## Phaenomenon[[@Headword:Phaenomenon]]

             (φαινόμενον, from φαίνομαι, to appear) is that which has, appeared. It is generally applied to some sensible appearance, some occurrence in the course of nature. But in mental philosophy it is applied to the various and changing states of mind. "How pitiful and ridiculous are the grounds upon which such men pretend to account for the very lowest and commonest phcenomena of nature without recurring to a God and Providence!" "Among the various phaenomena which the human mind presents to our view, there is none more calculated to excite our curiosity and our wonder than the communication which is carried on between the sentient, thinking, and active principle within us and the material objects with which we are surrounded" (Stewart, Elements, chapter 1, section 1). In the philosophy of Kant, phaenomenon means an object such as we represent it to ourselves or conceive of it, in opposition to noumenon, or a thing as it is in itself. "According to Kant, the facts of consciousness, in their subjective character, are produced partly from the nature of the things of which it is conscious; and hence, in their objective character, they are phenomena, or objects as they appear in relation to us, not things in themselves, noumena, or realities in their absolute nature, as they may be out of relation to the mind. The subjective elements which the mind itself contributes to the consciousness of every object are to be found, as regards intuition, in the forms of space and time; and as regards thought, in the categories, unity, plurality, and the rest. To perceive a thing in itself would be to perceive it neither in space nor in time; for these are furnished by the constitution of our perceptive faculties, and constitute an element of the phcenomenal object of intuition only. To think of a thing in itself would be to think of it neither as one nor as many, nor under any other category; for these, again, depend upon the constitution of our understanding, and constitute an element of the phcenomenal object of thought. The phaenonenal is the product of the inherent laws of our own mental constitution, and, as such, is the sum and limit of all the knowledge to which we can attain" (Mansel, Lect. on Phil. of Kant, pages 21, 22). The definition of phaenomenon is, "that which can be known only along with something else" (Ferrier, Inst. Of Metaphys. page 319). See McCosh, Intuition; Jour. Specul. Philos. volume 2, No. 2, art. 3 and 4; volume 3, No. 2, art. 4; June 1872, art. 5. SEE NOUMENON.

## Phaenos[[@Headword:Phaenos]]

             the capital of Trachonitis, in the northeast of Palestine; the AEnos of the Peutinger Table; one of the episcopal cities of Arabia (S. Paulo, Geogr. Sacr. page 297), twenty-seven Roman miles from Damascus, thirty-seven from Kenath. It is now the village of Musmeih, on the northern edge of the Lejah, as was proved by an inscription (Burckhardt, Travels, page 117 sq.; Porter, Damascus, 2:112 sq.). — Van de Velde, Memoir, page 339.

## Phagiphania[[@Headword:Phagiphania]]

             The name by which the Epiphany (q.v.) was sometimes called in the ancient Church; and it arose from connecting our Saviour's miracle of feeding five thousand men with the first miracle at Cana, as a manifestation of divine power to be celebrated on this day. See Riddle, Christian Antiquities; Siegel, Christl Alterthiimer.

## Phagophania[[@Headword:Phagophania]]

             SEE PHAGIPHANIA.

## Phagor[[@Headword:Phagor]]

             SEE PEOR.

## Phaisur[[@Headword:Phaisur]]

             [rather Phcesur] (Φαισούρ v.r. Φαισού), a corrupt Griecized form (1Es 9:44) of the Heb. name (Ezr 10:22) PASHUR SEE PASHUR (q.v.).

## Phalaeus[[@Headword:Phalaeus]]

             SEE PHALEUS.

## Phaldaius[[@Headword:Phaldaius]]

             [rather Phaldceus] (Φαλδαῖος), a corrupt Greek form (1Es 9:44) of the Heb. name (Neh 8:4) PEDAIAH SEE PEDAIAH (q.v.).

## Phaleas[[@Headword:Phaleas]]

             [rather Phaleus] (Φαλαῖος), an incorrect Grracism (1Es 5:29) of the Heb. name (Ezr 2:44; Neh 7:47) PADON SEE PADON (q.v.).

## Phalec[[@Headword:Phalec]]

             (Φαλέκ), a Grecized form (Luk 3:35) of the name of the patriarch PELEG SEE PELEG (q.v.).

## Phallicism[[@Headword:Phallicism]]

             or Phallic Worship. SEE PHALLUS.

## Phallu[[@Headword:Phallu]]

             (Gen 46:9). SEE PALLU.

## Phallus[[@Headword:Phallus]]

             (φαλλός, nmembrum virile), a representation of the male generative organ, as the symbol of the fertility of nature, was carried among the ancient Greeks in the processions of the Dionysia, and men disguised as women, called Ithyphalloi, followed immediately behind it. The phallus, which was called among the Romans fascinum, was often used by that people as an amulet hung around the necks of children to avert evil influences. The Satyrica signa of Pliny probably referred to the phallus, and he says that these were placed in gardens and on hearths to protect against the fascinations of the envious. From Pollux, also, we learn that smiths were accustomed to place figures of the phallus before their forges for the same purpose. This symbol, which disgusts us by its indecency, conveyed to the ancient heathens, as the Linga (q.v.) does to the modern Hindi's, a profound and sacred meaning. Diodorus Siculus, referring to the veneration in which the phallus was held among the Greeks, tells us that by this they would signify their gratitude to God for the populousness of their country. "It was an object of common worship throughout the nature- religion of the East, and was called by manifold names, such as Linga, Joni, Pollear, etc.

Originally it had no other meaning than the allegorical one of that mysterious union between the male and female which throughout nature seems to be the sole condition of the continuation of the existence of animated beings; but at a later period, more particularly when  ancient Rome had become the hot-bed of all natural and unnatural vices, its worship became an intolerable nuisance, and was put down by the senate on account of the more than usual immorality to which it gave rise. Its origin has caused much speculation, but no certainty has been arrived at by investigators. The Phoenicians traced its introduction into their worship to Adonis, the Egyptians to Osiris, the Phrygians to Attys, the Greeks to Dionysus. The common myth concerning it was the story of some god deprived of his powers of generation — an allusion to the sun, which in autumn loses its fructifying influence. The procession in which it was carried about was called Phallagogia, or Periphallia, and a certain hymn was sung on that occasion, called the φαλλικὸν μέλος. The bearers of the phallus, which generally consisted of red leather, and was attached to an enormous pole, were the Phallophoroi. Phalli were on those occasions worn as ornaments around the neck, or attached to the body. Aristotle traces the origin of comedy to the ribaldry and the improvised jokes customary on these festivals. Phalli were often attached to statues, and of a prodigious size; sometimes they were even movable. At a procession of Ptolemy Philadelphus a phallus was carried about made of gold, and one hundred and twenty yards long. Before the temple of Venus at Hierapolis there stood two phalli, one hundred and eighty feet high, upon which a priest mounted annually, and remained there in prayer for seven days.

The phallus was an attribute of Pan, Priapus, and to a certain extent also of Hermes" (Chambers). The believers in the development theory of course have a way of their own in accounting for the origin and progress of phallic worship. They teach that it is the most ancient and universal of the beliefs of the human race, and that it has prevailed among all known nations of antiquity, and has been handed down in both dead and living forms to the present day. They claim to see evidences of its existence not only in Egypt, Greece, and Rome, but also in Syria, Persia, Asia Minor, Italy, Spain, Germany, France, Ireland, and Scandinavia, among the mound-builders of North America, in Mexico, Central America, Peru, and Hayti, and in the islands of the Pacific Ocean, and in Africa. They ecen see its traces among the Jews, and in the use of certain symbols in Christianity. Thus, e.g., Westropp teaches: "The origin of the idea is coeval among primitive nations with that of the family, and rests in part upon the natural veneration of the father as the generator, the priest, and the ruler. Marriage derived much of its importance from a veneration of the principles at the foundation of the phallic worship. Its ceremony was attended with rites which marked their significance, and one of its symbols, the wedding-ring,  is employed at the present day. Circumcision was in its inception a purely phallic ordinance. Although the O.T. narrative relates that it was instituted as a covenant between Jehovah and Abraham, the rite had been practiced by the Egyptians and Phoenicians long before the birth of the Hebrew patriarch. Serpent symbolism was associated with the phallic emblems, but that there was an identity in their signification has not been clearly established. The serpent was used among most archaic nations as a symbol of wisdom and health, and yet its meaning often included the notion of life and an embodiment of the spirit." Mr. Wake, another essayist of the same school, treats the Mosaic account of the fall of man as a phallic legend, which was borrowed by the compiler of the Pentateuch from some foreign source, probably from the mysteries of Mithra, a Persian deity. The tree of the knowledge of good and evil he identifies with the figtree, which was highly venerated by many primitive peoples. Its leaves, it will be remembered, were sewed into aprons by Adam and Eve after their transgression. The kerub which guarded the tree of life is interpreted as a symbol of the Deity himself, in the form of the sacred bull of antiquity — a form under which the kerub is described by Ezekiel (chapter 1 and 10).

The story of the Deluge is also regarded as a myth, with decided evidences of a phallic character. In many of the incidents interwoven into the history of the Hebrews, and in many of their religious observances, Mr. Wake discovers testimony of the influence of the phallic superstition. Abraham was a Chaldaean, and by tradition declared to have been learned in astronomy, and to have taught the science to the Phoenicians. "He had higher notions of the relation of man to the Divine than his ancestors," says the writer, but there was no fundamental difference between his religious faith and that of his Syrian neighbors. The Jewish patriarchs erected pillars and planted groves, both of which were customs connected with phallic worship. Throughout the rule of the judges, and especially after the establishment of the monarchy, the Hebrews were given to derelictions from the purer religion of their nation to the idolatrous practices of their neighbors, which involved worship ofphallicstatues and omphalic emblems in "high places." The religion of Baal, openly denounced by the prophets, was a sort of phallism, and was conducted with lewd and abominable ceremonies, which the Jews too often imitated. Mr. Wake even holds that the basis of Christianity is more purely phallic than that of any other religion. "In the recognition of God as the universal Father, the great Parent of mankind, there is a development of the fundamental idea of phallism. In the position assigned to Mary as the mother of God the  paramount principle of the primitive belief is again predominant.

The nimbus, the aureole, the cross, the fish, and even the spires of churches, are symbols retained from the old phallic worship." The May-pole festival is cited as having a phallic origin, and, in the beginning, a reference to some event connected with the occurrences in the Garden of Eden. In fact, says Dr. Wilder, also of this class of writers, "There is not a fast or festival, procession or sacrament, social custom or religious symbol, existing at the present day which has not been taken bodily from phallism, or from some successive system of paganism" (comp. Ancient Symbol Worship: Influence of the Phallic Idea in the Religions of Antiquity, by Westropp and Wake; with Introd., etc., by Wilder [N.Y. 1871, 8vo]). These theorists lose sight altogether of the possibility that in the retrogression to which the nations cited became subject they must necessarily have manifested sensual tendencies of the very nature of phallicism, and that only in their lowest estate such worship was extensively indulged in. Absurd it is to point to circumcision as in anywise connected with phallic worship. The Jew practiced it as a rite of admission to the fold to distinguish him, and also as a sanitary precaution which physicians approve of in our day. We do not wonder that such ridiculous and extravagant hypotheses lead to the proposition recently made by one of the same school of thinkers as those quoted, that "there would also now appear good ground for believing that the ark of the covenant, held so sacred by the Jews, contained nothing more nor less than a phallus, the ark being the type of the Argha or Yoni (Linga worship) of India" (Sellon, in Anthropol. Society of London, 1863- 4, page 327 sq., 12th paper). (J.H.W.)

