

ference, every where intersected by canals, and connected with the mainland by six long and solidly constructed causeways, as is clearly shown by the plan given in the edition of Cortes's letters published at Nuremberg in 1524 (reproduced in vol. iv. of H. H. Bancroft's *History of the Pacific States*, San Francisco, 1833, p. 280). After its almost total destruction in November 1521, Cortes employed some 400,000 natives in rebuilding it on the same site; but since then the lake seems to have considerably subsided, for although still 50 square miles in extent it is very shallow and has retired 2½

MEYERBEER, GIACOMO (1791–1863), first known in Germany as Jakob Meyer Beer, was born at Berlin on September 5, 1791,¹ of a wealthy and talented Jewish family. His father, Herz Beer, was a banker; his mother, Amalie (née Wulf), was a woman of high intellectual culture; and two of his brothers distinguished themselves in astronomy and literature. He studied the pianoforte, first under Lauska, and afterwards under Lauska's master, Clementi. When seven years old he played Mozart's Concerto in D Minor in public, and at nine he was pronounced the best pianist in Berlin. For composition he was placed under Zelter, whose lessons were soon exchanged for those of Bernard Weber, then director of the Berlin opera, by whom he was introduced to the Abbé Vogler. Struck by his brilliant talent, Vogler invited him to Darmstadt, and in 1810 received him into his house, where he formed an intimate friendship with Karl Maria von Weber, who, though his senior by eight years, shared the daily lessons he received from the abbé in counterpoint, fugue, and extempore organ-playing. At the end of two years the grand-duke appointed Meyerbeer composer to the court. His early works, however, were far from successful,—his first opera, *Jephtha's Gelübde*, failing lamentably at Darmstadt in 1811, and his second, *Wirth und Gast (Alimetele)*, at Vienna in 1814. These checks discouraged him so cruelly that he feared he had mistaken his vocation. Nevertheless, by advice of Salieri, he determined to study vocalization in Italy, and then to form a new style. But at Venice he was so captivated by the style of Rossini that, renouncing all thought of originality, he produced a succession of seven Italian operas—*Romilda e Costanza*, *Semiramide riconosciuta*, *Edouardo e Cristina*, *Emma di Rosburgo*, *Margherita d'Anjou*, *L'Esule di Granata*, and *Il Crociato in Egitto*—which all achieved a success as brilliant as it was unexpected. Against this act of treason to German art Weber protested most earnestly; and before long Meyerbeer himself grew tired of his defection, though the success of *Il Crociato* was so great that he was crowned upon the stage. An invitation to Paris in 1826 led him to review his position fairly and dispassionately, and he could not conceal from himself the fact that he was wasting in imitation powers which, rightly used, might make his name immortal. For several years after this he produced nothing in public; but, in concert with Scribe, he planned the work which first made known the reality of his transcendent genius—his first French opera, *Robert le Diable*. This gorgeous drama was produced at the Grand Opéra in 1831, and received with acclamation. It was the first of its race, a grand romantic opera, abounding with scenes of startling interest, with situations more powerfully dramatic than any that had been attempted either by Cherubini or Rossini, with mysterious horrors and chivalric pomp, and with ballet music such as had never yet been heard, even in Paris. Its popularity exceeded all previous expectation; yet for five years after this signal triumph Meyerbeer appeared before the public no more. We cannot doubt that his motive for this retirement was the determination to produce something greater still; and

¹ Or, according to some accounts, 1794.

miles from the city. During the Spanish rule the chief event was the revolt of 1692, when the municipal buildings were destroyed. Since then Mexico has been the scene of many revolutions, and after the battle of Chapultepec (September 13, 1847) the city was held by the United States troops till the treaty of Guadalupe, May 1848. But since the disorders ending with the death of Maximilian it has turned to peaceful ways, and has become a great centre of civilizing influences for the surrounding semi-barbarous peoples. (A. H. K.)

in some respects his next opera, *Les Huguenots*, really was greater, though it fell short of the deep romance which rendered *Robert le Diable* so incomparably captivating.

The first performance of *Les Huguenots* took place in 1836. In gorgeous colouring, in depth of passion, in consistency of dramatic treatment, and in careful delineation of individual character, it is at least the equal of *Robert le Diable*. In two points only did its interest fall short of that inspired by the earlier work. Meyerbeer had shown himself so great a master in his treatment of the supernatural that one regretted the unavoidable omission of that powerful element in his second grand opera; and, more important still, the fifth act of *Les Huguenots* was so arranged by the librettist as to render effective musical treatment impossible. The substitution of a noisy fusillade for a legitimate dramatic situation was fatal to the anticipated climax. The music which accompanies this division of the work is necessarily inferior to all that precedes it. The true interest of the drama culminates at the close of the fourth act, when Raoul, leaping from the window, leaves Valentine fainting upon the ground. The spectator needs not to be told that the former will be shot down the moment he arrives in the street, or that the latter will mourn for him to the end of her days. Neither musically nor dramatically does anything more remain to be said; and therefore it is that those who quit the theatre when the curtain falls for the fourth time carry away with them a far more perfect ideal than those who remain to the end.

After the production of *Les Huguenots* Meyerbeer again retired from public view, and spent many years in the preparation of two of his greatest works—the greatest of all except the two we have already mentioned—*L'Africaine* and *Le Prophète*. The libretti of both these operas were furnished by Scribe; and both were subjected to countless changes of detail before they satisfied the composer's fastidious taste; in fact, the story of *L'Africaine* was more than once entirely rewritten.

