

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 Isaiah* (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).<sup>1</sup> He could not become

<sup>1</sup> 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

such an Arabist as Reiske; and, though for many years the most famous teacher of Semitic languages in Europe, he had little of the higher philological faculty, and neither his grammatical nor his critical work, highly praised as it then was, has left a permanent mark, with the exception perhaps of his text-critical studies on the Peshito.<sup>1</sup> His tastes were all for *realia*—history, antiquities, especially geography and natural science; in his autobiography he half regrets that he did not choose the medical profession. Here he found a field hardly touched since Bochart, in whose footsteps he followed in the *Spicilegium geographiae Hebraeorum exterae post Bochartum* (1769–80). To his impulse we owe the famous Eastern expedition of Von Haven, Forskål, and Niebuhr. He prepared the instructions for their journey, and drew up a series of questions and elucidations to guide their researches, which place in strong relief his comprehensive grasp of all that was then known of the East, and the keen delight in the knowledge of tangible and natural things, paired with a sober and patient judgment, which was his chief intellectual characteristic. The best part of this knowledge was turned to the profit of Biblical study; in his exegetical writings, for example, one of the main features is what was then the novelty of illustrations from Eastern travel. In spite of his doctrinal writings—which at the time made no little noise, so that his *Compendium of Dogmatic* (1760) was confiscated in Sweden, and the knighthood of the North Star was afterwards given him in reparation—it was the natural side of the Bible that really attracted him, and no man did more to introduce the modern method of studying Hebrew antiquity as an integral part of ancient Eastern life. The permanent influence of his works indeed has not been great, and many of them are now hardly readable; for, with all his historic tastes and learning, he had no large historic conceptions, and, what is closely akin to this defect, was singularly deficient in imagination and poetic sympathy. But the vivacity of his mind, his manysidedness, his singularly attractive though discursive method of lecturing, and above all his power of feeling and inspiring interest in every kind of fact, was a potent stimulus much needed in the Germany of that age, and did not soon die. Different as the three men are, there is a true historic nexus between the three great Göttingen Orientalists, Michaelis, Eichhorn, and Ewald.

The personal character of Michaelis can be read between the lines of his autobiography with the aid of the other materials collected by the editor Hassencamp (*J. D. Michaelis Lebensbeschreibung, &c.*, 1793). To understand the secret of his enormous influence, it is not enough to read his books, now for the most part dull enough to us; we must see the upright vivacious laborious man, with a good deal of worldly prudence and a good deal of temper, much absorbed in his manifold academic activities in the university and Royal Society of Göttingen, yet ever full of interest in the larger world, and of shrewd judgments and lively talk, with a strong sense of his rights and dignity, yet with a good and warm heart; shining especially in the lecture-room, where he dealt forth knowledge with discursive hand from a full store, displaying the methods as well as the results of his all-sided research, not without a touch of the vanity of the polyhistor, and loving to leave the chair under a storm of applause at a parting bon-mot which he acknowledged at the door in a backward glance of triumph. The same volume contains a full list of his works. Besides those already mentioned it is sufficient to refer to his New Testament *Introduction* (the first edition, 1750, preceded the full development of his powers, and is a very different book from the later editions), his reprint of Lowth's *Praelectiones* with important additions (1758–62), his German translation of the Bible with notes (1773–92), his *Orientalische und Exegetische Bibliothek* (1775–85), and *Neue O. und E. Bib.* (1786–91), his *Mosaisches Recht* (1770–71), and his edition of Castle's *Lexicon Syriacum* (1787–88). His *Litterarischer Briefwechsel* (1794–96) contains much that is interesting for the history of learning in his time.

(W. R. S.)

formed with the officers, that procured him the Paris MS. from which he edited Abulfeda's description of Egypt.

<sup>1</sup> *Cura in Actus Apostolorum Syriacos*, 1755.