## Phalti[[@Headword:Phalti]]

             (Heb. Palti', פִּלְטַי, my deliverance; Sept. Φαλτί), the son of Laish of Gallim, to whom Saul gave Michal in marriage after his mad jealousy had driven David forth as an outlaw (1Sa 25:44). B.C. cir. 1061. In 2Sa 3:15 he is called PHALTIEL. Ewald (Gesch. 3:129) suggests that this forced marriage was a piece of policy on the part of Saul to attach Phalti to his house. With the exception of this brief mention of his name, and the touching little episode in 2Sa 3:16, nothing more is heard of Phalti. Michal is there restored to David. "Her husband went with her along weeping behind her to Bahurim," and there, in obedience to Abner's abrupt command, "Go, return," he turns and disappears from the scene. SEE DAVID.  There was another person of the same Heb. name (Num 13:9, A.V. "Palti" [q.v.]).

## Phaltiel[[@Headword:Phaltiel]]

             (Heb. Paltiel', פִּלַטַיאֵל, deliverance of God; Sept. Φαλτιήλ), Saul's son-in-law (2Sa 3:15); elsewhere called PHALTI SEE PHALTI (q.v.).

## Phannias[[@Headword:Phannias]]

             (Φαννίας), son of Samuel, "of the village of Aphtha," raised by lot to the Jewish high-priesthood by the faction of John during the final siege by the Romans, A.D. 70. He was totally unfit for the position, and was compelled to go through its duties (Josephus, War, 4:3, 8). He doubtless perished in the sack of the Temple.

## Phantasiaets[[@Headword:Phantasiaets]]

             is a name given to the Docetce (q.v.), and of the same import with that term.

## Phantasiodocetae[[@Headword:Phantasiodocetae]]

             is a term used by Theophylact in his commentary on the 4th chapter of John. SEE PHANTASIASTS

.

## Phanton OF PHLIUS[[@Headword:Phanton OF PHLIUS]]

             a Pythagorean philosopher, one of the last of that school, was a disciple of Philolaus and Eurytus, and probably in his old age contemporary with Aristoxenus the Peripatetic. B.C. 320.

## Phanuel[[@Headword:Phanuel]]

             (Φανουήλ, probably a Graecized form of the same Heb. name with Penuel, face of God), a descendant of the tribe of Asher, and father of the prophetess Anna (Luk 2:36). B.C. cir. 80.

## Pharacim[[@Headword:Pharacim]]

             (Φαρακέμ v.r. Φαρακείμ), a name mentioned in the Apocrypha (1Es 5:31) as that of a Hebrew whose "sons" returned among the servants of the  Temple from the captivity with Zerubbabel; but it does not occur in the parallel lists of Ezra and Nehemiah.

## Pharaoh[[@Headword:Pharaoh]]

             [vulgarly pron. Phar'oh.] (Heb. Paroh', פֵּרַעֹה, Sept., New Test., and Josephus Φαραώ, but seldom in classical writers), the common title of the ancient kings of Egypt, as Ptolemy of its later kings, and Caesar of the emperors of Rome. (The following account includes those that are of Scriptural interest, with special reference to their identificatioh.)

The name is derived from the Egyptian word Pire, or Phre, signifying the sun (Wilkinson, Anc. Egyptians, 1:43). This identification, respecting which there can be no doubt, is due to the duke of Northumberland and general Felix (Rawlinson's Herod. 2:293). It has been supposed that the original was the same as the Coptic Ouro, "the king," with the article, Pi- ouro, P-ouro; but this word appears not to have been written, judging from the evidence of the Egyptian inscriptions and writings, in the times to which the Scriptures refer. The conjecture arose from the idea that Pharaoh must signify, instead of merely implying, "king," a mistake occasioned by a too implicit confidence in the exactness of ancient writers (Joseph. Ant. 8:6, 2; Euseb. ed. Scal. pages 20, 5, 1). Bunsen approves of this derivation of Josephus (Egypt's Place, 1:191, Lond. 1848), but Wilkinson in the passage above quoted shows reasons for rejecting it. The name was probably given in the earliest times to the Egyptian kings as being the chief on earth, as the sun was the chief among the heavenly bodies, and afterwards, when this luminary became the object of idolatrous worship, as the representation or incarnation of their sun-god, Phra or Re (Wilkinson, Anc. Egypt. 4:267; Rosellini, 1:115; Trevor, Egypt, pages 124-136). Regarding the sun at first as the greatest of the divine works and a main element in the production of Egypt's marvellous fertility, they readily used it as significant of their monarchs, to whose wise laws in the infancy of their state Egypt is supposed to be greatly indebted for the permanence and prosperity of her institutions. "Son of the sun" was the title of every Pharaoh, and the usual comparison made by the priesthood of their monarchs when returning from a successful war was that his power was exalted in the world as the sun was in the heavens (Wilkinson, 1:400; 4:288). In the hieroglyphics the hawk was the emblem of the king as Pharaoh (id. 3:287), and it is perhaps of consequence to note that in the representations of, apparently, two different kings ruling  contemporaneously over Upper and Lower Egypt, the hawk occurs only in connection with one of them (id. 3:282).

Readers of Scripture will remark that Pharaoh often stands simply like a proper name (Gen 12:15; Gen 37:36; Gen 40:2 sq.; Gen 44:1 sq.; and so generally throughout the Pentateuch, and also in Song of Solomon i, 9; Isa 19:11; Isa 30:2). "King of Egypt" is sometimes subjoined to it (1Ki 3:1; 2Ki 17:7; 2Ki 18:21); and sometimes also the more specific designation, or real proper name of the monarch is indicated, as Pharaoh Necho (2Ki 23:33), Pharaoh Hophra (Jer 44:30). Josephus (Ant. 8:6, 2) says that while every king of Egypt from Menes to the time of Solomon- took this title, no king of Egypt used it afterwards, and affirms the latter fact to be apparent from the sacred writings. This, however, is not quite correct. Several Egyptian kings were after the period in question called by foreigners Pharaoh, sometimes simply, sometimes in connection with a second name (2Ki 18:21; 2Ki 23:29); but the alteration from the time of Solomon which undoubtedly took place is remarkable, and probably points to an important change in the dynastic history of Egypt.

Some writers suppose Pharaoh to have been the name given in the Bible to the native kings of Egypt. There were, however, probably before Solomon's time several introductions of foreign dynasties, and some of them, if we accept the usual period ascribed to the rule of the Shepherds, of long duration; yet Scripture gives the title to all alike before this period, and Josephus states that all without exception assumed it. Wilkinson supposes that it was the title of such kings as had the sole direction of affairs while Egypt was an independent state, and that the title of "melek," or king, marked such as ruled conjointly with other kings of Egypt, or who governed as viceroys under a foreign ruler, as was the case after the Persian conquest (1:148, 179). This is very probably a satisfactory explanation for the long period down to the reign of Solomon. Most likely throughout it "Pharaoh" marks the monarch who ruled alone in Egypt, or over its inferior and tributary kings when there were such. This may seem intimated in the speech of one of them to Joseph: "I am Pharaoh, and without thee shall no man lift up his hand or foot in all the land of Egypt" (Gen 41:44). Wilkinson's explanation, however, scarcely accounts for the period subsequent to the Pharaoh who gave his daughter to Solomon. Shishak, who seems to have succeeded him, was evidently the supreme ruler of Egypt, and not only independent of foreigners, but able to extend Egyptian power far beyond the limits of Egypt. A change of dynasty  seems here to have caused the change of title, and was probably more or less connected with such changes in after periods. The Persian monarchs finally, administering the affairs of Egypt through tributary native kings, took the title of Pharaoh as indicative of their sovereignty (Trevor, Egypt, page 331). With them this ancient name of royalty passed away forever.

The political position of the Pharaohs in Egypt is of great moment in understanding the history of that country. If it were the exclusive title of the supreme ruler, it marks the general unity of Egypt under a single monarch. If it were given indifferently to every king of Egypt at those times, which seem unquestionably to have recurred, and may have been of long duration and early date, when several kings ruled over various divisions of the country, the occurrence of the title does not necessarily mark the political unity of the land. According to the first view. for instance, the Pharaoh of Abraham or Joseph would be the supreme ruler of the whole of Egypt, with, it might happen, various dynasties of subordinate kings under him; according to the latter, he might be only king of a portion of Egypt, with other dynasties of equal rank ruling contemporaneously elsewhere. To us the former view appears the preferable one for many reasons. The unity of Egypt under a single supreme monarch is, we think, unquestionably the view according to which the Scriptures lead us to think thatobreigners regarded that country. Whatever may have been the internal administration of the government, into which Scripture does not enter at all, the general view given us of Egypt in the Bible is that of a country united under one monarch. The earliest apparent reference to a different state of things occurs in 2Ki 7:6, where we read of "kings of Egypt," apparently of equal authority. Isaiah predicts great troubles arising probably from a similar dissolution of any central authority (ch. 19:3; Wilkinson, Egypt. 1:178; Rawlinson's Herodotus, 1:51, note 4, and 391). All ancient history with which we are acquainted (Herodotus, Diodorus, and Manetho) assumes the political unity of Egypt. The titles of the Pharaohs seem to establish it. They are always called on the monuments "Lords of Upper and Lower Egypt" (Wilkinson. 2:73; 2d ser. 1:261). This unity of Egypt from the earliest times is new generally acknowledged (Hengstenberg, Egypt, page 84). The power and greatness of Egypt from the remotest times point to such a unity. Its high civilization and peaceful internal condition are a similar indication. If divided into several independent kingdoms Egypt would have exhibited the same condition which all the petty states of antiquity did, in which every man was of  necessity a soldier (Hume, Essays, 2:11). Whereas in Egypt soldiers formed a different class from the rest of the community, never wore arms except in actual service, while private citizens at no time carried offensive weapons (Wilkinsoln 1:402). Indeed, it is impossible to imagine any country less suited by geographical configuration for divided rule than Egypt from the Cataracts to the sea. One level valley, only divided east and west by its river, shut in from the rest of the world by the Libvan and Arabian mountains and the Syrian deserts, it must of necessity form a single state.

This view of the political position of the Pharaohs is not inconsistent with the theory, for which there is very strong proof from Manetho and elsewhere, that for long periods of Egyptian history there may have been subordinate dynasties of kings ruling throughout Egypt. There may also have been, but probably for much shorter periods, a total overthrow of the central power, or a practical disregard of it even while acknowledging its nominal authority. There is a passage of Manetho preserved by Josephus which seems to point strongly to the view that the ancient internal constitution of Egypt was its government by subordinate kings under a supreme ruler (Josephus, Con. Rev 1:14). Such, he expressly tells us, was its state during the oppression of the Shepherds: "These tyrannized over the kings of Thebais and of the other parts of Egypt." The general idea of ancient government was that of a supreme monarch over tributary kings; and the great probability is that the Shepherds followed this analogy, and, merely deposing the ruling Pharaoh, left the minor dynasties undisturbed. The Pharaohs are supposed to have been at all times invested with the highest sacerdotal dignity (Hengstenberg, Egypt, page 35; Wilkinson, 1:245). From the circumstance that in the earliest names enclosed in ovals the title priest precedes that of king, and for other reasons, Wilkinson argues, as we think inconclusively, that Egypt was originally governed by hierarchical and not regal power (1:16). SEE EGYPT.

