traced in his early *Philosophical Poems.* His genius in one sense was singularly fecund. Work after work sprang with easy luxuriance from his pen. But his writings do not exhibit any clear growth or system of ideas, unfolding themselves gradually, and maturing to a more comprehensive rationality. This lack of method is more or less characteristic of the school. Not only so, in his later productions there is rather a decay than an increase and enrichment of the rational element. To enter into any exposition of his cabalistical studies, of his discovery of Cartesianism in the first chapters of Genesis, and his favorite

notion of all true philosophers descending from Moses through Pythagoras and Plato; and, still more, to touch his prophetical theories — the divine science which he finds in the dream of Ezekiel or the visions of the Apocalypse would be labor thrown away, unless to illustrate the weakness of human genius, or the singular absurdities which beset the progress of knowledge, even in its most favorable stages. The supposition that all higher wisdom and speculation were derived originally from Moses and the Hebrew Scriptures; and that it was confirmatory both of the truth of Scripture and the results of philosophy to make out this traditionary connection, was widely prevalent in the 17th century. It was warmly supported and elaborately argued by some of the most acute and learned intellects. Both Cudworth and More profoundly believed in this connection. But this was only one of many instances of their lack of critical and historical judgment. Historical criticism, in the modern sense, was not even then dreamed of; and it is needless to consider forgotten delusions which have perished, rather with the common growth of reason than by the force of any special genius or discovery" (2:351-353). See his *Praefatio Generalissima* prefixed to his *Opera Omnilia* (1679); Ward, *Life of Henry More* (Lond. 1710, 8vo); Burnet, *Hist. of his own Times;* Tulloch, *Rational Theol. and Christian Philos. in England in the 17th Century* (Lond. 1872, 2 volumes, 8vo), 2:303-409; Mullinger, *Cambridge Characteristics in the 17th Century* (Lond. 1867, 8vo), chapter 4; Tennemann, *Hist. Phil.* pages 302, 321; Morell, *Hist. Mod. Philos.* pages 208, 211 sq.; Stoughton, *Eccles. Hist.* 2:385, 454, 482-485; Hallam, *Introd. to Lit.* (see Index in volume 2, Harper's edition); Enfield, *Hist. Phil.* book 8, chapter 3, sec. 3; Theodore Parker, in *Christian Examiner,* volume 26, art. 127:48 sq.; *Retrospective Rev.* volume 5 (1822).

More, Sir Thomas

Picture for More, Sir Thomas

the noted chancellor of king Henry VIII of England, celebrated for the part he played in the political and ecclesiastical history of his country and for the philosophical views he espoused, was the son of Sir John More, one of the justices of the Court of King's Bench. Thomas was born in London in 1480 (some say 1479, others again 1484), and was educated at St. Anthony's School in Threadneedle Street until about his fifteenth year, when he was placed, according to the custom of the times, in the house of cardinal Morton, archbishop of Canterbury, where he became known to

Colet, dean of St. Paul's, who used to say "there was but one wit in England, and that was young Thomas More." In 1497 More went to Oxford. He had rooms in St. Mary's Hall, but carried on his studies at Canterbury College (afterwards Christ Church). Here he became intimately acquainted with Erasmus, who resided there during the greater part of 1497 and 1498, and formed a friendship which continued during life. It was also at Oxford that More composed the greater number of his English poems, which, though deficient in harmony and ease of versification, are spoken of by Ben Jonson as models of English literature. After More left Oxford he prosecuted the study of the law, and soon acquired great celebrity for his legal knowledge. He was appointed reader at Furnival's Inn. where he delivered lectures on law for three years; and about the same time he also delivered lectures at St. Lawrence's church in the Old Jewry, on the work of St. Augustine, *De Civitate Dei.* It must be remembered that religion, morals, and law were then taught together without distinction; yet More, in his lectures, did not so much discuss the points of divinity as the precepts of moral philosophy and history. It is, however, well known that More also did delight to touch on questions of theology, for he was always fond of it, and for some time thought of taking orders. "He manifested," says Mackintosh, "a predilection for monastic life, and is said to have practiced some of those austerities and self-inflictions which prevail among the gloomier and sterner orders" (Life, in *Works,* 1:405). He resolved indeed at one time to turn monk, and actually became a lay-brother of the Carthusian convent (the Charter-House) in London, where he is said to have passed several years. But he finally relinquished the ecclesiastical life, influenced perhaps by the general corruption of the priestly orders, or, as Erasmus has it, he preferred to be a chaste husband rather than an impure priest. More was called to the bar, though at what time is uncertain. He appears to have acquired an extensive practice. He came to be generally regarded as one of the most eloquent speakers of his day; indeed, his reputation became so great towards the latter part of the reign of Henry VII that it is said that there was no case of consequence before any court of law in which he was not engaged as counsel. About 1502 he first entered upon public office. He was then made an under-sheriff of London, an office at that time of great legal responsibility. Only two years later he was elected to Parliament, in which he opposed a subsidy which had been demanded by Henry VII for the marriage of his eldest daughter. In consequence of this opposition More incurred the displeasure of Henry 7:a -prince who never forgave an injury; and had not the king died soon