MICHAUD, JOSEPH (1767–1839), French historian and publicist, was born of an old family on June 19, 1767, at Albens, Savoy, was educated at Bourg-en-Bresse, and afterwards engaged in literary work at Lyons, where the events of 1789 first called into activity the dislike to revolutionary principles which manifested itself throughout the rest of his life. In 1791 he went to Paris, where, not without danger, he took part in editing several royalist journals. In 1794 he started *La Quotidienne*, for his connexion with which he was arrested after the 13th of Vendémiaire; he succeeded in escaping his captors, but was sentenced to death *par contumace* by the military council. Having resumed the editorship of his newspaper on the establishment of the Directory, he was again proscribed on the 18th of Fructidor, but at the close of two years returned to Paris when the consulate had superseded the Directory. His Bourbon sympathies led to a brief imprisonment in 1800, and on his release he for the time abandoned journalism, and began to write or edit books. Along with his brother and two colleagues he published in 1806 a *Biographie moderne, ou dictionnaire des hommes qui se sont fait un nom en Europe depuis 1789*, the earliest work of its kind; in 1808 the first volume of his *Histoire des Croisades* appeared, and in 1811 he originated the *Biographie Universelle*. In 1814 he resumed the editorship of the *Quotidienne*, and in the same year was elected Academician. In 1815 his brochure entitled *Histoire des quinze Semaines ou le dernier règne de Bonaparte met* with extraordinary success, passing through twenty-seven editions within a very short time. His political services were now rewarded with the cross of an officer in the Legion of Honour and the modest post of king's reader, of which last he was deprived in 1827 for having opposed Peyronnet's "Loi d'Amour" against the freedom of the press. In 1830–31 he travelled in Syria and Egypt for the purpose of collecting additional materials for the *Histoire des Croisades*; his correspondence with a fellow explorer, Poujoulat, consisting practically of discussions and elucidations of various important points in that work, was afterwards published (*Correspondance d'Orient*, 7 vols., 1832–35). The *Bibliothèque des Croisades*, in four volumes more, contained the "pièces justificatives" of the *Histoire*. Michaud died on September 30, 1839, at Passy, where his home had been since 1832. His *Histoire des Croisades* was published in its final form in six volumes in 1841 under the editorship of his friend Poujoulat (9th ed., with appendix, by Huillard-Bréholles, 1856). Michaud along with Poujoulat also edited and in part wrote *Nouvelle Collection des Mémoires pour servir à l'Histoire de France*, 32 vols., 1836–44. See Sainte-Beuve, *Causeries du Lundi*, vol. vii.

MICHAUX, ANDRÉ (1746–1802), a French botanist, best known for his works on the flora of North America and as a botanical traveller. In 1779 he spent some time botanizing in England, and in 1780 he explored Auvergne, the Pyrenees, and the north of Spain. In 1782 he was sent by the French Government on a botanical mission to Persia. His journey began unfavourably, as he was robbed by Arabs of all his equipments except his books; but he gained influential support in Persia, having cured the shah of a dangerous illness. After two years he returned to France with a fine herbarium, and also introduced numerous Eastern plants into the botanic gardens of France. In 1785 he was sent by the French Government to North America, and travelled through Canada, Nova Scotia, and the United States as far west as the Mississippi. The outbreak of the French Revolution deprived him of means to continue his work in America, and in 1796 he returned to France. He was shipwrecked, and lost most of his collections on the voyage. In 1800

he went to Madagascar to investigate the flora of that island, and died there in 1802. His work as a botanist was chiefly done in the field, and he added largely to what was previously known of the botany of the East and of America. He also introduced many plants into European botanic gardens. He wrote two valuable works on North-American plants,—the *Histoire des chênes de l'Amérique Septentrionale* (1801), with 36 plates, and the *Flora Boreali-Americana* (1803), 2 vols., with 51 plates.

MICHAUX, FRANÇOIS ANDRÉ (1770–1855), son of the preceding, was, like his father, employed by the French Government to explore the forests of North America with a view to the introduction into France of trees valuable for their wood or other products. He was very successful in carrying out this object. He published in 1810–13 a *Histoire des Arbres forestières de l'Amérique Septentrionale*, in 3 vols., with 156 plates, a work full of information on the characters, uses, distribution, and other points of interest in the various species. In 1817–19 a translation of it appeared under the title *North American Sylva*. He also wrote a *Voyage à l'Ouest des Monts Alléghany*, 1804, besides articles in scientific magazines.