Meanwhile Meyerbeer accepted the appointment of kapellmeister to the king of Prussia, and spent some years at Berlin, where he produced *Ein Feldlager in Schlesien*, a German opera, in which the matchless cantatrice Jenny Lind made her first appearance in Prussia, with unprecedented success. Here also he composed, in 1846, the overture to his brother Michael's drama, *Struensee*. But his chief care at this period was bestowed upon the worthy presentation of the works of others. He began by producing his dead friend Weber's *Euryanthe*, with scrupulous attention to the composer's original idea. With equal unselfishness he procured the acceptance of *Rienzi* and *Der Fliegende Holländer*, the first two operas of Richard Wagner, who, then languishing in poverty and exile, would, but for him, have found it impossible to obtain a hearing in Berlin. With Jenny Lind as prima donna and Meyerbeer as conductor, the opera flourished brilliantly in the Prussian capital; but the anxieties of this thankless period materially shortened the composer's life.

Meyerbeer produced *Le Prophète* at Paris in 1849; and, if it did not at first create so great a sensation as *Les Huguenots*, this was simply because it needed to be better

known. In 1854 he brought out *L'Étoile du Nord* at the Opéra Comique, and in 1859 *Le Pardon de Ploermel (Dinorah)*. His last great work, *L'Africaine*, was in active preparation at the Académie when, on the 23d of April 1863, he was seized with a sudden illness, of which he died on the 2d of May. *L'Africaine* was produced with pious attention to the composer's minutest wishes, on April 28, 1865, and fully justified the expectation which had been raised by his long and painstaking consideration of its details. Upon this, in conjunction with *Robert le Diable*, *Les Huguenots*, and *Le Prophète*, his fame now almost entirely rests.

Meyerbeer's genius has been criticized with widely different results. Mendelssohn thought his style exaggerated; Fétis thought him one of the most original geniuses of the age; Wagner calls him "a miserable music-maker," and "a Jewish banker to whom it occurred to compose operas." But the reality of his talent has been recognized throughout all Europe; and, in spite of the acknowledged crudity of his system of phrasing, and the inequality of merit too plainly observable even in his greatest works, his name will live so long as intensity of passion and power of dramatic treatment are regarded as indispensable characteristics of dramatic music. (W. S. R.)

MÉZIÈRES, a fortress of the first class, and the capital of the département of Ardennes, France, is 161 miles to the north-east of Paris by railway, on a peninsula of the Meuse, which almost entirely surrounds the town, and separates it from its more important suburb, Charleville. The fortifications, which, as well as the citadel, are the work of Vauban, are pierced by four gates, giving access to the town, the streets of which are narrow and winding. The parish church, erected in the 16th century, contains two inscriptions in commemoration respectively of the raising of the siege of Mézières in 1521 and the marriage of Charles IX. with the daughter of the emperor Maximilian II., which was celebrated at Mézières in 1570. The north and south portals, the glass of the windows, and the lofty vaultings of the church are worthy of remark. The hôtel de ville contains several interesting pictures relating to the history of the town. The iron industry, the only one of any importance, is being gradually transferred to Charleville. The population in 1881 was 6120.

Founded in the 9th century, Mézières was at first only a stronghold belonging to the bishops of Rheims, which afterwards became the property of the counts of Rethel. The town was increased by successive immigrations of the people of Liège, flying first from the emperor Otho, and afterwards from Charles the Bold; and also by concessions from the counts of Rethel. Its walls were built in the 13th century, and in 1521 it was successfully defended by Bayard against the imperialists. The anniversary of the deliverance of the town is still observed yearly on the 27th of September. The school of military engineering, since transferred successively to Metz and Fontainebleau, was originally founded at Mézières.

MEZŐ-TŰR,¹ a corporate town in the Cis-Tisian county of Jász-Nagy-Kun-Szolnok, Hungary, situated on the right bank of the Berettyó, and on the railway from Arad to Szolnok, in 47° 1' N. lat., 20° 39' E. long. It has Roman Catholic and Calvinist churches and schools, a judicial court for the circuit, and the usual Government offices, but can boast of few buildings of special interest. Horses, oxen, and sheep are reared in great numbers on the wide-spreading communal lands, which are productive also of cereals, and especially wheat, rape-seed, and maize. On the 31st December 1880 the population amounted to 20,649 (10,265 males, 10,384 females), mostly Magyars by nationality.

MEZZOFANTI, GIUSEPPE (1774–1849), cardinal, whose colloquial linguistic acquirements have become proverbial, was born, September 17, 1774, at Bologna, where his father followed the occupation of a carpenter. Educated first at one of the "scuole pie," and afterwards at the

¹ Mező is a Magyar word, signifying *Field*, prefixed to many agricultural localities in Hungary.

episcopal seminary of his native city, he was ordained to the priesthood in 1797, and in the same year became professor of Arabic in the university, but shortly afterwards was deprived on account of his refusal to take the oath of allegiance to the Government of the Cisalpine Republic. In 1803, however, he was appointed assistant librarian of the institute of Bologna, and soon afterwards was reinstated as professor of Oriental languages and of Greek. The chair was suppressed by the viceroy in 1808, but again rehabilitated on the restoration of Pius VII. in 1814, and continued to be held by Mezzofanti until his removal from Bologna to Rome in 1831, when he received certain ecclesiastical appointments and the rank of monsignore. Meanwhile his progress in the acquirement of languages had been rapid and untiring, and in 1833 he was appointed to succeed Mai as chief keeper of the Vatican Library. His promotion to the cardinalate, and the duties of director of studies in the Congregation of the Propaganda, followed in 1838. He died at Rome, during the absence of the pontifical court at Gaeta, on March 15, 1849.

