

The Comte de la Marck was a Flemish lord of the house of Aremberg, who had been proprietary colonel of a regiment in the service of France; he was a close friend of the queen, and had been elected a member of the states-general. His acquaintance with Mirabeau, commenced in 1788, ripened during the following year into a friendship, which La Marck hoped to turn to the advantage of the court. After the events of the 5th and 6th of October he consulted Mirabeau as to what measures the king ought to take, and Mirabeau, delighted at the opportunity, drew up an admirable state-paper, which was presented to the king by Monsieur, afterwards Louis XVIII. The whole of this *Mémoire* should be read to get an adequate idea of Mirabeau's genius for politics; here it must be merely summarized.

The main position is that the king is not free in Paris; he must therefore leave Paris and appeal to France. "Paris n'en veut que l'argent; les provinces demandent des lois." But where must the king go? "Se retirer à Metz ou sur toute autre frontière serait déclarer la guerre à la nation et abdiquer le trône. Un roi qui est la seule sauvegarde de son peuple ne fuit point devant son peuple; il le prend pour juge de sa conduite et de ses principes." He must then go towards the interior of France to a provincial capital, best of all to Rouen, and there he must appeal to the people and summon a great convention. It would be ruin to appeal to the noblesse, as the queen advised: "un corps de noblesse n'est point une armée, qui puisse combattre." When this great convention met, the king must show himself ready to recognize that great changes have taken place, that feudalism and absolutism have for ever disappeared, and that a new relation between king and people has arisen, which must be loyally observed on both sides for the future. "Il est certain, d'ailleurs, qu'il faut une grande révolution pour sauver le royaume, que la nation a des droits, qu'elle est en chemin de les recouvrer tous, et qu'il faut non seulement les rétablir, mais les consolider." To establish this new constitutional position between king and people would not be difficult, because "l'indivisibilité du monarque et du peuple est dans le cœur de tous les Français: il faut qu'elle existe dans l'action et le pouvoir."

Such was Mirabeau's programme, which he never diverged from, but which was far too statesmanlike to be understood by the poor king, and far too positive as to the altered condition of the monarchy to be palatable to the queen. Mirabeau followed up his *Mémoire* by a scheme of a great ministry to contain all men of mark,—Necker as prime minister, "to render him as powerless as he is incapable, and yet preserve his popularity for the king," the archbishop of Bordeaux, the Duc de Liancourt, the Duc de la Rochefoucauld, La Marck, Talleyrand bishop of Autun at the finances, Mirabeau without portfolio, Target mayor of Paris, Lafayette generalissimo to reform the army, Ségur (foreign affairs), Mounier, and Chapelier. This scheme got noised abroad, and was ruined by a decree of the Assembly of November 7, 1789, that no member of the Assembly could become a minister; this decree destroyed any chance of that necessary harmony between the ministry and the majority of the representatives of the nation existing in England, and so at once overthrew Mirabeau's present hopes and any chance of the permanence of the constitution then being devised. The queen utterly refused to take Mirabeau's counsel, and La Marck left Paris. However, in April 1790 he was suddenly recalled by the Comte de Mercy-Argenteau, the Austrian ambassador at Paris, and the queen's most trusted political adviser, and from this time to Mirabeau's death he became the medium of almost daily communications between the latter and the queen. Mirabeau at first attempted again to make an alliance with Lafayette by a letter in which he says, "Les Barnave, les Dupont, les Lameth ne vous fatiguent plus de leur active inaction; on s'ingse longtemps l'adresse, non pas la force." But it was useless to appeal to Lafayette; he was not a strong man himself, and did not appreciate "la force" in others. From the month of May 1790 to his death in April 1791 Mirabeau remained in close and suspected but not actually proved connexion with the court, and drew