1. The Pharaoh of Abraham. — The first mention of a Pharaoh in the Bible is on the occasion of Abram's visit to Egypt during a famine in Canaan (Gen 12:10). Which of the ancient kings of Egypt is to be understood by this Pharaoh it is perhaps impossible to determine with certainty. Wilkinson supposes him to have been Apappus; Africanus calls him Ramnessemenes; and some have taken him to be one of the Shepherd kings. We have, in truth, no materials in Scripture or elsewhere for fixing the name and place of this king in the dynasties of Egypt. In regard to the  date also of Abraham's intercourse with him there is great uncertainty. But as the investigation of the point would involve us in a discussion on the somewhat perplexed chronology of the earlier parts of Old-Test. history, and the still more perplexed chronology of ancient Egypt, we can here only touch upon it; but see for the refutation of extreme views on the part of the Egyptologists, Hengstenberg's Egypt and the Books of Moses, and Sir C. Lewis's Astronomy of the Ancients. At the time at which the patriarch went into Egypt, according to Hales's as well as Usher's chronology, it is generally held that the country, or at least Lower Egypt, was ruled by the Shepherd kings, of whom the first and most powerful line was the fifteenth dynasty, the undoubted territories of which would be first entered by one coming from the east. Manetho relates that Salatis, the head of this line, established at Avaris, perhaps the Zoan of the Bible, on the eastern frontier, what appears to have been a great permanent camp, at which he resided for part of each year. SEE ZOAN. It is noticeable that Sarah seems to have been taken to Pharaoh's house immediately after the coming of Abraham; and if this were not so, yet, on account of his flocks and herds, the patriarch could scarcely have gone beyond the part of the country which was always more or less occupied by nomad tribes. It is also possible that Pharaoh gave Abraham camels, for we read that Pharaoh "entreated Abram well for Sarah's sake: and he had sheep, and oxen. and he-asses, and men-servants, and maid-servants, and she-asses, and camels" (Gen 12:16), where it appears that this property was the gift of Pharaoh, and the circumstance that the patriarch afterwards held an Egyptian bondwoman, Hagar, confirms the inference. If so, the present of camels would argue that this Pharaoh was a Shepherd king, for no evidence has been found in the sculptures, paintings, and inscriptions of Egypt that in the Pharaonic ages the camel was used, or even known there, and this omission can be best explained by the supposition that the animal was hateful to the Egyptians as of great value to their enemies the Shepherds. On the other hand, Abraham's possessions, especially the camels, may have been purchased by him from the nomnad tribes with the proceeds of Pharaoh's liberality, and the fact that Hagar was of this Arab race hardly consists with her having been reduced to bondage while they were in the ascendant. Indeed, it appears that the Shepherd kings (q.v.) were not on good terms with the Hebrews, as their interests were rival. The date at which Abraham visited Egypt (according to the chronology which we hold most probable) was about B.C. 2081, which would not accord with the time of Salatis, the head of the fifteenth dynasty, B.C.  2006, according to our reckoning, but rather with that of Binothris of the second (Thinitic) dynasty, and that of Othoes of the sixth (Memphitic) dynasty, as well as with that of Tancheres of the fifth (Elephantinitic) dynasty, but anterior to all the other dynasties.

2. The Pharaoh of Joseph. — Between the Pharaoh of Abraham and the Pharaoh of Joseph there was an interval of two hundred years. During this period there may have been various changes of dynasty, art, and religion in Egypt of which we derive no information from Scripture; while the notice of the former king and of the state of the country in his time is so brief that we cannot by comparison arrive at any conclusion upon this point. Of the political position and character of the latter, and the condition of Egypt in his time, Scripture gives us very important information from his intimate connection with Joseph and the chosen people of God.

Wilkinson identifies this Pharaoh with Osirtesen I, one of the kings of his sixteenth dynasty of Tanites, whose reign he supposes to have exceeded forty-three years (Egypt. 1:42, 43). Bunsen prefers to identify him with Osirtesen III, of the seventeenth dynasty of Memphites, who is, according to him, the Sesostris of classical writers (Trevor, Egypt, page 254). Osburn thinks him to have been Apophis (ibid. page 216), as Eusebius states, changing the date so as to fit. The identification obviously depends simply upon a comparison of the Hebrew and Egyptian chronologies. Whether he was of one of the dynasties of the Shepherd kings is a question on which authorities differ, according to their views of the date of the Shepherd rule, and their interpretation of the scriptural account of this king. Wilkinson is decidedly of opinion that he was not a Shepherd king, an opinion with which Trevor agrees. Josephus says that he was a Shepherd. We are decidedly of opinion from the incidental notices of Scripture that he was not of a Shepherd dynasty. If we are to accept Manetho's account, we must suppose that these Shepherds conquered the most of Egypt, ruled with the greatest tyranny and cruelty over the Egyptians, disregarded the old laws of the country, and demolished its temples (Josephus, Rev 1:14). Their rule was not one of policy and conciliation, but of brute force and terror, an idea strongly corroborated by the abomination in which the Bible tells us all shepherds were held in Egypt, and by the testimony which the monuments bear to the detestation and scorn in which they were universally held (Wilkinson, 2:16; 4:126).

The Shepherds being such, it seems to us quite inconsistent with the Biblical narrative to suppose that Joseph's Pharaoh was a Shepherd king. Thus we find that the Egyptian prejudice against  shepherds was carefully and jealously respected by this king. The Israelites on coming into Egypt were by him located in the border-land (Hengstenberg, Egypt, page 42) of Goshen, where they would serve as a barrier against the shepherd-hating Egyptians (Gen 46:34). We cannot suppose a Shepherd king to act thus. He would not thus consult a native prejudice hostile to his own dynasty, while his own Shepherd garrisons occupied the strongholds of Egypt. Again, Pharaoh's court and household, so far as we know them, were composed of native Egyptians. Such was Potiphar, the captain of the king's bodyguard, probably the most trusted officer of Pharaoh (Gen 39:1); while the chief butler and baker of his court are the well-known officers of the native court of the Pharaohs (Trevor, page 256). The officials of Pharaoh's prime minister, Joseph, are also native Egyptians, whose feelings of caste towards foreigners were carefully consulted (Gen 43:32; see Rawlinson's Herodotus, book 2, c. 41, note 9). In the midst of universal destitution, when all others were reduced to serfdom, and the lands of Egypt passed into the possession of Pharaoh, the property of the native Egyptian priests alone was religiously respected, and they received, without any return, an ample maintenance from Pharaoh's stores for themselves and their families (Gen 47:22). When Pharaoh sought to bestow upon Joseph marks of the highest honor for his preservation of the country, one of these marks was the bestowal on him in marriage of Asenath, the daughter of Potipherah, priest of On or Heliopolis, who is thus distinguished as one of the highest and most honored personages in the land (Gen 41:45). These considerations lead us to conclude that this Pharaoh was a native Egyptian, not a Shepherd king, and that he ruled after the expulsion of the Shepherds, or during their supremacy, while the memory of their tyranny was still vivid in the national mind. Rawlinson (Herod. Luke 2, c. 108, note 2) seems to think that horses were unknown in Egypt till the time of Amosis (B.C. 1510), and would thus give a low date for this monarch, in whose time horses were in use for ordinary purposes as well as for war (Gen 47:17).

The testimony of Herodotus on which he comments seems, however, opposed to this view. According to the chronology which we adopt, the period of Joseph's deliverance from prison was B.C. 1883, which will fall, according to our view of the Egyptian dynasties, under the reign of Aphobis, the fourth king of the fifteenth (Shepherd) dynasty. But as the Shepherd kings do not seem to have been friendly to the Hebrews, and for the other reasons enumerated above, we presume that these foreigners were not at this time (if indeed they ever were) in possession of  the whole of Egypt. We therefore incline to identify the Pharaoh in question with one of the eighth (Memphitic) dynasty, whose names are unrecorded, but who were contemporaneous with the twelfth (Diospolitic) as well as with the fifteenth (Shepherd) dynasty. There is one indication in Scripture which seems to attribute a very considerable antiquity to this period. In Joseph's time the territory allocated to the Israelites was called Goshen (Gen 45:10). In the time of Moses this ancient name appears to have been almost forgotten, and to have yielded to that of the land of Rameses (Gen 47:11).

The religion of Egypt during the reign of this Pharaoh appears to have been far less corrupt than it subsequently presents itself in the tinme of Moses. The Scriptures give us several indications of this; and these of no indistinct kind. Thus Joseph speaks to his master's wife as if she recognised the same God th'at he did (Gen 39:9). His language to the chief butler and baker in the prison conveys a similar idea (Gen 40:8), as does his address to Pharaoh when called before him (Gen 41:16-57). Pharaoh in his speech to his servants and to Joseph speaks of God precisely as Joseph had done, and as if he recognised but cne God (Gen 41:38-39). Joseph, without any fear of injurious consequences to himself, and as if it were no extraordinary thing, allows the identity of his religion with that of the sons of Jacob (Gen 42:18). Joseph's steward, probably a native Egyptian, evidently recognises their God (Gen 43:23). No doubt corruption had now been introduced into the pure religion derived from Noah. In the magicians and wise men (Gen 41:8) of Egypt we see probably a caste who had already given a superstitious coloring to religion, introduced new rites of worship, and paved the way for a total declension from theism to gross polytheism. But this latter condition does not appear to have been reached in the time of Joseph. Symbolic worship, if now, as is most likely, in common use, had still to a very great extent left undestroyed the notion of one supreme God ruling over all the nations; nor have we reason to suppose that Potipherah, the father-in-law of Joseph, and priest of On, was an upholder of the idolatry of a later time. The sun, now introduced into Egyptian worship, was by him in all likelihood explained as the sign and symbol of deity, but not as partaking of deity itself. No doubt we see from this the danger of any alteration by man of the worship ordained by God, but at the same time the religion of Egypt may have been comparatively true and pure, though it had now introduced that symbolism which quickly degenerated into the  grossest idolatry the world has ever seen. Symbolic worship was now probably regarded as a high proof of religious wisdom (Rom 1:22); a short time proved it to be utter folly.

The government of Pharaoh seems to have been of an absolute kind (Gen 41:40-43; see Wilkinson, 1:45). The supposition that at this time Egypt was governed by several independent dynasties seems inconsistent with the language and conduct of Pharaoh in making by his own mere will Joseph to be ruler "over all the land of Egypt," only inferior to himself throughout its whole extent. But this language is evidently that of courtly assumption, and may very naturally be applied only to that region over which he ruled. The evidence is very strong from the monuments and other sources that even under the Shepherd rule there were kings in other parts of Egypt largely if not wholly independent of them. The appointment of coregents decorated with royal titles is thought to have been characteristic of this dynasty (Trevor, Egypt, page 258). This Pharaoh's personal character seems to have been that of a wise and prudent monarch, anxious for the welfare of his people, and superior to popular prejudice against strangers. Wilkinson thinks he was pacific in his policy, and his conduct in receiving a blessing from the aged Jacob shows a humility of mind and a respect for worth which contrasts very favorably with the conduct of other despotic kings. The situation of his capital was near the land of Goshen (Gen 45:10), and the civilization and flourishing condition of Egypt during his reign were very great (Wilkinson, 1:43). Whether he were the same monarch whom we find ruling Egypt at the time of Jacob's death, seventeen years subsequently to his removal into Goshen, has been differently viewed (Gen 1:4). It has been thought by some that Joseph's using the intercession of Pharaoh's household to procure a favor from the king indicates a less intimate acquaintance than we should expect between him and that king who ruled at the time of the famine. But local customs, probably connected with the habits of Egyptian mourning, may account for this.without supposing a different king (Hengstenberg, Egypt, page 71).

3. The Pharaoh of the First Persecution of the Israelites. — The interval which elapsed between the Pharaoh of Joseph's time and the Pharaoh who commenced the persecution of Israel is much affected by opinion as to the length of the sojourn in Egypt. SEE CHRONOLOGY.