Mezzofanti's peculiar talent, comparable in many respects to that of the numerous "calculating boys" who have been the wonder of their contemporaries, was not combined with any exceptional measure of intellectual power, and accordingly produced nothing that has not perished with him. It seems to be well established, however, that he spoke with considerable fluency, and in some cases even with attention to dialectic peculiarities, some fifty or sixty languages of the most widely separated families, besides having a less perfect acquaintance with many others. See Manavit, *Esquisse historique sur le Cardinal Mezzofanti*, Paris, 1854; and Russell, *Life of the Cardinal Mezzofanti*, London, 1857.

MEZZOTINT. See ENGRAVING.

MIAUTSE. The Miautse or Meaou-tse of southern China are one of the aboriginal tribes of the country. At one time they occupied a considerable portion of the rich and fertile lands which now form the central province of the empire, but as the Chinese advanced southwards they were driven, like the Ainos in Japan and the Welsh in Britain, into the more inaccessible districts until they were compelled to seek refuge from the invaders in the mountain ranges, in the provinces of Yunnan, Kwei-chow, Kwang-se, and Kwang-tung, where they are found at the present day. This line of mountains extends for about 400 miles, and, being in many parts high, steep, and rugged, it forms a convenient shelter for them. As early as the reign of king Seuen (about 800 B.C.) we read of an expedition having been sent to drive them out of Hoo-nan, and since that time they have been periodically attacked either to punish them for misdeeds or to make them yield up vineyards coveted by Chinese A-habs. The last important campaign against them was undertaken by the emperor K'een-lung, who, having completely subjugated the Eleuths, was desirous of bringing under his yoke these mountain tribesmen. But the same success which had attended his arms in the north did not follow them to the south. The first expedition was utterly defeated, and the general in command paid the penalty of discomfiture with his head. The leader of a second expedition, having learned wisdom by the fate of his predecessor, purchased the submission of the Miautse by a large bribe. As soon as the unsuspecting savages had been thus lulled into security a third army was set in motion against them. This time, being unprepared, they suffered a crushing defeat, and were compelled to purchase peace by swearing allegiance to their conquerors. But, though the Chinese thus gained sovereignty over them, they have since deemed it wise to content themselves with but the shadow of authority. No real jurisdiction is ever exercised over these hardy mountaineers. They are allowed to govern themselves on their own patriarchal system. The old men of each tribe manage the affairs of their juniors, and command an obedience which would be utterly refused to the mandate of any mandarin. In figure the Miautse,

both men and women, are shorter and darker-complexioned than the Chinese, their faces also are rounder and their features sharper. In disposition, too, they are very unlike their civilized neighbours. They are brave, passionate, suspicious, revengeful, and indifferent to cold and hunger; they are free and easy in their manners, and are as noisily joyous as the Chinese are grave and sedate.

They are divided into between forty and fifty clans, each of which is distinguished by a name which is generally derived either from some physical characteristic, or from some custom, or from the habit of the clan, as, for example, "The Black Miao," "the narrow-headed Miao," so named from their manner of dressing their hair, "the six-valley Miao," &c. Among these clans there exist wide differences of culture, some being in no way removed from savages, while others who have been brought under the influence of Chinese civilization show themselves apt and ready learners. Very few of them, so far as is known, possess any written records. The Yaou-jin, or Goblin clan, are said to have books, which, though they are now unable to read, they still regard with reverent awe. "The barbarous characters" used in these books are, according to a Chinese writer, "like knotted worms, and are utterly unintelligible." The Ko-los also are said to be a lettered clan, but for the most part the Miautse content themselves with conveying information and preserving records by means of notched sticks. Their language as well as their ethnic characteristics prove them to be closely related to the Siamese, Anamese, Cambodians, and the inhabitants of Hainan; in fact they form part of the race which is spread over the whole of south-eastern Indo-China. Their social customs are as widely different as their appearance is from those of the Chinese. The widest latitude is given to the youth of both sexes in the choice of their husbands and wives. As among the hill tribes of Chittagong, the selection is commonly made on the mountain side, where on moonlight nights in the "leaping month" the young men and maidens meet to sing or to play at ball, or to dance round the "devil's staff" (*Anglice*, Maypole), and to choose their partners for life. Among some clans the "couvade" is an established custom. Their funeral rites vary according to the districts, those living within reach of the influence of the Chinese having adopted their customs, while those more remote still hang their dead in baskets from trees, or lay them in the ground and disinter them yearly to wash their bones. In dress they are fond of bright colours, and commonly wear loose but short jackets, sometimes with and sometimes without trousers. The men wear turbans wound round their hair, which is raised above the head in the shape of a spiral shell, and the women either don a kind of cap, or dress their hair in the shape of a ram's horn. For many years the relations of the Miautse with the Chinese Government have been generally of a peaceable nature, and in the *Peking Gazette* of April 1881 there was published a new system of government by which it is hoped that the incorporation of the mountaineers into the empire may become more real and complete.