up many admirable state-papers for it. In return the court paid his debts; but it ought never to be said that he was bribed, for the gold of the court never made him swerve from his political principles—never, for instance, made him a royalist. He regarded himself as a minister, though an unavowed one, and believed himself worthy of his hire! Undoubtedly his character would have been more admirable if he had acted without court assistance, but it must be remembered that his services deserved some reward, and that by remaining at Paris as a politician he had been unable to realize his paternal inheritance. Before his influence on foreign policy is discussed, his behaviour on several important points must be noticed. On the great question of the veto he took a practical view, and seeing that the royal power was already sufficiently weakened, declared for the king's absolute veto, and against the compromise of the suspensive veto. He knew from his English experiences that such a veto would be hardly ever used unless the king felt the people were on his side, in which case it would be a useful check on the representatives of the people, and also that if it was used unjustifiably the power of the purse possessed by the representatives and the very constitutional organization of the people would, as in England in 1688, bring about a bloodless revolution, and a change in the person entrusted with the royal dignity. He saw also that much of the inefficiency of the Assembly arose from the inexperience of the members, and their incurable verbosity; so, to establish some system of rules, he got his friend Romilly to draw up a detailed account of the rules and customs of the English House of Commons, which he translated into French, but which the Assembly, puffed up by a belief in its own merits, refused to use. On the great subject of peace and war he supported the king's authority, and with some success. What was the good of an executive which had no power? Let it be responsible to the representatives of the nation by all means; but if the representatives absorbed all executive power by perpetual interference, there would be six hundred kings of France instead of one, which would hardly be a change for the better. Again Mirabeau almost alone of the Assembly understood the position of the army under a limited monarchy. Contrary to the theorists, he held that the soldier ceased to be a citizen when he became a soldier; he must submit to be deprived of his liberty to think and act, and must recognize that a soldier's first duty is obedience. With such sentiments, it is no wonder that he approved of Bouillé's vigorous conduct at Nancy, which was the more to his credit as Bouillé was the one hope of the court influences opposed to him. Lastly, in matters of finance he showed his wisdom: he attacked Necker's "caisse d'escompte," which was to have the whole control of the taxes, as absorbing the Assembly's power of the purse; and he heartily approved of the system of assignats, but with the important reservation that they should not be issued to the extent of more than one-half the value of the lands to be sold. This restriction was not observed, and it was solely the enormous over-issue of assignats that caused their great depreciation in value.

Of Mirabeau's attitude with regard to foreign affairs it is necessary to speak in more detail. He held it to be just that the French people should conduct their Revolution as they would, and that no foreign nation had any right to interfere with them, so long as they kept themselves strictly to their own affairs. But he knew also that neighbouring nations looked with unquiet eyes on the progress of affairs in France, that they feared the influence of the Revolution on their own peoples, and that foreign monarchs were being prayed by the French émigrés to interfere on behalf of the French monarchy. To prevent this interference, or rather to give no pretext for it was his guiding thought as

to foreign policy. He had been elected a member of the comité diplomatique of the Assembly in July 1790, and became its reporter at once, and in this capacity he was able to prevent the Assembly from doing much harm in regard to foreign affairs. He had long known Montmorin, the foreign secretary, and, as matters became more strained from the complications with the princes and counts of the empire, he entered into daily communication with the minister, advised him on every point, and, while dictating his policy, defended it in the Assembly. Thus in this particular instance of the foreign office, for the few months before Mirabeau's death, a harmony was established between the minister and the Assembly through Mirabeau, which checked for a time the threatened approach of foreign intervention, and maintained the honour of France abroad. Mirabeau's exertions in this respect are not his smallest title to the name of statesman; and how great a work he did is best proved by the confusion which ensued in this department of affairs upon his death.