According to our view, the interval between Jacob's removal into Egypt and the birth of Moses was a little over one hundred and thirty-five years. The unknown  quantity is the period from the commencement of the persecution to the birth of Moses. It was the same Pharaoh that began to afflict Israel who reigned when Moses was born (Act 7:20), and the persecution must have continued a considerable time previous to allow for the events mentioned in the first chapter of Exodus. These included the building oftwo considerable cities and other labor, for which a period of several years seems to be required. The name and dynasty of this king have been differently given (Jour. of Sac. Lit. [new ser.] 1:491). Wilkinson supposes him to have been Amosis or Ames, the first of the eighteenth dynasty of Theban or Diospolitan kings, and supports his view of the change of dynasty at this time, and the accession of kings from the distant province of Thebes, from the scriptural account of him as" a new king that knew not Joseph"(1:47, 76). Lord Prudhoe, in an able paper given by Wilkinson (1:78), argues that the new king was Rameses I, who was also, according to him, the head of a new dynasty, and as such ignorant of the history of Joseph, while it was for Rameses II that the Israelites built the treasure cities. According to the fragment of Manetho preserved by Theophilus, the new king was Tkthmosis (Bunsen, Egypt, 1:655). He is very commonly supposed to have been the king who crushed the power of the Shepherds in Egypt. From a picture on the walls of a very interesting tomb of Roshere, "superintendent of the great buildings" to king Thothmes III, Trevor (Egypt, page 72) thinks it likely that it was during his dynasty, the eighteenth, that the oppression of Israel occurred, and that most likely Amosis, the first king, was the originator of it (page 275). Josephus (Ant. 2:9, 1) considers him to have been of a new family called to the throne; but Hengstenberg (Egypt, page 252) argues that the appellation of "new king," in the Bible, which is very often referred to in proof of a change of dynasty, indicates only a disregard of the services of Joseph, and a forgetfulness of the old affection that used to be entertained in Egypt and by its kings for the great preserver of their country.

According to Manetho's story of the Exodus-a story so contradictory to historical truth as scarcely to be worthy of mention-the Israelites left Egypt in the reign of Meneptah, who was great-grandson of the first Rameses, and son and successor of the second. This king is held by some Egyptologists to have reigned about the time of the rabbinical date of the Exodus, which is virtually the same as that which has been supposed to be obtainable from the genealogies. There is, however, good reason to place these kings much later; in which case Rameses I would be the oppressor; but then the building of Rameses could not be placed in his reign without a disregard of Hebrew chronology. But  the argument that there is no earlier known king Rameses loses much of its weight when we bear in mind that one of the sons of Aahmes, head of the eighteenth dynasty, who reigned about two hundred years before Rameses I, bore the same name, besides that very many names of kings of the Shepherd period, perhaps of two whole dynasties, are unknown. Against this one fact, which is certainly not to be disregarded, we must weigh the general evidence of the history, which shows us a king apparently governing a part of Egypt, with subjects inferior to the Israelites, and fearing a war in the country. Like the Pharaoh of the Exodus, he seems to have dwelt in Lower Egypt, probably at Avaris. (When Moses went to see his people, and slew the Egyptian, he does not seem to have made any journey, and the burying in sand shows that the place was in a part of Egypt, like Goshen, encompassed by sandy deserts.) Compare this condition with the power of the kings of the latter part of the eighteenth and of the nineteenth dynasties: rulers of an empire, governing a united country from which the head of their line had driven the Shepherds. The view that this Pharaoh was of the beginning or middle of the eighteenth dynasty seems at first sight extremely probable, especially if it be supposed that the Pharaoh of Joseph was a Shepherd king. The expulsion of the Shepherds at the commencement of this dynasty would have naturally caused an immediate or gradual oppression of the Israelites.

But it must be remembered that what we have just said of the power of some kings of this dynasty is almost as true of their predecessors. The silence of the historical monuments is also to be weighed, when we bear in mind how nuinerous the gaps are, and that we might expect many of the events of the oppression to be recorded even if the exodus were not noticed. If we assign this Pharaoh to the age before the eighteenth dynasty, which our view of Hebrew chronology would probably oblige us to do, we have still to determine whether he were a Shepherd or an Egyptian. If a Shepherd, he must have been of the sixteenth or the seventeenth dynasty; and that 'he was Egyptianized does not afford any argument against this supposition, since it appears that foreign kings, who can only be assigned to one of these two lines, had Egyptian names. In corroboration of this view we quote a remarkable passage that does not seem otherwise explicable: "My people went down aforetime into Egypt to sojourn there; and the Assyrian oppressed them without cause" (Isa 52:4): which may be compared with the allusions to the exodus in a predic tion of the same prophet respecting Assyria (10:24, 26). Our inference is strengthened by the discovery that kings bearing a name almost certainly an Egyptian  translation of an Assyrian or Babylonian regal title are among those apparently of the Shepherd age in the Turin Papyrus (Lepsius, Konigsbuch, Tafel 18:19:275, 285). According to our view of the Hebrew chronology, the birth of Moses occurred B.C. 1738. The scheme of Egyptian chronology which we have adopted places the beginning of the sixteenth (Shepherd) dynasty in B.C. 1755, and it would therefore be under the reign of one of the first kings of this dynasty, whose names are unknown, that the persecution of the Israelites began.

4. The Pharaoh of Moses's Exile. — It is often supposed that the Pharaoh who ruled Egypt at the birth of Moses is the same Pharaoh who ruled it when Moses fled into Midian (Exo 2:15). There is nothing in the narrative of Scripture to lead us to this conclusion, though it may possibly have been the case. The probabilities, however, seem to point the other way. We have allowed about eight years of his reign to have elapsed prior to the birth of Moses, who at the period of flight was forty years of age (Act 7:23). The monarch, therefore, if the same, must have reigned forty-eight years, which is an unusual length. (The entire 16th dynasty of thirty-two kings seems to have lasted but 112 years.) The jealousy also with which Moses was regarded by this Pharaoh seems to indicate that he did not stand towards him in the relation of his grandfather by adoption. The view is further confirmed by the intimation in Exo 4:19, which seems to tell us that the Pharaoh who sought Moses's life lived nearly to the time of his return into Egypt, a period of forty years. If this were so, it is impossible for this king to have been the monarch who began the persecution of Israel. We prefer, therefore, to regard him as different, and as probably chosen by adoption, to continue the succession of a childless family. We would mace the year during his reign at the flight of Moses to have been B.C. 1698, and his attempt upon the life of the great lawgiver is the only event of his reign recorded in Scripture.

5. The Pharaoh of the Exode. — The Pharaoh in whose reign the deliverance of the Israelites was achieved would appear to have succeeded to the throne not very long before the return of Moses to Egypt after his forty years' sojourn in Midian (Exo 4:19). His relationship to his predecessor is not told us, but he was probably of the same dynasty, and carried on the traditional policy of a grinding oppression of the Israelites. We do not read of any effort of his to re. duce the numbers of that nation: he seems rather to have looked on their numbers as an additional source of grandeur and power to Egypt by an enforced system of labor. The name of  this Pharaoh is very variously related. Wilkinson supposes him to have been Thothmes III, the fourth or fifth monarch, according to him, of the eighteenth dynasty of Theban or Diospolitan kings; while Manetho, according to Africanus, makes him to have been Amos, the first of that line of monarchs; and lord Prudhoe would have him to have been Pthahmen, the last of that dynasty (Wilkinson, AEgypt. 1:31, 41, 81). Ptolemy, the priest of Mendis, agrees in opinion with Manetho (Bunsen, Egypt, 1:90). Various reasons are given in the Journal of Sacred Literature (new ser. i, 490) for supposing him to have been Sethos II. Respecting the time of this king, we can only be sure that he was reigning for about a year or more before the exodus, which we place B.C. 1658.

His acts show us a man at once impious and superstitious, alternately rebelling and submitting. At first he seems to have thought that his magicians could work the same wonders as Moses and Aaron, yet even then he begged that the frogs might be taken away, and to the end he prayed that a plague might be removed, promising a concession to the Israelites, and as soon as he was respited failed to keep his word. This is not strange in a character principally influenced by fear, and history abounds in parallels to Pharaoh. His vacillation only ended when he lost his army in the Red Sea, and the Israelites were finally delivered out of his hand. Whether he himself was drowned has been considered matter of uncertainty, as it is not so stated in the account of the exodus. Another passage, however, appears to affirm it (Psa 136:15). It seems to be too great a latitude of criticism either to argue that the expression in this passage indicates the overthrow, but not the death of the king, especially as the Hebrew expression "shook off" or "threw in" is very literal, or that it is only a strong Shemitic expression. Besides, throughout the preceding history his end is foreshadowed, and is, perhaps, positively foretold in Exo 9:15; though this passage may be rendered, "For now I might have stretched out my hand, and might have smitten thee and thy people with pestilence; and thou wouldest have been cut off from the earth," as by Kalisch (Commnentary, ad loc.), instead of as in the A.V.

Although we have already stated our reasons for abandoning the theory that places the exodus under the nineteenth dynasty, it may be well to notice an additional and conclusive argument for rejecting as unhistorical the tale preserved by Manetho, which makes Meneptah, the son of Rameses II, the Pharaoh in whose reign the Israelites left Egypt. This tale was commonly current in Egypt, but it must Le remarked that the historian  gives it only on the authority of tradition. M. Mariette's recent discoveries have added to the evidence we already had on the subject. In this story the secret of the success of the rebels was that they had allotted to them by Amenophis, or Meneptah, the city of Avaris, formerly held by the Shepherds, but then in ruins. That the people to whom this place was given were working in the quarries east of the Nile is enough of itself to throw a doubt on the narrative, for there appear to have been no quirries north of those opposite Memphis, from which Avaris was distant nearly the whole length of the Delta; but when it is found that this very king, as well as his father, adorned the great temple of Avaris, the story is seen to be essentially false. Yet it is not improbable that some calamity occurred about this time, with which the Egyptians wilfully or ignorantly confounded the exodus: if they did so ignorantly, there would be an argument that this event took place during the Shepherd period, which was probably in after- times an obscure part of the annals of Egypt. The character of this Pharaoh finds its parallel among the Assyrians rather than the Egyptians. The impiety of the oppressor and that of Sennacherib are remarkably similar, though Sennacherib seems to have been more resolute in his resistance than Pharaoh. This resemblance is not to be overlooked, especially as it seems to indicate an idiosyncrasy of the Assyrians and kindred nations, for national character was more marked in antiquity than it is now in most peoples, doubtless because isolation was then general and is now special. Thus, the Egyptian monuments show us a people highly reverencing their gods, and even those of other nations, the most powerful kings appearing as suppliants in the representations of the temples and tombs. In the Assyrian sculptures, on the contrary, the kings are seen rather as protected by the gods than as worshipping them; so that we understand how in such a country the famous decree of Darius, which Daniel disobeyed, could be enacted. Again, the Egyptians do not seem to have supposed that their enemies were supported by gods hostile to those of Egypt, whereas the Assyrians considered their gods as more powerful than those of the nations they subdued. This is important in connection with the idea that at least one of the Pharaohs of the oppression was an Assyrian.