See *Sketches of the Miautse*, translated by E. C. Bridgman; J. Edkins, *The Miautse Tribes, their History*; and "Quaint customs in Kwei-chow," *Cornhill Magazine*, January 1872.

MICAH (מִיכָה) is the short form of a name which in various modifications—*Micaiāhū*, *Micāihū*, *Micāiah*—is common in the Old Testament, expressing as it does a fundamental point of Hebrew faith: Who is like Jehovah? The name was borne among others by the Danite whose history is given in Judg. xvii. sq., by the prophet who opposed Ahab's expedition to Ramoth-Gilead (1 Kings xxii.), and by the subject of the present article, the contemporary and fellow-worker of Isaiah, whose name is prefixed to the sixth in order of the books of the minor prophets.¹

It is at once apparent that the book of Micah divides itself into at least two distinct discourses, chap. vi. 1 forming a new commencement; and from what we know in general of the compilation of the prophetic collection we cannot at once determine whether the second discourse, which has no title, is to be ascribed to the author of the immediately preceding prophecy, or is to be regarded as an independent and anonymous piece. To decide this question, if it can be decided, we must begin by a separate study of the earlier chapters to which the title in Micah i. 1 directly belongs. These again fall into two parts. Chaps. i.—iii. (with the exception of two verses, ii. 12, 13) are a predic-

¹ A confusion between the two prophets of the name has led to the insertion in the Massoretic text of 1 Kings xxii. 28 of a citation from Micah i. 2, rightly absent from the LXX.

tion of judgment on the sins of Judah and Ephraim. In a majestic exordium Jehovah Himself is represented as coming forth in the thunderstorm (comp. Amos i. 2) from His heavenly palace, and descending on the mountains of Palestine, at once as witness against His people, and the executer of judgment on their sins. Samaria is sentenced to destruction for idolatry; and the blow extends to Judah also, which participates in the same guilt (chap. i.). But, while Samaria is summarily dismissed, the sin of Judah is analysed at length in chaps. ii. and iii., in which the prophet no longer deals with idolatry, but with the corruption of society, and particularly of its leaders—the grasping aristocracy whose whole energies are concentrated on devouring the poor and depriving them of their little holdings, the unjust judges and priests who for gain wrest the law in favour of the rich, the hireling and gluttonous prophets who make war against every one "that putteth not into their mouth," but are ever ready with assurances of Jehovah's favour to their patrons, the wealthy and noble sinners that fatten on the flesh of the poor. The prophet speaks with the strongest personal sympathy of the sufferings of the peasantry at the hands of their lords, and contemplates with stern satisfaction the approach of the destroyer who shall carry into exile "the luxurious sons" of this race of petty tyrants (i. 16), and leave them none to stretch the measuring line on a field in the congregation of Jehovah (ii. 5). The centre of corruption is the capital, the city of Zion, grown great on the blood and wrongs of the provincials, the seat of the cruel princes, the corrupt judges and diviners. For their sake, he concludes, Zion shall be plowed as a field, Jerusalem shall lie in ruins, and the temple hill return to jungle (iii. 12).

The situation thus sketched receives its elucidation from the data supplied by the title (i. 1) and confirmed and rendered more precise by a remarkable passage in Jeremiah. According to the title Micah flourished in the reigns of Jotham, Ahaz, and Hezekiah; according to Jeremiah (xxvi. 18 sq.) the prophecy of the destruction of Jerusalem just cited was spoken under Hezekiah, and bore fruit in the repentance of king and people, by which the judgment was averted. The allusion beyond doubt is to Hezekiah's work of religious reformation (2 Kings xviii. 4 sq.). It is hardly possible to separate this reformation from the influence of Isaiah, which did not become practical in the conduct of the state till the crisis of Sennacherib's invasion; and the conclusion that Hezekiah was not from the first a reforming king, which is forced on us by many passages of Isaiah, is confirmed by the prophecy of Micah, which, after Hezekiah's accession, still represents wickedness as seated in the high places of the kingdom. The internal disorders of the realm depicted by Micah are also prominent in Isaiah's prophecies; they were closely connected, not only with the foreign complications due to the approach of the Assyrians, but with the break-up of the old agrarian system within Israel, and with the rapid and uncompensated aggrandisement of the nobles during those prosperous years when the conquest of Edom by Amaziah and the occupation of the port of Elath by his son (2 Kings xiv. 7, 22) placed the lucrative trade between the Mediterranean and the Red Sea in the hands of the rulers of Judah. On the other hand the democratic tone which distinguishes Micah from Isaiah, and his announcement of the impending fall of the capital (the deliverance of which from the Assyrian appears to Isaiah as the necessary condition for the preservation of the seed of a new and better kingdom), are explained by the fact that, while Isaiah lived in the centre of affairs, Micah was a Morasthite or inhabitant of Moresheth Gath, a place near the Philistine frontier so unimportant as to be mentioned