MICHELANGELO (1475–1564). Michelangelo Buonarroti, best known simply as Michelangelo, the last and most famous of the great artists of Florence, was the son of Ludovico Buonarroti, a poor gentleman of that city, and of his wife Francesca di Nerl. Ludovico was barely able to live on the income of his estate, but made it his boast that he had never stooped to add to it by mercantile or mechanical pursuits. The favour of the Medici procured him employment in some minor offices of state, and in the autumn of 1474 he was appointed resident magistrate of Caprese, in the Casentino, for a period of six months. Thither he accordingly repaired with his family, and there, on March 6, 1475, his second son Michelagnolo or Michelangelo was born. Immediately afterwards the family returned to Florence, and the child was put to nurse with a marble-worker's wife of Settignano. His mother's health had already, it would seem, begun to fail; at all events in about two years from this time, after she had borne her husband two more sons, she died. While still a young boy, Michelangelo determined in spite of his father's opposition to be an artist. He had sucked in the passion, as he himself used to say, with his foster-mother's milk. After a sharp struggle, his stubborn will overcame his father's pride of gentility, and at thirteen he got himself articulated as a paid assistant in the workshop of the brothers Ghirlandaio. Domenico Ghirlandaio, bred a jeweller, had become by this time the foremost painter of Florence. In his service the young Michelangelo laid the foundations of that skill in fresco with which twenty years afterwards he confounded his detractors at Rome. He studied also, like all the Florentine artists of that age, in the Brancacci chapel, where the frescoes of Masaccio, painted some sixty years before, still victoriously held their own; and here, in a quarrel with an ill-conditioned fellow-student, Torrigiani, he received the blow of which his face bore the marks to his dying day.

Though Michelangelo's earliest studies were directed towards painting, he was by nature and predilection much more inclined to sculpture. In that art he presently received encouragement and training under the eye of an illustrious patron, Lorenzo dei Medici. On the recommendation, it is said, of Ghirlandaio, he was transferred, before the term of his apprenticeship as a painter had expired, to the school of sculpture established by Lorenzo in the Medici gardens. Here he could learn to match himself against his great predecessor, Donatello, one of whose pupils was the director of the school, and to compare the works of that master and his Tuscan contemporaries

with the antiques collected for the instruction of the scholars. Here, too, he could listen to discourses on Platonism, and steep himself in the doctrines of an enthusiastic philosophy which sought to reconcile with Christian faith the lore and the doctrines of the Academy. Michelangelo remained a Christian Platonist to the end of his days; he was also from his youth up a devoted student of Dante. His powers of mind and hand soon attracted attention, and secured him the regard and favour of his patrons in spite of his rugged, unsocial exterior, and of a temper which at best was but a half-smothered volcano.

Michelangelo had been attached to the school and household of the Medici for barely three years when, in 1492, his great patron Lorenzo died. Lorenzo's son Piero dei Medici inherited the position, but not the qualities, of his father; Florence soon chafed under his authority; and towards the autumn of 1494 it became apparent that disaster was impending over him and his adherents. Michelangelo was constitutionally subject to dark and sudden presentiments: one such seized him now, and, without awaiting the popular outbreak which soon followed, he took horse with two companions and fled to Bologna. There, being now in his twentieth year, he was received with kindness by a member of the Aldovrandi family, and on his commission executed two figures of saints, and one of an angel, for the shrine of St Dominic in the church of St Petronius. After about a year, work at Bologna failing, and his name having been included in his absence on the list of artists appointed to provide a new hall of assembly for the Great Council of Florence, Michelangelo returned home. The strange theocracy established by Savonarola was now in force, and the whole character of civic life at Florence was for the time being changed. But Michelangelo was not left without employment. He found a friend in another Lorenzo, the son of Pierfrancesco dei Medici, for whom he at this time executed a statue of the boy St John. Having also carved a recumbent Cupid in imitation of the antique, it was suggested to him by the same patron that it should be so tinted and treated as to look like a real antique, and sold accordingly. Without increasing the price he put upon the work, Michelangelo for amusement lent himself to the counterfeit, and the piece was then actually sold for a large sum to a Roman collector, the cardinal San Giorgio, as a genuine work of antiquity,—the dealer appropriating the profits. When presently the cardinal discovered the fraud, he caused the dealer to refund; but as to Michelangelo himself, it was represented to the young sculptor that if he went to Rome, the amateur who had just involuntarily paid so high a tribute to his skill would certainly befriend him. He set forth accordingly, and arrived at Rome for the first time at the end of June 1496. Such hopes as he may have entertained of countenance from the cardinal San Giorgio were quickly dispelled. Neither did the banished Piero dei Medici, who also was now living at Rome, do anything to help him. On the other hand Michelangelo won the favour of a Roman nobleman, Jacopo Galli, and through him of the French cardinal Jean de Villiers de la Grolaie, abbot of St Denis. From the former he received a commission for a Cupid and a Bacchus, from the latter for a *Pietà*, or Mary lamenting over the body of Christ,—works of which probably all three, the last two certainly, are preserved. Michelangelo's stay in Rome at this time lasted five years, from the summer of 1496 till that of 1501. The interval had been one of extreme political distraction at Florence. The excitement of the French invasion, the mystic and ascetic regimen of Savonarola, the reaction which led to his overthrow, and finally the external wars and internal dissidences which preceded a new settlement, had all created an atmosphere most unfavourable to art.