The idolatry of Egypt appears to have arrived at its height in the time of this monarch. We see evidences of a great difference between the religious system of this period and of the time of Joseph's Pharaoh. At both periods indeed we read of the "magician and wise men of Egypt," but it by no means follows that because the names are the same the part discharged by  them was identical in the two periods. Besides, we read in the later period (Exo 7:11) of an order of men (sorcerers, מְכִשְּׁפַים) apparently unknown in the earlier. These men supported their authority and doctrine by claims to miraculous power (Exo 7:11), whether we suppose them to have executed their feats merely by a skilful system of jugglery and sleight of hand, or, as many think, by diabolical aid. The authority of the God of Israel, acknowledged by the earlier Pharaoh, is by this king scornfully renounced, and a vast system of polytheism, embracing the famous worship of sacred animals, is firmly established as the religion of Egypt (5:2; 12:12; 8:26). This was the suitable time chosen by God, when a great monarch ruled over the greatest empire of its time, which had brought to full development the idolatry by it widely propagated, to read a lesson to the Gentile world on the feebleness of idols as compared to him.

Before speaking of the later Pharaohs we may mention a point of weight in reference to the identification of these earlier ones. The accounts of the campaigns of the Pharaohs of the eighteenth, nineteenth, and twentieth dynasties have not been found to contain any reference to the Israelites. Hence it might be supposed that in their days, or at least during the greater part of the time, the Israelites were not yet in the Promised Land. There is, however, an almost equal silence as to the Canaanitish nations. The land itself, Kanana or Kanaan, is indeed mentioned as invaded, as well as those of Kheta and Amar, referring to the Hittites and Amorites; but the latter two must have been branches of those nations seated in the valley of the Orontes. A recently discovered record of Thothmes III, published by M. de Rouge in the Revue Archeologique (November 1861, page 344 sq.), contains many names of Canaanitish towns conquered by that king, but not one recognised as Israelitish. These Canaanitish names are, moreover, on the Israelitish borders, not in the heart of the country. It is interesting that a great battle is shown to have been won by this king at Megiddo. It seems probable that the Egyptians either abstained from attacking the Israelites from a recollection of the calamities of the exodus, or that they were on friendly terms. It is very remarkable that the Egyptians were granted privileges in the law (Deu 23:7), and that Shishak, the first king of Egypt after the exodus whom we know to have invaded the Hebrew territories, was of foreign extraction, if not actually a foreigner.

6. Pharaoh, the Father-in-law of Mered. — In the genealogies of the tribe of Judah, mention is made of the daughter of a Pharaoh married to an Israelite: "Bithiah, the daughter of Pharaoh, which Mered took" (1  Chronicles 4:18). That the name Pharaoh here probably designates an Egyptian king we have already shown, and observed that the date of Mered is doubtful, although it is likely that he lived before, or not much after, the exodus. SEE BITHIAH. It may be added that the name, Miriam, of one of the family of Mered (Deu 23:17), apparently his sister, or perhaps a daughter by Bithiah, suggests that this part of the genealogies may refer to about the time of the exodus. This marriage may tend to aid us in determining the age of the sojourn in Egypt. It is perhaps less probable that an Egyptian Pharaoh would have given his daughter in marriage to an Israelite, than that a Shepherd king would have done so, before the oppression. But Bithiah may have been taken in war after the exodus, by the surprise of a caravan, or in a foray. Others, however, bring down this event to the times of or near those of David. It was then the policy of the Pharaohs to ally themselves with the great families whose power lay between Egypt and Assyria, as we know from the intermarriages of Hadad and Solomon with the Egyptian dynasty. The most interesting feature connected with this transaction is the name, Bithiah (daughter of Jehovah), given to the daughter of Pharaoh. It exhibits the true faith of Israel as exerting its influence abroad, and gaining proselytes even in the royal house of idolatrous Egypt. SEE MEREU.

7. Pharaoh, the Protector of Hadad. — With the exception of the preceding Pharaoh, whose date is doubtful, there is a long silence in Jewish history as to the kings of Egypt. During the period of the judges, and throughout the reigns of Saul and David, they had apparently neither entered into alliance nor made war with the Israelites. If such an event had happened, it is probable that some mention would have been made of it. It does not follow from this that during this period they had made no wars nor effected any conquests to the east of Egypt, for the seaboard of Canaan, which Israel did not during this time occupy, seems to have been a usual passage for the Egyptian armies in their eastern wars. But the silence of Scripture points to the probability that for this long period Egypt did not occupy the commanding position of the earlier or the later Pharaohs. Intestine divis'ons and dynastic quarrels may during a great portion of it have retained the Egyptians within their proper borders, satisfied if they were not assailed by foreign nations. In the reign of David we incidentally find notice of a Pharaoh who received with distinction Hadad the Edomite fleeing from Joab, and gave him his sister-in-law for wife (1Ki 11:15-22).

We find this Pharaoh ruling from about the twentieth year of  David'a reign to its close, i.e., from about B.C. 1033 to B.C. 1013. His reign perhaps came to an end soon after David's death, as Solomon's father-in-law is thought to have been another Pharaoh. His treatment of Hadad, a bitter enemy of David, and with strong reason so, was certainly an unfriendly act towards the latter, but it does not seem to have been attended by any ulterior consequences. No war ensued between Egypt and Israel, and Pharaoh made no attempt to restore Hadad to the throne of Edom. When this latter, upon David's death, sought to return home, evidently with the intention of disturbing the reign of Solomon in its commencement, Pharaoh was apparently opposed to his return, very probably from a disinclination to favor any step which might involve him in unpleasant relations with the powerful kingdom of Israel, then at the height of its greatness. Probably in the first part of this account the fugitives took refuge in an Egyptian mining-station in the peninsula of Sinai, and so obtained guides to conduct them into Egypt. There they were received in accordance with the Egyptian policy, but with the especial favor that seems to have been shown about this time towards the eastern neighbors of the Pharaohs, which may reasonably be supposed to have led to the establishment of the twenty-second dynasty of foreign extraction.

For the identification of this Pharaoh we have chronological indications, and the name of his wife. Unfortunately, however, the history of Egypt at this time is extremely obscure, neither the monuments nor Manetho giving us clear information as to the kings. It appears that towards the latter part of the twentieth dynasty the highpriests of Amen, the god of Thebes, gained great power, and at last supplanted the Rameses family, at least in Upper Egypt. At the same time a line of Tanitic kings, Manetho's twenty-first dynasty, seems to have ruled in Lower Egypt. The feeble twentieth dynasty was probably soon extinguished, but the priest-rulers and the Tanites appear to have reigned contemporaneously, until they were both succeeded by the Bubastites of the twenty-second dynasty, of whom Sheshonk I, the Shiskak of the Bible, was the first. The monuments have preserved the names of several of the highpriests, perhaps all, and probably of some of the Tanites; but it is a question whether Manetho's Tanitic line does not include some of the former, and we have no means of testing the accuracy of its numbers. It may be reasonably supposed that the Pharaoh or Pharaohs spoken of in the Bible as ruling in the time of David and Solomon were Tanites, as Tanis was nearest to the Israelitish territory. We have therefore to compare the chronological indications of Scripture with the list of this dynasty. Shishak must have begun to reign in the twenty-fifth year of Solomon (B.C. 989).

The conquest of Edom probably took place some fifty years earlier. It may therefore be inferred that Hadad fled to a king of Egypt who may have ruled at least twenty-five years, probably ceasing to govern before Solomon married the daughter of a Pharaoh early in his reign; for it seems unlikely that the protector of David's enemy would have given his daughter to Solomon, unless he were a powerless king, which it appears was not the case with Solomon's father-in-law. This would give a reign of twenty-five years, or 25 + x separated from the close of the dynasty by a period of twenty-four or twenty-five years. According to Africanus, the list of the twenty-first dynasty is as follows: Smendes, 26 years; Psusennes, 46; Nephelcheres, 4; Amenothis, 9; Osochor, 6; Psinaches, 9; Psusennes, 14; but Eusebius gives the second king 41, and the last 35 years, and his numbers make up the sum of 130 years, which Africanus and he agree in assigning to the dynasty, although the true sum seems to be 109 years. If we take the numbers of Eusebius, Osochor would probably be the Pharaoh to whom Hadad fled, and Psusennes II the father-in-law of Solomon; but the numbers of Africanus would substitute Psusennes I, and probably Psinaches. We cannot however, be sure that the reigns did not overlap, or were not separated by intervals, and the numbers are not to be considered trustworthy until tested by the monuments. The royal names of the period have been searched in vain for any one resembling Tahpenes. If the Egyptian equivalent to the similar geographical name Tahpanhes, etc., were known, we might have some clew to that of this queen. SEE TAHPANHES; SEE TAHPENES.

8. Pharaoh, the Father-in-law of Solomon. — In the narrative of the beginning of Solomon's reign, after the account of the deaths of Adonijah, Joab, and Shimei, and the deprivation of Abiathar, we read: "And the kingdom was established in the hand of Solomon. And Solomon made affinity with Pharaoh king of Egypt, and took Pharaoh's daughter, and brought her into the city of David, until he had made an end of building his own house, and the house of the Lord, and the wall of Jerusalem round about" (1Ki 2:46; 1Ki 3:1). The events mentioned before the marriage belong altogether to the very commencement of Solomon's reign, excepting the matter of Shimei, which, extending through three years, is carried on to its completion. The mention that the queen was brought into the city of David while Solomon's house, and the Temple, and the citywall were building, shows that the marriage took place not later than the eleventh year of the king, when the Temple was finished, having been  commenced in the fourth year (1Ki 6:1; 1Ki 6:37-38). It is also evident that this alliance was before Solomon's falling away into idolatry (1Ki 3:3), of which the Egyptian queen does not seem to have been one of the causes. From this chronological indication it appears that the marriage must have taken place between about twenty-four and eleven years before Shishak's accession. It must be recollected that it seems certain that Solomon's father-in-law was not the Pharaoh who was reigning when Hadad left Egypt. Both Pharaohs, as already shown, cannot vet be identified in Manetho's list. SEE PHARAOHS DAUGHTER

This Pharaoh led an expedition into Palestine, which is thus incidentally mentioned, where the building of Gezer by Solomon is recorded: "Pharaoh king of Egypt had gone up, and taken Gezer, and burnt it with fire, and slain the Canaanites that dwelt in the city, and given it [for] a present unto his daughter, Solomon's wife" (1Ki 9:16). This is a very curious historical circumstance, for it shows that in the reign of David or Solomon, more probably the latter, an Egyptian king, apparently on terms of friendship with the Israelitish monarch, conducted an expedition into Palestine, and besieged and captured a Canaanitish city. This occurrence warns us against the supposition that similar expeditions could not have occurred in earlier times without a war with the Israelites. Its incidental mention also shows the danger of inferring, from the silence of Scripture as to any such earlier expedition, that nothing of the kind took place.

This Pharaoh we suppose to have reigned over all Egypt, but he does not appear to have had any possessions in Asia. The kingdom of Israel, we are told, stretched to the land of the Philistines and the border of Egypt (1Ki 4:21), so that Egypt seems to have been strictly confined on the eastward by Philistia and Canaan. His expedition to and capture of Gezer was the capture of a city hitherto independent both of him and Solomon, and over which he retained no authority (1Ki 9:15-16). The kingdom of Israel was at this time of greater extent and power than that of Egypt, so that the alliance with Solomon would be courted by Pharaoh, and seems to have been productive of great commercial advantages both to Egypt and Israel (1Ki 10:28-29; 2Ch 1:16-17). It is the first direct intercourse of which we are with certainty informed between these two kingdoms since the time of the exodus. It is most likely that Pharaoh's daughter, married to Solomon in the opening of his reign, and when his zeal for Jehovah and his worship was at its height, was herself a convert to the faith of Solomon (1Ki 3:1-3). He would scarcely at  this period of his life have married an idolatress. and in the Bithiah of an uncertain date we have already seen some evidence of the influence of true religion on the royal house of Pharaoh. Nor can we readily suppose that the Song of Solomon, emblematic of the union of Christ and his Church, was founded on any other than the marriage of Solomon with a daughter of the true faith. To what extent this good influence may have spread in the family of Pharaoh can be only matter of conjecture. If it had prevailed to any great extent it may have partly led to the change of dynasty which we have reason to believe took place in Egypt during the reign of Solomon. Any tendency towards truth, if it existed in the royal house, was not shared by the priesthood or people of Egypt, who were firmly wedded to their debased system of idolatry.