only in Micah i. 14.¹ The provincial prophet sees the capital and the aristocracy entirely from the side of a man of the oppressed people, and foretells the utter ruin of both. But this ruin does not present itself to him as involving the captivity or ruin of the nation as a whole; the congregation of Jehovah remains in Judæa when the oppressors are cast out (ii. 5); Jehovah's words are still good to them that walk uprightly; the glory of Israel is driven to take refuge in Adullam, as in the days when David's band of broken men was the true hope of the nation, but there is no hint that it is banished from the land. Thus upon the prophecy of judgment we naturally expect to follow a prophecy of the reintegration of Jehovah's kingship in a better Israel, and this we find in ii. 12, 13 and in chaps. iv., v. Both passages, however, present difficulties. The former seems to break the pointed contrast between ii. 11 and iii. 1, and is therefore regarded by Ewald as an example of the false prophecies on which the wicked rulers trusted. The thought, however, is one proper to all true prophecy (comp. Hos. i. 11 [ii. 2], Isa. xi. 11 sq., Zeph. iii. 14, Jer. xxxi. 8), and precisely in accordance with chaps. iv., v., even in the details of expression and imagery.² It is indeed possible that these verses are a separate oracle of Micah, which did not originally stand in its present connexion. The sequence of thought in chaps. iv., v., on the other hand, is really difficult, and has given rise to much complicated discussion.³ There is a growing feeling among scholars that iv. 11–13 stands in direct contradiction to iv. 9, 10, and indeed to iii. 12. The last two passages agree in speaking of the capture of Jerusalem, the first declares Zion inviolable, and its capture an impossible profanation. Such a thought can hardly be Micah's, even if we resort to the violent harmonistic process of imagining that two quite distinct sieges, separated by a renewal of the theocracy, are spoken of in consecutive verses. An interpolation, however, in the spirit of such passages as Ezek. xxxviii., xxxix., Joel iii. [iv.], Zech. xiv., is very conceivable in post-exilic times, and in connexion with the growing impulse to seek a literal harmony of all prophecy on lines very different from the pre-exilic view in Jer. xxvi.; that predictions of evil may be averted by repentance. Another difficulty lies in the words "and thou shalt come even to Babylon" in iv. 10. Micah unquestionably looked for the destruction of Jerusalem as

¹ That Micah lived in the Shephela or Judæan lowland near the Philistine country is clear from the local colouring of i. 10 sq., where a number of places in this quarter are mentioned together, and their names played upon in a way that could hardly have suggested itself to any but a man of the district. The paronomasia makes the verses difficult, and in i. 14 none of the ancient versions recognizes Moresheth Gath as a proper name. The word Morasthite (*Morashtite*) was therefore obscure to them; but this only gives greater weight to the traditional pronunciation with *sh* in the first syllable, which is as old as the LXX., and goes against the view, taken by the Targum both on Micah and on Jeremiah, and followed by some moderns (including Rooda), that Micah came from Maresah. When Eusebius places *Morasthite* near Eleutheropolis it is not likely that he is thinking of Maresah (Maresa), for he speaks of the former as a village and of the latter as a ruin 2 miles from Eleutheropolis. Jerome too in the *Epit. Paulæ* (*Ep. cviii.*), speaking as an eye-witness, distinguishes Morasthim, with the church of Micah's sepulchre, from Maresa. This indeed was after the pretended miraculous discovery of the relics of Micah in 385 A.D.; but the name of the village which then existed (*Præf. in Mich.*) can hardly have been part of a pious fraud.

² The figure of the shepherd gathering a scattered flock certainly does not presuppose a total captivity, as Stade (*Z. f. A. T. W.*, i. 161 sq.) argues.

³ See, besides the commentaries, Nöldeke in the *Bibel-lex.*, iv. 214; a paper by Oort and two by Kuenen in *Theol. Tijdsch.*, 1872; Wellhausen-Bleek, *Einleitung*, p. 426; Stade, *l.c.*, and *ibid.*, iii. 1 sq. Stade goes so far as to make the whole of Micah iv., v. presuppose the exile, and to find still later additions in iv. 5–10., v. 5, 6 [v. 4, 5]. Giesebrecht, *Theol. LZ.*, 1881, col. 443 sq., rejects chap. iv. only. The arguments cannot be here cited at length, but they are tacitly kept in view in what follows.

well as of Samaria in the near future and by the Assyrians (i. 9), and this was the judgment which Hezekiah's repentance averted. If these words, therefore, belong to the original context, they mark it as not from Micah's hand; but it is easy to see that they are really a later gloss. The prophetic thought is that the daughter (population) of Zion shall not be saved by her present rulers or defensive strength; she must come down from her bulwarks and dwell in the open field; there, and not within her proud ramparts, Jehovah will grant deliverance from her enemies. This thought is in precise harmony with chaps. i.—iii., and equally characteristic is what follows in chap. v. Micah's opposition to present tyranny expresses itself in recurrence to the old popular ideal of the first simple Davidic kingdom (iv. 8) to which he had already alluded in i. 15. These old days shall return once more. Again guerilla bands (*בְּתִירוֹת*) gather to meet the foe as they did in the time of Philistine oppression. A new David, like him whose exploits in the district of Micah's home were still in the mouths of the common people, goes forth from Bethlehem to feed the flock in the strength of Jehovah. The kindred Hebrew nations are once more united to their brethren of Israel (comp. Amos ix. 12, Isa. xvi. 1 sq.). The remnant of Jacob springs up in fresh vigour, inspiring terror among the surrounding peoples; and there is no lack of chosen captains to lead them to victory against the Assyrian foe. In the rejuvenescence of the nation the old stays of that oppressive kingship which began with Solomon, the strongholds, the fortified cities, the chariots and horses so foreign to the life of ancient Israel, are no more known; they disappear together with the divinations, the soothsayers, the idols, the *maçebas* and *asheras* of the high places Jehovah is king on Mount Zion, and no inventions of man come between Him and His people.