For indeed in the beginning of 1791 his death was very near; and he knew it to be so. The wild excesses of his youth and their terrible punishment had weakened his strong constitution, and his parliamentary labours completed the work. So surely did he feel its approach that some time before the end he sent all his papers over to his old English friend and schoolfellow Sir Gilbert Elliot, who kept them under seal until claimed by Mirabeau's executors. In March his illness was evidently gaining on him, to his great grief, because he knew how much depended on his life, and felt that he alone could yet save France from the distrust of her monarch and the present reforms, and from the foreign interference, which would assuredly bring about catastrophes unparalleled in the history of the world. On his life hung the future course of the Revolution. Every care that science could afford was given by his friend and physician, the famous chemist Cabanis, to whose brochure on his last illness and death the reader may refer. The people, whose faith in him revived in spite of all suspicions, when they heard that he was on his death-bed, kept the street in which he lay quiet; but medical care, the loving solicitude of friends, and the respect of all the people could not save his life. His vanity appears in its most gigantic proportions in his last utterances during his illness; but many of them have something grand in their sound, as his last reported expression, when he looked upon the sun—"If he is not God, he is at least His cousin-german." When he could speak no more he wrote with a feeble hand, the one word "dormir." and on April 2, 1791, he died.

With Mirabeau died, it has been said, the last hope of the monarchy; but, with Marie Antoinette supreme at court, can it be said that there could ever have been any real hope for the monarchy? Had she been but less like her imperious mother, Louis would have made a constitutional monarch, but her will was as strong as Mirabeau's own, and the Bourbon monarchy had to meet its fate. The subsequent events of the Revolution justified Mirabeau's prognostications in his first *mémoire* of October 15, 1789. The royal family fled towards the German frontier, and from that moment there sunk deep into the hearts of the people not only of Paris, but of the provinces, a conviction that the king and queen were traitors to France, which led inevitably to their execution. The noblesse and the foreign aid on which the queen relied proved but a source of weakness. The noblesse, Mirabeau had said, was no army which could fight; and truly the army of the émigrés could do nothing against revolutionary France in arms. The intervention of foreign aid only sealed the king's fate, and forwarded the progress of the Revolution, not in a course of natural development, but to the terrible resource of the Reign of Terror. With regard to the Assembly too, and its constitution, Mirabeau had shown his foresight. The constitution of 1791, excellent as it was on paper, and well adapted to an ideal state, did not deal adequately with the great problems of the time in France, and by its ridiculous weakening of the executive was unsuited to a modern state. Surely if events ever proved a man's political sagacity, the history of the French Revolution proved Mirabeau's.

A few words must be added on Mirabeau's manner of work and his character.

No man ever so thoroughly used other men's work, and yet made it all seem his own. "Je prends mon bien où je le trouve" is as true of him as of Molière. His first literary work, except the bombastic but eloquent *Essai sur le Despotisme*, was a translation of Watson's *Philip II.*, accomplished in Holland with the help of Durival; his *Considérations sur l'ordre de Cincinnatus* was based on an American pamphlet, and the notes to it were contributed by Target; while his financial writings were all suggested by the Genevese exile Clavières. During the Revolution he received yet more help; men were proud to labour for him, and did not murmur because he absorbed all the credit and fame. Dumont, Clavières, Duroveray, Pellenc, Lamourette, and Reybaz were but a few of the most distinguished of his collaborators. Dumont was a Genevese exile, and an old friend of Romilly's, who willingly prepared for him those famous addresses which Mirabeau used to make the Assembly pass by sudden bursts of eloquent declamation; Clavières and Duroveray helped him in finance, and not only worked out his figures, but even wrote his financial discourses. Pellenc was his secretary, and wrote the speeches on the goods of the clergy and the right of making peace, and even the Abbé Lamourette wrote the speeches on the civil constitution of the clergy. Reybaz, whose personality has only been revealed within these last ten years, not only wrote for him his famous speeches on the assignats, the organization of the national guard, &c., which Mirabeau read word for word at the tribune, but even the posthumous speech on succession to estates of intestates, which Talleyrand read in the Assembly as the last work of his dead friend. Yet neither the gold of the court nor another man's conviction would make Mirabeau say what he did not himself believe, or do what he did not himself think right. He took other men's labour as his due, and impressed their words, of which he had suggested the underlying ideas, with the stamp of his own individuality; his collaborators themselves did not complain,—they were but too glad to be of help in the great work of controlling and forwarding the French Revolution through its greatest thinker and orator. True is that remark of Goethe's to Eckermann, after reading Dumont's *Souvenirs*: "At last the wonderful Mirabeau becomes natural to us, while at the same time the hero loses nothing of his greatness. Some French journalists think differently. . . . The French look upon Mirabeau as their Hercules, and they are perfectly right. But they forget that even the Colossus consists of individual parts, and that the Hercules of antiquity is a collective being—a gigantic personification of deeds done by himself and by others."