This Egyptian alliance is the first indication, however, after the days of Moses, of that leaning to Egypt which was distinctly forbidden in the law, and produced the most disastrous consequences in later times. The native kings of Egypt and the Ethiopians readily supported the Hebrews, and were unwilling to make war upon them, but they rendered them mere tributaries, and exposed them to the enmity of the kings of Assyria. If the Hebrews did not incur a direct punishment for their leaning to Egypt, still this act must have weakened their trust in the divine favor, and paralyzed their efforts to defend the country against the Assyrians and their party.

The next kings of Egypt mentioned in the Bible are Shishak, probably Zerah, and So. The first and second of these were of the twenty-second dynasty, if the identification of Zerah with Userken be accepted, and the third was doubtless one of the two Shebeks of the twenty-fifth dynasty, which was of Ethiopians. The twenty-second dynasty was a line of kings of foreign origin, who retained foreign names, and it is noticeable that Zerah is called a Cushite in the Bible (2Ch 14:9; comp. 16:8). Shebek was probably also a foreign name. The title “Pharaoh" is probably not once given to these kings in the Bible, because they were not Egyptians, and did not bear Egyptian names. The Shepherd kings, it must be remarked, adopted Egyptian names, and therefore some of the earlier sovereigns called Pharaohs in the Bible may be conjectured to have been Shepherds notwithstanding that they bear this title. SEE SHISHAK; SEE SO; SEE ZERAH.

9. Pharaoh, the Opponent of Sennacherib. — It is not at all certain that the name used for so many centuries for the supreme ruler of Egypt was  ever again correctly used by itself to designate a particular king of Egypt. The Pharaoh of whom we read in the reign of Hezekiah as the rival of the Assyrian Sennacherib (2Ki 18:21; Isa 36:9), is, indeed, simply called Pharaoh, but this title is not given him by the sacred historian, but by the Assyrian general Rabshakeh. Pharaoh is still, indeed, used as the generic title of Egyptian rovalty (Isa 19:11), when no individlual king is intended, but when particular kings are meant the Scriptures join to Pharaoh a second title, as PharaohNecho, Pharaoh-Hophra. This may have been Josephus's reason for his statement (Ant. 8:6, 2) that after the father- in-law of Solomon no king of Egypt used this name. The Jewish historian was too well acquainted with Scripture not to have known of the title in connection with a second name, and he therefore meant probably that it was never again used by itself as the title of Egyptian royalty. The king of whom we are now speaking reigned in the fourteenth year of Hezekiah, i.e., about B.C. 713, and was the contemporary of Tirhakah king of Ethiopia, and of Sennacherib king of Assyria. This latter synchronism depends, however, on the correctness of the present Hebrew text, which some suppose to have been corrupted, and that it was Sargon and not Sennacherib who invaded Judaea in the fourteenth vear of IHezekiah (Journ. of Sacr. Lit. October 1858; January 1863). The comparison of Pharaoh in the above passages to a broken reed is remarkable, as the common hieroglyphics for" king," restricted to Egyptian sovereigns, Su- ten, strictly a title of the ruler of Upper Egypt, commence with a bent reed, which is an ideographic symbolical sign proper to this word, and is sometimes used alone without any phonetic complement. This Pharaoh can only be the Sethos whom Herodotus mentions as the opponent of Sennacherib, and who may reasonably be supposed to be the Zet of Manetho, the last king of his twenty-third dynasty. Tirhakah, as an Ethiopian, whether then ruling in Egypt or not, is, like So, apparently not called Pharaoh. SEE TIRHAKAH.

10. Pharaoh-Necho. — He was king of Egypt during the reigns of Josiah, Jehoahaz, and Jehoiakim, kings of Judah (2Ki 23:29-34). We do not read of him in Scripture until the last year of Josiah's reign, B.C. 609. How long before this he may have been king of Egypt the. Bible gives us no help in ascertaining. It mentions him as still reigning in the fourth year of king Jehoiakim, i.e., B.C. 606 (Jer 46:2), and from 2Ki 24:7 it seems probable that he continued to reign for a considerable time after this. In the Bible his name is written Nek6,נְכוֹ, and נְכֹה, and in  hieroglyphics Neku. This king was of the Saitic twenty-sixth dynasty, of which Manetho makes him either the fifth ruler (Africanus) or the sixth (Eusebius). Herodotus calls him Nekos, and assigns to him a reign of sixteen years, which is confirmed by the monuments. According to this historian, he was the son of Psammetichus I; this the monuments do not corroborate. Dr. Brugsch says that he married Nit-Akert, Nitocris, daughter of Psammetichus I and queen Shepuntepet, who appears, like her mother, to have been the heiress of an Egyptian royal line, and supposes that he was the son of Psammetichus by another wife (see Hist. d'Egypte, page 252; comp. 248). If he married Nitocris, he may have been called by Herodotus by mistake the son of Psammetichus.

The father of Necho had already distinguished himself by the siege and capture from the Assyrians of the strong town of Ashdod, which had been taken from the Egyptians in the reign of Sargon (Herod. 2:157; Isa 20:1). In the decline of the Assyrian empire Egypt ventured once more beyond her eastern confines, and indulged in the hope of universal domination, Necho in the commencement of his reign prepared to carry out to completion his father's ambitious designs, and it was in this endeavor that he came into contact with the kingdom of Judah, and so finds a place in Scripture history. Claiming an oracle from the true God, he advanced an Egyptian army against the town of Carchemish on the Euphrates. then apparently under the dominion of the king of Assyria (2Ch 35:21; 2Ki 23:29). There seems to be no doubt that Necho's claim to this oracle was sincere, and that he really thought himself commissioned to go to war with Assyria. How far this may indicate a true knowledge of God on Necho's part it is difficult to determine. Yet it can scarcely be understood as more than a conviction that the war was predestined, for it ended in the destruction of Necho's army and the curtailment of his empire. Josiah, however, influenced perhaps by an alliance with Assyria, or dreading the rising ambition of Egypt, disputed the march of Pharaoh's army. In vain the latter, evidently most unwilling to come into collision with Josiah, entreated him not to oppose him, and pleaded the oracle of him whom he would appear, in common with Josiah, to have recognised as the true God. At Megiddo (now Lejjun), a town not far from the coast-line of Palestine, so frequently the passage of great armies in the old wars of Asia, Josiah encountered the armies of Egypt, and his death on this occasion formed the subject of lamentations among his people long after it took place.

Without pausing upon his march, or returning back to attack  Jerusalem, Pharaoh seems to have passed on with all haste to accomplish his original design of capturing Carchemish, which commanded one of the ordinary fords of the Euphrates, and thus of meeting and conquering the king of Assyria in his own dominions. In this great expedition he was entirely success. ful. He took Carchemish, and retained possession of the countries between Egypt and the Euphrates until the rising power of Babylon under the great Nebuchadnezzar met and overthrew the Egyptian army four years afterwards at Carchemish, and forced them back into their own land. Returning from the Euphrates, he treated Judaea as a conquered country,. and exercised over it the same absolute authority which the Babylonians did immediately after him. Sending for Jehoahaz to Riblah in the land of Hamath, on the Orontes, a favorite camping-ground for the great armies of that period (Robinson, Bibl. Res. 3:545), he placed him there in bonds for a time after a brief reign of three months. This he seems to have done because he was not consulted in the choice of a king. On his farther march homeward, Necho entered as a conqueror into Jerusalem, placed the brother of Jehoahaz on the throne, and put the land to tribute. He then seems to have returned to Egypt, carrying with him the dethroned king of Judah, who died in the land of his captivity. The expedition of Necho, which Scripture describes as having been made against the king of Assyria, Josephus says was directed against the Medes and Babylonians, who had at this time, according to him, captured Nineveh (Ant. 10:5; see Rawlinson's Herod. 1:418. Herodotus mentions this battle, relating that Necho made war against the Syrians, and defeated them at Magdolus, after which he took Cadytis, "a large city of Syria" (2:159). There can be no reasonable doubt that Magdolus is Megiddo, and not the Egyptian town of that name, SEE MIGDOL, but the identification of Cadytis is difficult. It has been conjectured to be Jerusalem, and its name has been supposed to correspond to the ancient title, "the Holy," הקדושה, but it is elsewhere mentioned by Herodotus as a great coast-town of Palestine near Egypt (3:5), and it has therefore been supposed to be Gaza. The difficulty that Gaza is not beyond Megiddo would perhaps be removed if Herodotus be thought to have confounded Megiddo with the Egyptian Magdolus, or we may understand the term "coast" here used in a wide sense. (See Sir Gardner Wilkindon's note to Herod. 2:159, ed. Rawlinson.) It seems possible that Cadytis is the Hittite city Ketesh, on the Orontes, which was the chief stronghold in Syria of those captured by the kings of the eighteenth and nineteenth dynasties. The Greek historian adds that Necho  dedicated the dress he wore on these occasions to Apollo at the temple of Branchidae (l.c.).

The power of Egypt under Necho at this period of his reign was very great. From the composition of the army which he led to Carchemish and left there in garrison (Jer 46:9), we gather that Ethiopia and Libya were at this time a part of his dominions. Eastward of Egypt his power extended to the Great River, and the Lydians, if not his subjects, were in strict league with him. This was the period of the fall of Assyria, and Egypt for a time succeeded to its rule on the west of the Euphrates (Wilkinson, 1:157). This was that time of boasting in its military successes which Jeremiah describes in chapter 46, and he takes occasion from it to predict the approaching overthrow of Egypt. When this land "rose up like a flood, and he said, I will go up, and will cover the earth," the prophet in plain words spoke of approaching defeat in battle and utter humiliation as a nation. The power of Necho to the east of Egypt only lasted about four years. In the fourth year of Jehoiakim, Nebuchadnezzar, having conquered Nineveh, had leisure to turn his arms against Egypt. At Carchemish, which Necho had wrested from the Assyrians, the Babylonian army conquered that of Egypt. Whether Necho was present at this contest does not appear. Its issue was that he was driven out of Asia and came into it no more (2Ki 24:7). It would seem to have been at a later period, however, that the utter humiliation of Egypt described by Jeremiah took place, though the battle of Carchemish was one of those decisive conflicts which changed for a period the history of the world. The strength of Necho's armies seems not to have lain in the native Egyptians, but in foreigners, whether subjects, allies, or mercenaries. They were Ethiopians, Libyans, and Lydians who fought with Nebuchadnezzar. Wilkinson places the death of Necho shortly before the captivity of Jehoiakim (1:167). It is not certain, however, that Jehoiakim was carried away captive by Nebuchadnezzar. The book of Kings makes no mention of such an occurrence. Josephus states that he was put to death at Jerusalem (Ant. 10:6, 3). The second book of Chronicles only says (2Ch 36:6) that he was put into fetters for the purpose of being brought to Babylon. If Josephus's account is true, this purpose was not put into execution. Necho is famous in history for other besides his military exploits. The celebrated canal of Suez, according to Herodotus (2:158; see Wilkinson, 1:70), was completed by this king. He is also stated by this historian to have circumnavigated Africa, a performance the credibility of which is disputed by him for the very reason that makes it  to modern readers all but certainly true (Herod. 4:62; see Wilkinson, 1:160; Sir C. Lewis, Astronomy of the Ancients, page 317). SEE NECHO.