The elements of this picture, drawn so largely from the most cherished memories of the Judæans, could not fail to produce a wide impression, especially when the invasion of Sennacherib, although it spared Jerusalem, fulfilled in the most striking way a great part of Micah's predictions of judgment. Of this we have evidence, not only in Jer. xxvi., but in the political and religious ideas of the book of Deuteronomy. The picture of the right king (Deut. xvii. 14 sq.) and the condemnation of the high-places alike follow the doctrine of Micah.

A difficulty still remains in the opening verses of chap. iv. Micah iv. 1–3 and Isa. ii. 2–4 are but slightly modified recensions of the same text, and as Isa. ii. is older than the prophecy of Micah, while on the other hand Micah iv. 4 seems the natural completion of the passage, it is common to suppose that both copy an older prophet. But the words have little connexion with the context in Isaiah, and may be the quotation of a copyist suggested by ver. 5. On the other hand it has been urged that the passage belongs to a later stage of prophetic thought than the 8th century B.C. There is, however, no real difficulty in the idea that foreign nations shall seek law and arbitrament at the throne of the king of Zion (comp. the old prophecy Isa. xvi.); and the mention of the temple as the seat of Jehovah's sovereignty may be illustrated by Isa. vi., where the heavenly palace (Micah i. 3) is at least pictured in the likeness of the temple on Zion. At the same time the Jerusalem of Micah iv. 8 is the Jerusalem of David not of Solomon, the ideas of iv. 1–4 do not reappear in chap. v., and the whole prophecy would perhaps be more consecutive and homogeneous if iv. 6 (where the dispersed and the suffering are, according to chap. ii., the victims of domestic not of foreign oppression) followed directly on iii. 12.

The sixth chapter of Micah presents a very different situation from chaps. i.–v. Jehovah appears to plead with his people for their sins, but the sinners are no longer a careless and oppressive aristocracy buoyed up by deceptive assurances of Jehovah's help, by prophecies of wine and strong drink; they are bowed down by a religion of terror, wearied with attempts to propitiate an angry God by countless offerings, and even by the sacrifice of the first-born. Meantime the substance of true religion—justice, charity, and a humble walk with God—is forgotten, fraud and deceit reign in all classes, the works of the house of Ahab are observed (worship of foreign gods). Jehovah's judgments are multiplied against the land, and the issue can be nothing else than its total desolation. All

these marks fit exactly the evil times of Manasseh as described in 2 Kings xxi. Chap. vii. 1-6, in which the public and private corruption of a hopeless age is bitterly bewailed, obviously belongs to the same context (comp. vol. xiii. p. 415). Micah may very well have lived into Manasseh's reign, but the title in i. 1 does not cover a prophecy which certainly falls after Hezekiah's death, and the style has nothing in common with the earlier part of the book. It is therefore prudent to regard the prophecy, with Ewald, as anonymous. Ewald ascribes the whole of chaps. vi., vii. to one author. Wellhausen, however, remarks with justice that the thread is abruptly broken at vii. 6, and that verses 7-20 represent Zion as already fallen before the heathen and her inhabitants as pining in the darkness of captivity. The hope of Zion is in future restoration after she has patiently borne the chastisement of her sins. Then Jehovah shall arise mindful of His oath to the fathers, Israel shall be forgiven and restored, and the heathen humbled. The faith and hope which breathe in this passage have the closest affinities with the book of Lamentations and Isa. xl.-lxvi.

We have seen that the text of Micah has suffered from redactors; it is also not free from verbal corruptions which make some places very obscure. The LXX. had many readings different from the present Hebrew, but their text too was far from sound. Of commentaries on Micah, that which deals most fully with the question of the text is Rood's Latin work, Leyden, 1869. The most elaborate book on Micah is Caspari's (*Ueber Micha den Morasthiten und seine prophetische Schrift*, Christiania, 1851-52). In English Pocock's *Commentary* (3d ed., 1692) and Cheyne's *Micah* (1882) are to be noted. See also the literature on the minor prophets in general cited under Hosaa, and W. E. Smith's *Prophecy of Israel* (1882). (W. E. S.)

MICHAEL (מִיכָאֵל, "who is like God?") appears in the Old Testament as a man's name, synonymous with Micaiah or Micah. In the book of Daniel the same name is given to one of the chief "princes" of the heavenly host, the guardian angel or "prince" of Israel (Dan. x. 13, 21; xii. 1), and as such he naturally appears in Jewish theosophy as the greatest of all angels, the first of the four who surround the throne of God (see GABRIEL). It is as guardian angel of Israel, or of the church, the true Israel, that Michael appears in Jude 9 and Rev. xii. 7. In the Western Church the festival of St Michael and All Angels (Michaelmas) is celebrated on September 29th; it appears to have grown out of a local celebration of the dedication of a church of St Michael either at Mount Garganus in Apulia or at Rome, and was a great day by the beginning of the 9th century. The Greek Church dedicates November 8 to St Michael, St Gabriel, and All Angels.

MICHAEL, the name of several Byzantine emperors.