There was something gigantic about all Mirabeau's thoughts and deeds. The excesses of his youth were beyond all bounds, and severely were they punished; his vanity was immense, but never spoiled his judgment; his talents were enormous, but could yet make use of those of others. As a statesman his wisdom is indubitable, but by no means universally recognized in his own country. Lovers of the *ancien régime* abuse its most formidable and logical opponent; believers in the Constituent Assembly cannot be expected to care for the most redoubtable adversary of their favourite theorists, while admirers of the republic of every description agree in calling him from his connexion with the court the traitor Mirabeau. As an orator more justice has been done him: his eloquence has been likened to that of both Bossuet and Vergniaud, but it had neither the polish of the old 17th-century bishop nor the flashes of genius of the young Girondin. It was rather parliamentary oratory in which he excelled, and his true compeers are rather Burke and Fox than any French speakers. Personally he had that which is the truest mark of nobility of mind, a power of attracting love, and winning faithful friends. "I always loved him," writes Sir Gilbert Elliot to his brother Hugh; and Romilly, who was not given to lavish praise, says, "I have no doubt that in his public conduct, as in his writings, he was desirous of doing good, that his ambition was of the noblest kind, and that he proposed to himself the noblest ends." What more favourable judgment could be passed on an ambitious man! What finer epitaph could a statesman desire!

The best edition of Mirabeau's works is that published by Blanchard in 1822, in 10 vols., of which two contain his *Œuvres oratoires*; from this collection, however, many of his less important works, and the *Monarchie Prussienne*, in 4 vols., 1788, are omitted. For his life consult *Mirabeau: Mémoires sur sa vie littéraire et privée*, 4 vols., 1824, and, what is of most importance, *Mémoires biographiques, littéraires, et politiques de Mirabeau écrits par lui-même, par son oncle, et son fils adoptif*, which was issued by M. Lucas de Montigny in 8 vols., Paris, 1824. See also Dumont, *Souvenirs sur Mirabeau*, 1832; Duval, *Souvenirs sur Mirabeau*, 1832; Victor Hugo, *Étude sur Mirabeau*, 1834; *Mirabeau's Jugendleben*, Breslau, 1832; Schneidewin, *Mirabeau und seine Zeit*, Leipzig, 1831; *Mirabeau, a Life History*, London, 1848. The publication of the *Correspondance entre Mirabeau et le Comte de la Marck*, by Ad. Bacourt, 2 vols., 1851, marks an epoch in our exact knowledge of Mirabeau and his career. The most useful modern books are Louis de Loménie, *Les Mirabeau*, 1878, which, however, chiefly treats of his father and uncle; Ph. Plan, *Un Collaborateur de Mirabeau*, 1874, treating of Reybaz, and *Mirabeau et la Constituante*, 1873. On his eloquence and the share his collaborators had in his speeches, see Aulard, *L'Assemblée Constituante*, 1882. For his death see the curious brochure of his physician Cabanis, *Journal de la maladie et de la mort de Mirabeau*, Paris, 1791. (H. M. S.)