11. Pharuoh-Hophra. — This is the last of the Pharaohs of whom mention is made in the Bible. He is introduced to our notice in connection with the closing period of the Jewish monarchy, as attempting to ward off from God's people the judgments brought upon them for their sins at the hand of Nebuchadnezzar (Jer 37:7). He was on the throne of Egypt in the ninth year of the reign of Zedekiah (2Ki 25:1), i.e., about B.C. 590, continued to reign when Jerusalem had been taken by the Babylonians, B.C. 588, and was to continue reigning until a signal destruction should fall upon him, and he was to suffer the loss of life at the hand of his enemies (Jer 44:30), a prediction fulfilled about five years subsequently in the invasion of Egypt by Nebuchadnezzar, about B.C. 582 (Josephus, A nt. 10:9, 7). He ascended the throne about B.C. 589, and reigned for a period of nineteen years; but Eusebius, according to Syncellus. makes his reign to have lasted twenty-five years (Bunsen, Egypt, 1:640).

This Pharaoh is generally considered to have been the Apries or Vaphres (in hieroglyphic Wah-[p]rahah) of whom an account is given in Herodotus and Diodorus (Wilkinson, 1:168; Lewis. A stronomy of the Ancients, page317). He was, according to the former historian, the son of Psammis, and the grandson of Pharaoh-Necho, and enjoyed a fortunate reign of twenty-five years (2:141). Wilkinson (1:179) is doubtful whether he is the same person as Psammetichus III. Bunsen considers him to have be(n the fourth king of the twenty-sixth dynasty (Egypt, 1:164). Of PharaohNecho we are told that after his defeat by Nebuchadnezzar he came forth out of Egypt no more; but Pharaoh-Hophra had recovered strength sufficient to enable him to meet the armies of Babvlon out of his own country. At the time we read of him in Scripture he was in intimate alliance with Zedekiah, and it was doubtless in great part owing to his reliance upon Egypt that the infatuated king of Judah ventured to enter upon that contest with Nebuchadnezzar which terminated in the famous captivity of seventy years in Babylon. The pride of this Pharaoh was excessive. Ezekiel (Eze 29:3) compares him to a great dragon lying in the midst of his rivers, and saying, "My river is mine own, and I have made it for myself," much as his successful antagonist Nebuchadnezzar gloried in the contemplation of Babylon. Influenced by an opinion of Pharaoh's power, and stimulated in all likelihood by promises of aid, Zedekiah rebelled against the Babylonians, and drew on'that siege of Jerusalem which after two years resulted in its  capture (2Ki 25:1-3). The narrative of this event in Kings is very concise, but the fuller accounts in Jeremiah bring before us a temporary suspension of the siege caused by the advance of Pharaoh-Hophra with an Egyptian army to relieve Zedekiah (Jer 37:5-12). It is quite plain from Jeremiah that the siege was abandoned for a time and the Babylonian army withdrawn from Jerusalem, so as to allow free intercourse between the city and the surrounding country; but whether the Chaldaean army withdrew before the advancing army of Egypt or advanced against it is not agreed on. Josephus (Ant. 10:7, 3) expressly states that Nebuchadnezzar on hearing of the march of the Egyptians broke up from before Jerusalem, met the Egyptians on their advance, conquered them in battle, drove them out of Syria, and then returned to the siege of Jerusalem. Some, however, think that the Babylonians retreated from before the Egyptians, who on this occasion took Gaza, Sidon, and Tyre (Trevor, Egypt, page 321).

Looking simply to the scriptural account, the case appears to stand thus: On hearing of the rebellion of Zedekiah, Nebuchadnezzar despatched a force against Jerusalem, but without accompanying it himself. This force was sufficient to shut up Zedekiah within the city, but was not able to meet the Egyptian army in the field. This is the partial siege which is spoken of in Jer 37:5-11, in which nothing is said of Nebuchadnezzar's presence. On the approach of Pharaoh-Hophra the Chaldaean army, unequal to the conflict, retired before him, and he advanced unopposed. This was probably in the eighth year of Zedekiah. That Pharaoh came to Jerusalem we are not told. Probably on hearing of the raising of the siege he judged it unnecessary, and took the easier coast-line towards Syria (Jer 47:1). Nebuchadnezzar, made aware of the retreat of his army, now advanced with his entire force (Jer 39:1), laid siege to Jerusalem in the ninth year of Zedekiah, and took it in the eleventh year. That the Egyptians and Babylonians met on this occasion in battle is not stated in the Bible. We think it probable from Jer 37:7, that on hearing of Nebuchadnezzar's approach with the entire army of Babylon, the Egyptians retired without a contest and left Jerusalem to its fate (see Rawlinson's Herodotus, 1:423). Pharaoh-Hophra continued to be king of Egypt after the overthrow of Zedekiah (Jer 44:30), and he and his land were the refuge of those Jews who, contrary to God's command to remain in their own land ,after the general captivity, preferred a course of their own. They expected peace beneath the shadow of Egypt, trusting in the power of Pharaoh, who seems till then to have enjoyed great prosperity. But in this they were to be disappointed. Pharaoh was himself to be delivered  "into the hands of those who sought his life," of which Herodotus gives an account (2:169); at the very entry of Pharaoh's palace in Taphanes the Babylonian Nebuchadnezzar was to set his throne and spread his pavilion (Jer 43:10); and henceforth Egypt was to descend in the scale of nations, and to become the meanest among kingdoms. Herodotus relates how he attacked Sidon. and fought a battle at sea with the king of Tyre, until at length an army which he had despatched to conquer Cyrene was routed, and the Egyptians, thinking he had purposely caused its overthrow to gain entire power, no doubt by substituting mercenaries for native troops, revolted, and set up Amasis as king. Apries, only supported by the Carian and Ionian mercenaries, was routed in a pitched battle. Herodotus remarks in narrating this, "It is said that Apries believed that there was not a god who could cast him down from his eminence, so firmly did he think that he had established himself in his kingdom." He was taken prisoner, and Amasis for a while treated him with kindness, but when the Egyptians blamed him, "he gave Apries over into the hands of his former subjects, to deal with as they chose. Then the Egyptians took him and strangled him" (Herod. 2:161-169).

The Scripture passages, which entirely agree with the account Herodotus gives of the death of Apries, make it not improbable that the invasion of Nebuchadnezzar was the cause of that disaffection of his subjects which ended in the overthrow and death of this Pharaoh. The invasion is not spoken of by any trustworthy profane historian excepting Berosus (Cory, Anc. Frag. 2d ed. pages 37, 38), but the silence of Herodotus and others can no longer be a matter of surprise, as we now know from the Assyrian records in cuneiform of conquests of Egypt either unrecorded elsewhere or only mentioned by second-rate annalists. SEE HOPIRA.

Pharaoh-Hophra was succeeded by two independent monarchs, the first of whom, Amasis, had a very prosperous reign; but in the reign of his son, Psammetichus, or Psammenitus, according to the Greeks, the Persian invasion took place, when Egypt was reduced to insignificance, and the ancient title of Pharaoh was transferred from the kings of Egypt to their conquerors (Trevor, Egypt, page 331; Wilkinson, Egypt. 1:169-198); No subsequent Pharaoh is mentioned in Scripture, but there are predictions doubtless referring to the misfortunes of later princes until the second Persian conquest, when the prophecy "There shall be no more a prince of the land of Egypt" (Eze 30:13) was fulfilled. SEE EGYPT.

## Pharaoh Of The Exode[[@Headword:Pharaoh Of The Exode]]

             Owing to the deep interest in the history of that event, extraordinary efforts have been made by Biblical scholars to identify this Egyptian king, whose name is .not-given in the sacred narrative. Most writers have been content to, compare the-chronologies of Egypt and the Bible together, and rest in the simple synchronism, a result necessarily problematical from the acknowledged uncertainty of both these chronological schemes. Thus the Speaker's Commentary (1:455, Amer. ed.) concludes that the Egyptian monarch in question was Thothmes III; but this result depends upon a series of chronological calculations and comparisons every step in which is debatable. The most favorite identification, however, of late, has been with  Menephthah I, son of Rameses II, or the great Sesostris. This is adopted by Brugsch, Bunsen, Chabas, Ebers, Lenormant, Lepsius, Rawlinson, De Rouge, Vigouroux, and others. We give the reasons pro ct con.

1. Josephus cites (Apion, 1:26 sq.) Manetho as stating that Moses was identical with a certain Osarsiph, or Egyptian priest of Heliopolis, who headed a revolt of a band of lepers in the reign of Amenophis; and this prince appears to be the Menephthah (or Mernephthah) of the monuments, and the Amenophath or Amenephthes of the 19th dynasty of Manetho's lists, by reason of his association, in the above account in Josephus, with Sethos or Rameses as his son, and Rhampses (or Rameses) as his father. But Josephus himself expressly and somewhat passionately contradicts the identification in question, and he alleges, and goes far to prove, numerous inconsistencies and fallacies in it, arguing, in, short, that the whole story is a mendacious invention, and especially dwelling upon the fact that the insurgents in that case, so far from succeeding in their escape from Egypt, were ultimately subdued and destroyed by the Egyptians.. The statements of Manetho himself, as extant in Syncellus and Eusebius, make no mention of-this identification, but variously name Amosis (head of the 18th dynasty) and Achencheroes (ninth king of the same dynasty) as the Pharaoh of the Exode.

In another passage (Apion, 1:32, 33) Josephus gives a similar narrative from Cheremon: but, as he justly shows, the contradictions of the story are there still more apparent. In a third account, from Lysimachus (ibid. 34) the Egyptian king's name is given as Bocchoris, and so all trace of identity disappears. Josephus himself repeatedly affirms that Manetho's own work gave Tethmosis (or Thummoses, son of Alisphragmuthosis [Misphragmuthosis]) as the name of the Pharaoh of the Exode.

2. The circumstances of Rameses II, father of the Egyptian king under consideration, are supposed to favor his identification with the Pharaoh of the oppression. and so to coincide with the theory in question. Thus he was a great builder of cities, especially (it is alleged) of Pi-Tum and Pi-Ramses, which are held to be the Pithom and Raameses of the Bible. But the last identifications are extremely doubtful, and the name Rameses appears as that of a district as early as Joseph's day (Gen 47:11). The identification of an oppressed or conquered people in his reign, named Aperu on the monuments, with the Hebrews, is equally doubtful, both in the reading and application; it is at all events certain that the people so  named were foreign serfs, and that they were employed in large numbers at a period considerably later than the Exode (Brugsch, Hist. of Egypt, 2:129). Opposed to this identification is the well-known character of the Rameses in question as a just and humane prince, who cannot have been guilty of the atrocious policy of drowning all the male children of a portion of his subjects.

3. The character and circumstances of Menephthah himself are not given with sufficient detail in the Egyptian chronicles or monuments to enable us to say with definiteness whether; they agree or, disagree with the Biblical account.... There is nothing in them, however, which tallies with the overthrow at the Red Sea. It, as the history in Exodus implies, and as later Scriptural notices expressly affirm (e.g. Psa 136:15), the Egyptian king was himself: drowned there, it cannot have been Menephthah, who certainly reigned much longer than the brief interval between Moses' return to Egypt (Exo 4:19; comp. 2:15) and the Exode. Moreover, Menephthah was one of a large family of sons born to Rameses during his long reign, and this militates decidedly against the adoption of Moses as heir through a daughter. Dr. Schaff adduces (Through Bible Lands, page 102) a circumstance-mentioned by Herodotus (2:111), that the successor of Sesostris (supposed to be Rameses II) was smitten with blindness for ten years as a punishment for hurling his spear into the Nile during an extraordinary overflow; but this looks to us very little, like the catastrophe at the Red Sea; and, besides, the historian calls the king in question Pheron, and he names his successor Proteus, words which have no place in the dynastic lists.