afterwards, More would have been obliged to leave the country. Notwithstanding all opposition at court, More flourished, and gained constantly in reputation and friends. His graceful and varied learning, coupled as it was with sprightly, inexhaustible wit, so that Erasmus could write of him that "with More you might imagine yourself in the Academy of Plato," no doubt contributed in a large measure to his rapid advancement. "His professional practice became so considerable," says Mackintosh, "that about the accession of Henry VIII (1509) it produced £400 a year, probably equivalent to an annual income of £5000 in the present day." With the accession of Henry VIII to the English throne More's most auspicious days began. He became a favorite of his royal master, always so quick to detect in his surroundings whatever and whoever was likely to prove serviceable to him. King "Harry" remarked More's talents, and not only gladly consulted him on affairs of state, but sought him as the companion of his amusements and convivial hours. According to the account of Erasmus, the circle there collected must have been one of the most brilliant and engaging that the world has ever seen, and it was adorned by virtues which to other associations, high in intellect, have often been wanting. More was appointed to several important civil offices, and even employed as envoy on foreign missions. Thus, in 1514, he was sent to Flanders, to secure favors from the prince afterwards known as emperor Charles V. More was also employed by his king on various public missions to France, and so interested did Henry VIII become in More that he ordered cardinal Wolsey, then his chancellor, to engage More in the service of the court. Accordingly More was made treasurer of the exchequer in 1520. and not only acceptably performed his public functions, but also grew in popularity with the courtiers and the king, by reason of his sweet temper and great conversational power. The king frequently met More, and enjoyed many hours with him, not only socially, but intellectually. Indeed, in 1521, when king Harry was working up his reply to the German Reformer, More assisted his royal friend by casting that celebrated treatise against the Protestant effort into a proper method. It was published in 1521, under the title of *Assertio septem sacramentorum adversus M. Lutherum,* etc., and in 1523 More himself published *Responsio ad convitia Al. Lutheri congesta in Henricum regent Angliae.* "In this *Answer to Luther,"* says Atterbury, "More has forgot himself so as to throw out the greatest heap of nasty language that perhaps ever was put together; and that the book throughout is nothing but downright ribaldry, without a grain of reason to support it, and gave to the author no other

reputation but that of having the best knack of any man in Europe at calling bad names in good Latin, etc. The like censure do his English tracts against Tindal, Barnes, etc., deserve" *(Epistolary Correspondence,* 3:452). And though this criticism is rather harsh, it was yet in a large measure deserved (comp., however, More's *Apology,* in which he denies these charges of overzeal against heresy). In 1523 More was chosen speaker of the House of Commons, and now entered upon a career in which for a time he alienated both his royal master and the chancellor. The cardinal had taken the liberty of asking a greater subsidy for the king than he was entitled to, and was inclined to be generally lavish in his expenditures for the crown, as well as very unmindful of the ancient liberties and privileges of the house. More valiantly defended the people's cause, and hesitated not to speak out, though it endangered his popularity with the king. Indeed, More had never deceived himself as to the extent of his favor with the king, though his friend Erasmus had dared to assert that "the king would scarcely ever suffer the philosopher to quit him," and though Henry visited him uninvited at Chelsea, and walked with him by the hour in his garden, "holding his arm about his neck." More had a true insight into Henry's character, and clearly revealed this in an answer which he once gave when congratulated by his son-in-law, Roper, on the king's favor: "If my head would win him a castle in France, when there was war between us, it should not fail to go." Henry's faithfulness, was, however, more lasting in More's case than it was wont to be, for he clung to him notwithstanding this waywardness, and shortly after caused his appointment as chancellor of Lancaster, and on the death of the cardinal in 1529 More was even more strongly impressed with his royal friend's affection by his appointment to the high chancellorship of all England, vacated by the disgrace of Wolsey. Here was more than usual expression of confidence and affection. The favor was, moreover, the more extraordinary as he was a layman, and it was wont to be the custom to invest an ecclesiastic with the office of lord chancellor. But it was afterwards revealed why this apparent warmth and fervor. Henry had simply advanced More to the chancellorship with the hope that he would assist him in his divorce, and marriage with Anne Boleyn, and no sooner had he been elevated to the high chancellorship than the king pressed him strongly for his opinion on the subject. But More was sincerely attached to the Roman Catholic Church; he looked with a certain degree of horror upon a project which was denounced by the pontifical head of the Church, and therefore begged Henry to excuse him from giving an opinion. This was granted for a time; but as it was evident that Henry had determined to