MIRABEAU, VICTOR RIQUETI, MARQUIS DE (1715-1789), himself a distinguished author and political economist, but more famous as the father of the great Mirabeau, was born at Pertuis near the old chateau de Mirabeau on October 4, 1715. He was brought up very sternly by his father, and in 1729 joined the army. He took keenly to campaigning, but never rose above the rank of captain, owing to his being unable to get leave at court to buy a regiment. In 1737 he came into the family property on his father's death, and spent some pleasant years till 1743 in literary companionship with his dear friends Vauvenargues and Lefranc de Pompignan, which might have continued had he not suddenly determined to marry—not for money, but for landed estates. The lady whose property he fancied was Marie Geneviève, daughter of a M. de Vassan, a brigadier in the army, and widow of the Marquis de Saulvebeuf, whom he married without previously seeing her on April 21, 1743. While in garrison at Bordeaux, Mirabeau had made the acquaintance of Montesquieu, which may have made him turn his thoughts to political speculations; anyhow it was while at leisure after retiring from the army that he wrote his first work, his *Testament Politique* (1747), which demanded for the prosperity of France a return of the French noblesse to their old position in the Middle Ages. This work, written under the influence of the feudal ideas impressed upon him by his father, was followed in 1750 by a book on the *Utilité des États Provinciaux*, full of really wise considerations for local self-government, which was published anonymously, and had the honour of being attributed to Montesquieu himself. In 1756 Mirabeau made his first appearance as a political economist by the publication of his *Ami des Hommes ou traité de la population*. This work has been often attributed to the influence, and in part even to the pen, of Quesnay, the founder of the economical school of the physiocrats, but was really written before the marquis had made the acquaintance of the physician of Madame de Pompadour. In 1760 he published his *Théorie de l'Impôt*, in which he attacked with all the vehemence of his son the farmers-general of the taxes, who got him imprisoned for eight days at Vincennes, and then exiled to his country estate at Bignon. At Bignon the school of the physiocrats was really established, and the marquis surrounded himself with devotees, and eventually in 1765 bought the *Journal de l'agriculture, du commerce, et des finances*, which became the organ of the school. He was distinctly recognized as a leader of political thinkers by Prince Leopold of Tuscany, afterwards emperor, and by Gustavus III. of Sweden, who in 1772 sent him the grand cross of the order of Vasa. But the period of his happy literary life was over; and his name was to be mixed up in a long scandalous lawsuit. Naturally his marriage had not been happy; he had separated from his wife by mutual consent in 1762, and had, he believed, secured her safely in the provinces by a lettre de cachet, when in 1772 she suddenly appeared in Paris, and soon after commenced proceedings for a separation. The poor marquis did not know what to do; his sons were a great trouble to him, and it was one of his own daughters who had encouraged his wife to take this step. Yet he was determined to keep the case quiet if possible for the sake of Madame de Pailly, a Swiss lady whom he had loved since 1756. But his wife would not let him rest; her plea was rejected in 1777, but she renewed her suit, and, though the great Mirabeau had pleaded his father's case, was successful in 1781, when a decree of separation was pronounced. This trial had quite broken the health of the marquis, as well as his fortune; he sold his estate at Bignon, and hired a house at Argenteuil, where he lived quietly till his death on July 11, 1789.

For the whole family of Mirabeau, the one book to refer to is Louis de Loménie's *Les Mirabeau*, 2 vols., 1878, and it is greatly to be regretted that the talented author did not live to treat the lives of the great Mirabeau and his brother. See also Lucas de Montigny's *Mémoires de Mirabeau*, and, for the marquis's economical views, De la Vergne's *Économistes français du 18^{me} siècle*.

MIRAGE. See LIGHT, vol. xiv. p. 600.