MICHAEL I. (Rhangabé) was an obscure nobleman who had married Procopia, the daughter of Nicephorus I., and been made master of the palace; his elevation to the throne was due to a revolutionary movement against his brother-in-law Stauracius, who reigned only two months after the death of Nicephorus on the battlefield (812). Elected as the tool of the bigoted orthodox party in the church, Michael diligently persecuted the Iconoclasts on the northern and eastern frontiers of the empire, but meanwhile allowed the Bulgarians to ravage a great part of Macedonia and Thrace; having at last taken the field in the spring of 813, he was defeated near Bersinikia, and Leo the Armenian was saluted emperor in his stead in the following summer. Michael, after having been compelled to become a monk, was permitted thenceforward to live unmolested in the island of Prote, where he died in 845.

MICHAEL II. (The Stammerer), a native of Amorium in Phrygia, was of humble origin, and began life as a private soldier, but rose by his talents and assiduity to the rank of general. He was one of those who had favoured the election to the throne of his old companion in arms Leo the Armenian in 813, but, detected in a conspiracy against the government of that emperor, had been sentenced to death in December 820; his partisans, however, succeeded in assassinating Leo on the morning of Christmas Day, and called Michael from the prison to the throne. The principal features of his reign (820-829) were a protracted struggle (of nearly three years) against his brother general, Thomas, who aimed at the throne, the conquest of Crete by the Saracens in 823, and the beginning of their attacks upon Sicily (827). Conciliatory on the whole,

in his policy towards the image worshippers (his own sympathies were iconoclastic), he incurred the wrath of the monks by entering into a second marriage with Euphrosyne, daughter of Constantine VI., who had previously taken the veil. He died in October 829, and was succeeded by Theophilus his son.

MICHAEL III. (The Drunkard) was the grandson of Michael the Stammerer, and succeeded his father Theophilus when only three years of age (842). Until his majority at the age of eighteen the affairs of the empire were managed by the empress-regent his mother Theodora; his education was shamefully neglected, and it was during this period that Michael formed the disgraceful personal habits which are indicated by his surname. In 861 Michael, together with his uncle Bardas, undertook an expedition against the Bulgarians, which resulted in the conversion of the Bulgarian king, who thenceforth bore the Christian name of Michael. The emperor had been less successful in the campaign which he led in person against Omar of Melitene in 860, but in 863 his uncle Petronas gained an important victory over the Saracens in Asia Minor. The year 865 was marked by the first appearance of the Russians in the Bosphorus. Michael was assassinated in his palace in 867 by Basilus the Macedonian, whom he had associated with himself in the empire in the previous year.

MICHAEL IV. (The Paphlagonian) owed his elevation to Zoe, daughter of Constantine IX., the last of the Macedonian dynasty; this princess was married to Romanus III., but becoming enamoured of Michael, her chamberlain, she poisoned her husband and married her attendant (1034). Michael, however, being of a weak character and subject to epileptic fits, possessed the supreme power only in name, and was a mere instrument in the hands of his brother, John the Eunuch, who had been first minister both of Constantine and Romanus. John's diplomacy was successful in keeping the Arabs in the archipelago and Egypt quiet for some time, and he was at last able to secure a victory for the imperial arms at Edessa in 1037. The attempt to recover Sicily in the following year with the help of the Normans was less prosperous, and in 1040 the island wholly ceased to be a Byzantine province. About the same time, the Bulgarians having overrun Macedonia and Thrace, and threatening Constantinople, the indolent and infirm emperor, to the surprise alike of friends and foes, put himself at the head of the army, and not only drove the enemy beyond the frontier, but followed them into their own territory. He died, shortly after his triumph, on December 10, 1041.

MICHAEL V. (Calaphates or The Caulker), nephew and successor of the preceding, derived his surname from his father Stephen, who had originally followed the occupation of a caulker of ships. He owed his elevation (December 1041) to his uncle John, whom along with Zoe he almost immediately banished; this led to a popular tumult and his dethronement after a brief reign of four months (April 1042). He lived for many years afterwards in the quiet obscurity of a monastery.

MICHAEL VI. (The Warlike) was already an old man when chosen by the empress Theodora as her successor shortly before her death in 1056. His government was feeble in the extreme, and he was at last compelled to abdicate by Isaac Comnenus, who had defeated his army in Phrygia (August 1057). He also spent the rest of his life in a monastery.

MICHAEL VII. (Ducas or Parapinaees) was the eldest son of Constantine XI. Ducas, by whom along with his brothers Andronicus I. and Constantine XII. he was invested with the title of Augustus; this joint succession took place in 1067, but in 1071 it suited the policy of the uncle Joannes Cæsar to make Michael sole emperor. For

this position Michael, whose "character was degraded, rather than ennobled, by the virtues of a monk and the learning of a sophist," was by no means fitted, and at length two generals of the name of Nicephorus, surnamed Bryennius and Botaniates, simultaneously rebelled against him in 1078; with hardly a struggle he resigned the purple and retired into a monastery, where he afterwards received the title of archbishop of Ephesus.