effect the divorce, and would soon require the active cooperation of his chancellor, More, who determined not to be a party to the transaction, finally asked and obtained permission to retire from the office, May 16, 1532. From this time Henry, who never seems to have recollected any former friendship when his purposes were in the least degree thwarted, appears to have resolved upon the destruction of his old favorite. Anne Boleyn's coronation being fixed for May 31, 1533, all fair means were used to win him over; and when these proved ineffectual, recourse was had to threats and terrors. More was included in the bill of attainder which was passed against Elizabeth Barton, the celebrated nun of Kent, and her accomplices for treasonable practices, on the ground that he had encouraged Elizabeth; but his innocence in the case was made so clear that his name had to be withdrawn from the bill of accusation. He was then accused of other crimes, but with the same effect. Yet the court party soon found an opportunity of gratifying their vindictive master. By a law passed in the session of 1533-34 it was made high-treason, by writing, print, deed, or act, to do anything to the prejudice, etc., of the king's lawful matrimony with queen Anne; and it was also provided that all persons should take an oath to maintain the whole contents of the statute. At the end of the session commissioners were appointed to administer the oath, and on April 15, 1534, More was summoned before them to take it. This More declined doing, but at the same time offered to swear that he would maintain the order of succession to the throne as established by Parliament. In consequence of his refusing to take this oath, More was committed to the Tower; and in the same year two statutes were passed to attaint More and Fisher, *SEE FISHER, JOHN* of misprision of treason, with the punishment of imprisonment and loss of goods. More remained in prison for thirteen months, during which time several efforts were made to induce him to take the oath, and also to subscribe to the king's ecclesiastical supremacy. His reputation and credit being very great in the kingdom, and much being apprehended from his conduct at that critical conjuncture, all arguments that could be devised were alleged to him by archbishop Cranmer and others to persuade him to a compliance, and many fair promises were made from the king to induce him thereto; but, as nothing could prevail, he was finally brought to trial for high-treason. He appears to have been indicted under the statute alluded to above, which made it high-treason to do anything to the prejudice of Henry's lawful marriage with queen Anne, and also for refusing to admit the king's ecclesiastical supremacy; and although the evidence against him completely failed, he was found guilty and

condemned to death. He was beheaded July 6, 1535, and met his fate with intrepidity and even cheerfulness. In the words of Addison: "The innocent mirth which had been so conspicuous in his life did not forsake him to the last. When he laid his head on the block, he desired the executioner to wait until he had removed his beard, 'for that had never offended his highness.' He did not look upon the severing of his head from his body as a circumstance which ought to produce any change in the' disposition of his mind; and as he died in a fixed and settled hope of immortality, he thought any unusual degree of sorrow and concern improper" *(Spectator,* No. 349). His body was first interred in the Tower, but was afterwards begged and obtained by his daughter, Margaret Roper, and deposited in' the chancel of the church at Chelsea, where a monument, with an inscription written by himself, had been some time before erected, and is still to be seen. His head was placed on London Bridge, but was taken down and preserved also by his daughter in a vault belonging to the Roper family, under a chapel adjoining St. Dunstan's church in Canterbury. The story of Margaret's tenderness and devotion to her father should live as long as the English language endures.