MIRAMON, MIGUEL, a Mexican soldier of French extraction, was born in the city of Mexico, September 29, 1832, and shot along with the emperor Maximilian at Queretaro, June 19, 1867. While still a student he helped to defend the military academy at Chapultepec against the forces of the United States; and, entering the army in 1852, he rapidly came to the front during the civil wars that disturbed the country. It was largely due to Miramon's support of the ecclesiastical party against Alvarez and Comonfort that Zuloaga was raised to the presidency; and in 1859 he was called to succeed him in that office. Decisively beaten, however, by the Liberals, he fled the country in 1860, and spent some time in Europe earnestly advocating foreign intervention in Mexican affairs; and when he returned it was as a partisan of Maximilian. His ability as a soldier was best shown by his double defence of Puebla in 1856.

MIRANDA, FRANCESCO (1754-1816), was born at Santa Fé in New Granada in 1754. He entered the army, and served against the English in the American War of Independence. The success of that war inspired him with a hope of being the Washington of his own country, and a belief that the independence of Spanish America would increase its material prosperity. With these views he began to scheme a revolution, but his schemes were discovered and he had only just time to escape to the United States. Thence he went to England, where he was introduced to Pitt, but chiefly lived with the leading members of the opposition—Fox, Sheridan, and Romilly. Finding no help in his revolutionary schemes, he travelled over the greater part of Europe, notably through Austria and Turkey, till he arrived at the court of Russia, where he was warmly received, but from which he was dismissed, though with rich presents, at the demand of the Spanish ambassador, backed up by the envoy of France. The news of the dispute between England and Spain about Nootka Sound in 1790 recalled him to England, where he saw a good deal of Pitt, who had determined to make use of him to "insurge" the Spanish colonies, but the peaceful arrangement of the dispute again destroyed his hopes. In April 1792 he went to Paris, with introductions to Pétion and the leading Girondists, hoping that men who were working so hard for their own freedom might help his countrymen in South America. France had too much to do in fighting for its own freedom to help others; but Miranda's friends sent him to the front with the rank of general of brigade. He distinguished himself under Dumouriez, was intrusted in February 1793 with the conduct of the siege of Maestricht, and commanded the left wing of the French army at the disastrous battle of Neerwinden. Although he had given notice of Dumouriez's projected treachery, he was put on his trial for treason on May 12. He was unanimously acquitted, but was soon again thrown into prison, and not released till after the 9th Thermidor. He again mingled in politics, and was sentenced to be deported after the struggle of Vendémiaire. Yet he escaped, and continued in Paris till the *coup d'état* of Fructidor caused him finally to take refuge in England. He now found Pitt and Dundas once more ready to listen to him, and the latter sent a special minute to Colonel Picton, the governor of Trinidad, to assist General Miranda's schemes in every possible way; but, as neither of them would or could give him substantial help, he went to the United States, where President Adams gave him fair words but nothing more. Once more he returned to England,

where Addington might have done something for him but for the signature of the peace of Amiens in 1802. At the peace, though in no way amnestied, he returned to Paris, but was promptly expelled by the First Consul, who was then eager to be on good terms with the court of Spain. Disappointed in further efforts to get assistance from England and the United States, he decided to make an attempt on his own responsibility and at his own expense. Aided by two American citizens, Colonel Smith and Mr Ogden, he equipped a small ship, the "Leander," in 1806, and with the help of the English admiral Sir A. Cochrane made a landing near Caracas, and proclaimed the Colombian republic. He had some success, and would have had more had not a false report of peace between France and England caused the English admiral to withdraw his support. At last in 1810 came his opportunity; the events in Spain which brought about the Peninsular War had divided the authorities in Spanish America, some of whom declared for Joseph Bonaparte, others for Ferdinand VII., while others again held to Charles IV. At this moment Miranda again landed, and had no difficulty in getting a large party together who declared a republic both in Venezuela and New Granada or Colombia. But Miranda's desire that all the South American colonies should rise, and a federal republic be formed, awoke the selfishness and pride of individual provincial administrations, and thus weakened the cause, which further was believed to be hateful to heaven owing to a great earthquake on March 26, 1812. The count of Monte Verde, the Bourbon governor, had little difficulty in defeating the dispirited forces of Miranda, and on July 26 the general capitulated on condition that he should be deported to the United States. The condition was not observed; Miranda was moved from dungeon to dungeon, and died in 1816 at Cadiz.