MICHAEL VIII. (Palæologus), born in 1234, was the son of Andronicus Palæologus Comnenus and Irene Angela the granddaughter of Alexius Angelus, emperor of Constantinople. At an early age he rose to distinction, and ultimately became commander of the French mercenaries in the employment of the emperors of Nicæa. A few days after the death of Theodore Lascaris II. in 1259, Michael, by the assassination of Muzalon (which he is believed but not proved to have encouraged), succeeded to the guardianship, shared with the patriarch Arsenius, of the young emperor John Lascaris, then a lad of only eight years. Afterwards invested with the title of "despot," he was finally proclaimed joint-emperor, and crowned alone at Nicæa on January 1, 1260. In the following year (July 1261) Constantinople fell into the hands of the Cæsar Alexius Strategopulus, and Michael, having got himself crowned anew in the church of St Sophia, caused his boy colleague to be blinded and sent into banishment. For this last act he was excommunicated by Arsenius, and the ban was not removed until six years afterwards (1268), on the accession of a new patriarch. In 1263 and 1264 respectively Michael, with the help of Urban IV., concluded peace with Villehardouin, prince of Achaia, and Michael, despot of Epirus, who had previously been incited by the pope to attack him; the friendly intervention had been secured by a promise on the emperor's part to help forward the reunion of the Eastern and Western churches. In 1269 Charles of Sicily, aided by John of Thessaly, again made war with the alleged purpose of restoring Baldwin to the throne of Constantinople, and pressed Michael so hard that ultimately, yielding to the importunities of Gregory X., he caused the deputies of the Eastern church to attend the council of Lyons (1274) and there accept the "filioque" and papal supremacy. The union thus brought about between the two churches was, however, extremely distasteful to the Greeks, and the persecution of his "schismatic" subjects to which the emperor was compelled to resort weakened his power so much that Martin IV. was tempted to enter into alliance with Charles of Anjou and the Venetians for the purpose of reconquering Constantinople. The invasion, however, failed, and Michael so far had his revenge in the "Sicilian Vespers," which he helped to bring about. He died in Thrace in December 1282, and was succeeded by his son Andronicus II.

MICHAEL IX. (Palæologus) was the son of Andronicus II., and was associated with him on the throne from 1295, but predeceased him (1320).

MICHAELIS, JOHANN DAVID (1717-1791), one of the most influential scholars and teachers of last century, belonged to a family which had the chief part in maintaining that solid discipline in Hebrew and the cognate languages which distinguished the university of Halle in the period of Pietism. Johann Heinrich Michaelis (1668-1738) was the chief director of Francke's *Collegium Orientale Theologicum*, a practical school of Biblical and Oriental philology then quite unique, and the author of an annotated Hebrew Bible and various exegetical works of reputation, especially the *Adnotationes uberiores in Hagiographos*, 1720. In his chief publications J. H. Michaelis had as fellow-worker his sister's son Christian Benedict Michaelis (1680-1764), the father of Johann David, who

was likewise influential as professor at Halle, and a very sound scholar, especially in Syriac. J. D. Michaelis was trained for academical life under his father's eye. Halle was not then the best of universities; a narrow theological spirit cramped all intellectual activity, and the eager vivacious youth, already distinguished by a love for realities and a distaste for small pedantries, found much of the teaching wearisome enough. He acquired, however, a good knowledge of the Latin classics,—Greek, he tells us, was hardly taught at all, and his knowledge of Greek literature was gained by his own reading in later years,—learned all that his father could teach, and was influenced, especially in philosophy, by Baumgarten, the link between the old Pietism and Semler, while he cultivated his strong taste for history under Ludwig. In the winter-semester 1739-40 he qualified as university lecturer. One of his dissertations was a defence of the antiquity and divine authority of the vowel points in Hebrew. His scholarship still moved in the old traditional lines in which no further progress was possible, and he was also much exercised by religious scruples, the conflict of an independent mind with that submission to authority at the expense of reason encouraged by the type of Lutheranism in which he had been trained. A long visit to England in 1741-42 lifted him out of the narrow groove of his earlier education. In passing through Holland he made the acquaintance of the great Schultens, whose influence on his philological views was not immediate, but became all-powerful a few years later. England offered to him no such commanding personal influence, and he was not yet able to turn to profit the stores of the great libraries, but his personality was strengthened by contact with a larger life, and his theological views were turned aside from the pietistic channel. Michaelis never ceased to regard himself as essentially orthodox, though he did not feel able fully to subscribe the Lutheran articles, and more than once declined on this account to be professor of theology. But his views acquired a distinctly rationalistic complexion, and the orthodoxy of his Göttingen lectures and publications on dogmatic (delivered from a philosophical chair) is of a very washed-out kind. His really useful work, however, lay in other directions; the change of his theological views was important because it relieved him from trammels that hampered the free course of his development as a scholar. From England Michaelis went back to Halle; but he felt himself out of place, and in 1745 gladly accepted an invitation to Göttingen as privat-docent. In 1746 he became extraordinary, in 1750 ordinary, professor, and in Göttingen he remained till his death in 1791. In the first years of his new position Michaelis passed through a second education. In the young and intellectually vigorous Georgia Augusta he came under the powerful personal influence of such men as Gesner and Haller. His intellect was active in many directions; universal learning indeed was perhaps one of his foibles. Literature—modern as well as ancient—occupied his attention; one of his works was a translation of four parts of *Clarissa*; and translations of some of the then current English paraphrases on Biblical books manifested his sympathy with a school which, if not very learned, attracted him by its freer air. His Oriental studies were reshaped by diligent perusal of the works of Schultens; for the Halle school, with all its learning, had no conception of the principles on which a fruitful connexion between Biblical and Oriental learning can be established. His linguistic work indeed was always hampered by the lack of MS. material which is felt in his philological writings, e.g., in his valuable *Supplementa* to the Hebrew lexicons (1784-92).¹ He could not become

¹ By a strange fortune of war it was the occupation of Göttingen by the French in the Seven Years' War, and the friendly relations he