More was the author of many and various works, which were mostly in defence of Romanism, and directed against the revolutionary tendencies of the Church of his day. They have no value now as literary productions. There is, however, one work of his which deserves special notice. It is entitled *De optimo reipublicae statu deque nova insula Utopia* (Lovanni, 1566, 4to), the first communistic writing by an English author. It criticises the English government and European politics, and is an account of an imaginary commonwealth on the island of Utopia, feigned to have been discovered by a companion of Amerigo Vespucci, and from whom More learns the tale. Society is represented there as an ideal system, in which opinions are expressed with great boldness and originality, and especially favorable to freedom of inquiry even in religion. In it all its members would labor for the public good, all being equally obliged to contribute, and the only difference being in the nature of the labor; all its members would thus be on a footing of absolute equality, all property be in common, all forms of religion perfectly free, etc. "Many questions of the highest importance to the citizen," says Lieber, "are discussed in a spirit far in advance of his time. He recommended perfect freedom of conscience, which was a thing absolutely unknown then, and for centuries afterwards" *(Political Ethics,* part 1, page 332). Of the work as a whole, lord Campbell says that "since

the time of Plato there had been no composition given to the world which, for imagination, for philosophical discrimination of men and manners, and for felicity of expression, could be compared to the *Utopia" (Lives of the Lord Chancellors; Life of Sir Thomas More).* Hallam pronounces it "the only work of genius that England can boast in this age" *(Lit. Hist. of Europe* [4th ed. 1854], page 276). Yet, though Sir Thomas advocated such lofty principles in his *Utopia,* it must be admitted that he was not himself altogether free from the religious bias of the times, being not. only a most strenuous advocate of the power of the pope, but also a vehement opponent and persecutor of heretics. It is true Erasmus cites as proof of More's clemency "that while he was chancellor no man was put to death for these pestilent dogmas;" but Froude contradicts this statement, and implicates Sir Thomas in the persecutions for conscience' sake. There is, however, a solemn declaration by the chancellor himself in his *Apology* (published in 1533), in which he expressly denies that he was guilty of any cruel treatment of the heretics. It was never contradicted in his own time, and therefore should be well considered before Froude's statement is accepted.

If now, from his works, we turn to the personal character of Sir Thomas More, we find that he is generally acknowledged to have been, "for justice, contempt of money, humility, and a true generosity of mind, an example to the age in which he lived." His Christian temper, too, we may add, was such as made him an honor to the Christian cause in general. It is true he declared upon the scaffold that he died in and for the faith of the Church of Rome, but any Church might have wished him theirs; and therefore that Church has placed him, not without reason, among the brightest of her martyrs. "More," says bishop Burnet, "was the glory of his age; and his advancement was the king's honor more than his own, who was a true Christian philosopher. He thought the cause of the king's divorce was just, and as long as it was prosecuted at the court of Rome, so long he favored it; but when he saw that a breach with that court was likely to follow, he left the post he was in with a superior greatness of mind. It was a fall great enough to retire from that into a private state of life, but the carrying matters so far against him as the king did was one of the justest reproaches of that reign. More's superstition seems indeed contemptible, but the constancy of his mind was truly wonderful" *(Hist. Reformation,* 3:100). A British writer of considerable note thus summarizes upon More: " The terseness and liveliness of his sayings, his sweet temper and affectionate

disposition, his blameless life, his learning and probity, combine to make a union of perfect simplicity with moral and intellectual greatness which will forever endear his memory to his countrymen of every sect and party." The English works of Sir Thomas More were collected and published at London in 1557, and his Latin works at Louvain in 1556. His letters to Erasmus are printed in the collection of Erasmus's letters published at London in 1642. His *Utopia,* which has been translated into many European languages, and has had a world-wide circulation, was given an English dress by Robynson (Lond. 1551), by bishop Burnet, and more recently by Arthur Cavley (Lond. 1808). The Life of Sir Thomas More has been written by his son-in-law, Roper, who married his favorite daughter Margaret (Lond. 1626); by his great-grandson, T. More (1626); by Hoddesden (Lond. 1652); by Cayley (1808); by Walter [R.C.] (Lond. 1840); and by Sir James Mackintosh, in *Lives of Eminent British Statesmen,* published in Dr. Lardner's *Cabinet Cyclop.,* and in *Miscell. Works* (Lond. 1854, 18mo), 1:393 sq. See also lord Campbell, *Lives of the Lord Chancellors;* Froude, *Hist. of Enyl.* volume 2, chapter 9, reviewed in *North Brit. Rev.* 1859; Burnet, *Own Times,* i, 155 sq.; Wordsworth, *Eccles. Biog.* 2:49 sq.; Soames, *Reformed Ch. of Eng.* volume 1 and 2; Macaulay, *Crit. and Hist. Essays,* 2:543; Seebohm, *The Oxford Reformers of* 1498 (Lond. 1869); *Edinburgh Rev.* 14:360; *Westminster Rev.* 11:193; *Foreign Rev.* 5:391; *Retrospective Rev.* (1822), 5:249; *North American Rev.* 8:181; 66, 272; *National Qu. Rev.* June 1863, art. 3.