There are allusions to Miranda's early life in nearly all memoirs of the time, but they are not generally very accurate. For his trial see Buchez et Roux, *Histoire Parlementaire*, xvii. 26-70. For his later life see Biggs, *History of Miranda's Attempt in South America*, London, 1809; and Veggasi, *Revolucion de la Columbia*.

MIRANDOLA. See PICO.

MIRKHOND (1433-1498). Mohammed bin Khâwandshâh bin Mahmûd, commonly called Mirkhând or Mirkhâwand, more familiar to Europeans under the name of Mirkhond, was born in 1433, the son of a very pious and learned man who, although belonging to an old Bokhara family of Sayyids or direct descendants of the Prophet, lived and died in Balkh. From his early youth he applied himself to historical studies and literature in general. In Herât, where he spent the greater part of his life, he gained the favour of that famous patron of letters, Mir 'Alishîr (born 1440), who served his old school-fellow the reigning sultan Husain (who as the last of the Timûrides in Persia ascended the throne of Herât in 1468), first as keeper of the seal, afterwards as governor of Jurjân. At the request of this distinguished statesman and writer¹ Mirkhond began about 1474, in the quiet convent of Khilâsiyah, which his patron had founded in Herât as a house of retreat for literary men of merit, his great work on universal history, the largest ever written in Persian, and to the present day an inexhaustible mine of information both to Eastern and Western scholars. It is named *Rauzat-ussafâ fi sirat-ulanbiâ wal-mulûk walkhulafâ or Garden of Purity on the Biography of Prophets, Kings, and Caliphs*. That the author has made no attempt at a critical examination of historical traditions can scarcely be called a peculiar fault of his, since almost all Oriental writers are equally deficient in sound criticism; more censurable is his

¹ Mir 'Alishîr not only excelled as poet both in Chaghatâi, in which his epopees gained him the foremost rank among the classic writers in that language, and in Persian, but composed an excellent *tadhkirah* or biography of contemporary Persian poets.

flowery and often bombastic style, but in spite of this drawback, and although, in our own age, the discovery of older works on Asiatic history has diminished to some extent the value of Mirkhond's *Rauzat*, it still maintains its high position as one of the most marvellous achievements in literature from the pen of one man, and often elucidates, by valuable text-corrections, various readings, and important additions, those sources which have lately come to light. It comprises seven large volumes and a geographical appendix; but internal evidence proves beyond doubt that the seventh volume, the history of the sultan Husain (1438-1505), together with a short account of some later events down to 1523, cannot have been written by Mirkhond himself, who died in 1498. He may have compiled the preface, but the main portion of this volume is probably the work of his grandson, the equally renowned historian Khwândamîr (1475-1534), to whom also a part of the appendix must be ascribed.

The following is a summary of the contents of the other six volumes. Vol. i.: Preface on the usefulness of historical studies, history of the creation, the patriarchs, prophets, and rulers of Israel down to Christ, and the Persian kings from the mythical times of the Peshdâdians to the Arab conquest and the death of the last Sâsânian Yazdajird III. in 30 A.H. (651 A.D.). Vol. ii.: Mohammed, Abûbekr, 'Omar, 'Othmân, and 'Alî. Vol. iii.: The twelve imâms and the Omayyad and 'Abbâsid caliphs down to 656 A.H. (1258 A.D.). Vol. iv.: The minor dynasties contemporary with and subsequent to the 'Abbâsids, down to 778 A.H. (1376 A.D.), the date of the overthrow of the Kurds by Tîmûr. Vol. v.: The Moghuls down to Tîmûr's time. Vol. vi.: Tîmûr and his successors down to Sultan Husain's accession in 873 A.H. (1468 A.D.). The best accounts of Mirkhond's life are De Sacy's "Notice sur Mirkhond" in his *Mémoires sur diverses antiquités de la Perse*, Paris, 1793; Jourdain's "Notice de l'histoire universelle de Mirkhond" in the *Notices et Extraits*, vol. ix., Paris, 1812 (together with a translation of the preface, the history of the Ismailians, the conclusion of the sixth volume, and a portion of the appendix); Elliot, *History of India*, vol. iv. p. 127 sq.; Morley, *Descriptive Catalogue*, London, 1854, p. 30 sq.; Rien, *Cat. of Persian MSS. of the Brit. Mus.*, vol. i., London, 1870, p. 87 sq. Mirkhond's patron, Mir 'Alishîr, to whom the *Rauzat* is dedicated, died three years after him (1501).

Besides the lithographed editions of the whole work in folio, Bombay, 1853, and Teheran, 1852-56, and a Turkish version, Constantinople, 1842, the following portions of Mirkhond's history have been published by European Orientalists: *Early Kings of Persia*, by D. Shea, London, 1832 (Oriental Translation Fund); *L'Histoire de la dynastie des Sassanides*, by S. de Sacy (in the above-mentioned *Mémoires*); *Histoire des Sassanides (des Perses)*, by Saubert, Paris, 1843; *Historia priorum regum Persarum*, Pers. and Lat., by Jenish, Vienna, 1782; *Mirchond's Historia Taheridarum*, Pers. and Lat., by Mitscherlik, Göttingen, 1814, 2d ed., Berlin, 1819; *Historia Samanidarum*, Pers. and Lat., by Wilken, Göttingen, 1808; *Histoire des Samanides*, translated by Defrémery, Paris, 1848; *Historia Ghaznevidarum*, Pers. and Lat., by Wilken, Berlin, 1832; *Geschichte der Sultane aus dem Geschlechte Dajeh*, Pers. and German, by Wilken, Berlin, 1835; followed by Erdmann's *Erläuterung und Ergänzung*, Kazan, 1836; *Historia Seltschuckidarum*, ed. Vullers, Gissen, 1837, and a German translation by the same; *Histoire des Sultans du Khorezm*, in Persian, by Defrémery, Paris, 1842; *History of the Atabeks of Syria and Persia*, in Persian, by W. Morley, London, 1848; *Historia Ghuridarum*, Pers. and Lat., by Mitscherlik, Frankfurt, 1818; *Histoire des Sultans Ghurides*, translated into French by Defrémery, Paris, 1844; *Vi de Djenhis-Khan*, in Persian, by Saubert, Paris, 1841 (see also extracts from the same 6th volume in French translation by Langlès in vol. vi. of *Notices et Extraits*, Paris, 1789, p. 192 sq., and by Hammer in *Sur les origines Russes*, St. Petersburg, 1825, pp. 52 sq.); "Timûr's Expedition against Tuktamish Khân," Persian and French, by Charmoy, in *Mémoires de l'Acad. Impér. de St. Pétersbourg*, 1836, pp. 270-321 and 441-471. (H. E.)

MIROPOLIE, a town of Russia, situated in the government of Kursk, district of Suja, 83 miles south-west of Kursk and 25 miles from the Sumy railway station. It is supposed to have been founded in the 17th century, when it was fortified against the raids of Tartars. The fertility of the soil led to the settlement of large villages close by the fort, and the 10,800 inhabitants of this town are still engaged mostly in agriculture. There is also an extensive manufacture of boots.

MIRROR. It is only since the early part of the 16th century that mirrors have become articles of household furniture and decoration. Previous to that time—from the 12th to the end of the 15th century—pocket mirrors or small hand mirrors carried at the girdle were indispensable adjuncts to ladies' toilets. The pocket mirrors consisted of small circular plaques of polished metal fixed in a shallow circular box, covered with a lid. Mirror cases were chiefly made of ivory, carved with relief representations of lofty