4. Finally and ,conclusively, the chronology of the period will not allow this identification. The lowest date for the Exode is the Rabbinical, B.C. 1312; Usher's is 1491; Hales's, 1614; our own, 1658; while the dates assigned to the end of Menepothah's reign are as follows: Mariette, cir. B.C., 1288; Lepsius, 1273; Wilkinson, 1200; ours, 1175. The difference, in any case, is from a quarter of a century to, four centuries and a half. It is useless to plead the uncertainty of the dates in either line, because it is precisely here that both the Egyptian and the Biblical chronologies begin to be definite; and the tendency of modern criticism is to widen rather than contract the discrepancy at this point. This objection has not escaped Josephus, who expressly remarks (Apion, 1:27) that, according to Manetho, "Moses lived many generations earlier" than the king in question, or, more definitely (ibid. 26), 518 years, or, according to his own detailed estimate (ibid. 15),  exactly 327 years. Our calculation, 483 years, is nearly a mean between. these. Josephus further states (Apion, 2:2) that Solomon built the temple 612years after the Jews came out of Egypt" (he elsewhere makes it variously 592 and 632 years in our own scheme it was 648 years); and he fortifies this date by. a reference to the then well-known contemporaneous Tyrian annals. He adds (ibid.) that the date of the Exode, according to the above notice of Lysimachus (i.e., as occurring under king Bocchoris) would make it "1700 years ago," or about B.C. 1630, which again is substantially our date. We conclude therefore that Josephus at least (from whom, be it noted, the whole basis of this proposed identification is derived) was clear and consistent as well as definitely grounded in his chronology, both in its Biblical and its Egyptian relations; and like him we must decidedly reject this synchronism. SEE MANETHO.

## Pharaohs Daughter[[@Headword:Pharaohs Daughter]]

             Three Egyptian princesses, daughters of Pharaohs, are mentioned in the Bible. Our account of them includes whatever notices are extant in other writers.

1. The preserver of Moses, daughter of the Pharaoh who first oppressed the Israelites. She appears from her conduct towards Moses to have been heiress to the throne, something more than ordinary adoption seeming to be expressed in the passage in Hebrews respecting the faith of Moses (Heb 11:23-26), and the designation "Pharaoh's daughter" perhaps here indicating that she was the only daughter. She probably lived for at least forty years after she saved Moses, for it seems to be implied in the above passage of Hebrews that she was living when he fled to Midian. Artapanus, or Artabanus, a historian of uncertain date, who appears to have preserved traditions current among the Egyptian Jews, calls this princess Merrhis, and her father, the oppressor, Palmanothes, and relates that she was married to Chenephres, who ruled in the country above Memphis, for that at that time there were many kings of Egypt, but that this one, as it seems, became sovereign of the whole country (Frag. Hist. Graec. 3:220 sq.). Palmanothes may be supposed to be a corruption of Amenophis, the equivalent of Amen-hept, the Egyptian name of four kings of the eighteenth dynasty, and also, but incorrectly, applied to one of the nineteenth, whose Egyptian name, Meneptah, is wholly different from that of the others. No one of these, however, had, as far as we know, a daughter with a name resembling Merrhis, nor is there any king with a name like Chenephres of this time. These kings Amenophis, moreover, do not belong to the period of contemporary dynasties. The tradition is apparently of little value, excepting as showing that one quite different from that given by Manetho and others was anciently current. SEE PHARAOH, 4.

2. Bithiah, wife of Mered, an Israelite, daughter of a Pharaoh of an uncertain age, probably about the time of the exodus. SEE BITHIAH; SEE PHARAOH, 6.

3. A wife of Solomon, most probably daughter of a king of the twenty-first dynasty. She was married to Solomon early in his reign, and apparently treated with distinction. It has been supposed that the Song of Solomon was written on the occasion of this marriage and the idea is, we think,  sustained by sound criticism. She was at first brought into the city of David (1Ki 3:1), and afterwards a house was built for her (1Ki 7:8; 1Ki 9:24), because Solomon would not have her dwell in the house of David, which had been rendered holy by the ark having been there (2Ch 7:11). SEE PHARAOH, 8.

## Pharaohs Wife[[@Headword:Pharaohs Wife]]

             The wife of one Pharaoh, the king who received Hadad the Edomite, is mentioned in Scripture. She is called "queen," and her name, Tahpenes, is given. Her husband was most probably of the twenty-first dynasty. SEE PHARAOH, 7, TAHPENES.

## Pharathoni[[@Headword:Pharathoni]]

             (Φαραθωνί v.r. Φαραθών; Josephus, Φαραθώ, Peshito, Pherath; Vulg. Phara), one of the cities of Judica fortified by Bacchides during his contests with Jonathan Maccabeeus (1Ma 9:50). In both MSS. of the Sept. the name is joined to the preceding — Tharmnatha-Pharathon; but in Josephus, the Syriac, and Vulgate, the two are separated. Ewald (Geschichte, 4:373) adheres to the former. Pharathon doubtless represents an ancient Pirathon, though hardly that of the Judges, since that was in Mount Ephraim, probably at Ferata, a few miles west of Nablus, too far north to be included in Judaea properly so called.

## Phares[[@Headword:Phares]]

             (Φαρές), a Grsecized form (Mat 1:3; Luk 3:33) of the name of PHAREZ SEE PHAREZ (q.v.), the son of Judah.

P

harez,

the name of two persons.

1. (Heb. Pe'retz, פֶּרֶוֹ, a breach, as explained Gen 38:29; Sept. and N.T. Φαρές; A.V. "Perez," 1Ch 27:3; "Phares," Mat 1:3; Luk 3:33; 1Es 5:5), twin son with Zarah, or Zerah, of Judah by Tamar his daughter-in-law. B.C. cir. 1890. The circumstances of his birth are detailed in Genesis 38. Pharez seems to have kept the right of primogeniture over his brother, as, in the genealogical lists, his name comes first. The house also which he founded was far more numerous and illustrious than that of the Zarhites. Its remarkable fertility is alluded to in  Rth 4:12 : "Let thy house be like the house of Pharez, whom Tamar bare unto Judah." Of Pharez's personal history or character nothing is known. We can only speak of him therefore as a demarch, and exhibit his genealogical relations. At the time of the sojourn in the wilderness "the families of the tribe of Judah were: of Shelah, the family of the Shelalites, or Shilonites; of Pharez, the family of the Pharzites; of Zerah, the family of the Zarhites. And the sons of Pharez were, of Hezron, the family of the Hezronites, of Hamul, the family of the Hamulites" (Num 26:20-21). After the death therefore, of Er and Onan without children, Pharez occupied the rank of Judah's second son, and, moreover, from two of his sons sprang two new chief houses, those of the Hezronites and Hamulites. From Hezron's second son Ram, or Aram, sprang David and the kings of Judah, and eventually Jesus Christ. SEE GENEALOGY OF JESUS CHRIST.

The house of Caleb was also incorporated into the house of Hezron, SEE CALEB, and so were reckoned among the descendants of Pharez. Another line of Pharez's descendants were reckoned as sons of Manasseh by the second marriage of Hezron with the daughter of Machir (1Ch 2:21-22). In the census of the house of Judah contained in 1 Chronicles 4, drawn up apparently in the reign of Hezekiah (1Ch 4:41), the houses enumerated in 1Ch 4:1 are Pharez, Hezron, Carmi, Hur, and Shobal. Of these all but Carmi (who was a Zarhite, Jos 7:1) were descendants of Pharez. Hence it is not unlikely that, as is suggested in the margin of the A.V., "Carmi" is an error for "Chelubai." Some of the sons of Shelah are mentioned separately at Jos 7:21-22. SEE PAHATH-MOAB.

In the reign of David the house of Pharez seems to have been eminently distinguished. The chief of all the captains of the host for the first month, Jashobeam, the son of Zabdiel (1Ch 27:2-3), so famous for his prowess (1Ch 11:11), and called "the chief among the captains" (ibid. and 2Sa 23:8), was of the sons of Perez, or Pharez. A considerable number of the other mighty men seem also, from their patronymic or gentile names, to have been of the same house, those, namely, who are called Bethlehemites, Paltites (1Ch 2:33; 1Ch 2:47), Tekoites, Netophathites, and Ithrites (1Ch 2:53; 1Ch 4:7). Zabad, the son of Ahlai, and Joab and his brothers, Abishai and Asahel, we know were Pharzites (1Ch 2:31; 1Ch 2:36; 1Ch 2:54; 1Ch 11:-41). The royal house itself was the head of the family. We have no means of assigning to their respective famiilies those members of the tribe of Judah who are incidentally mentioned after David's reign, as Adnah, the 'chief captain of Judah in Jehoshaphat's reign, and Jehohanan and Amasiah,  his companions (2Ch 17:14-16); but that the family of Pharez continued to ithrive and multiply we may conclude from the numbers who returned from captivity. At Jerusalem alone 468 of the sons of Perez, with Athaiah, or Uthai, at itheir head, were dwelling in the days of Zerubbabel (1Ch 9:4; Neh 11:4-6), Zerubbabel himself of course being of the family (1Es 5:5). Of the lists of returned captives in Ezra 2, Nehemiah 7, Nehemiah's time, the following seem to have been of the sons of Pharez, judging as before from the names of their ancestors, or the towns to which they belonged: the children of Bani (Ezr 2:10; comp. 1Ch 9:4); of Bigvai (1Ch 2:14; comp. Ezr 8:14); of Ater (Ezr 2:16; conp. 1Ch 2:26; 1Ch 2:54); of Jorah, or Hariph (1Ch 2:18; Neh 7:24; comp. 1Ch 2:51); of Bethlehem and Netophah (1Ch 2:21-22; comp. 1Ch 2:54); of Kirjatharim (1Ch 2:25; comp. 1Ch 2:50; 1Ch 2:53); of Harim (1Ch 2:32; comp. 1Ch 4:8); and, judging from their position, many of the intermediate ones also (comp. also the lists in Ezr 10:25-43; Neh 10:14-27). Of the builders of the wall named in Nehemiah 3 the following were of the house of Pharez: Zaccur, the son of Imri (Neh 3:2, by comparison with 1Ch 9:4, and Ezr 8:14, where we ought, with many MSS., to read "Zaccur" for "Zabbud"); Zadok, the son of Baana (Ezr 8:4, by comparison with 2Sa 23:29, where we find that Baanah was a Netophathite, which agrees with Zadok's place here next to the Tekoites, since Bethlehem, Netophah, and Tekoa are often in close juxtaposition, comp. 1Ch 2:54; 1Ch 4:4-5; Ezr 2:21-22; Neh 7:26, and the situation of the Netophathites close to Jerusalem, among the Benjamites, Neh 12:28-29, compared with the mixture of Benjamites with Pharzites and Zarhites in Neh 3:2-7); the Tekoites (Neh 3:5; Neh 3:27, comp. with 1Ch 2:24; 1Ch 4:5); Jehoiada, the son of Paseah (1Ch 4:6, comp. with 1Ch 4:12, where Paseah, a Chelubite, is apparently descended from Ashur, the father of Tekoa); Rephaiah, the son of Hur (1Ch 4:9, comp. with 1Ch 2:20; 1Ch 2:50; 1Ch 4:4; 1Ch 4:12, Beth- Raphah); Hanun (1Ch 4:13; 1Ch 4:30), with the inhabitants of Zanoah (comp. with 1Ch 4:18); perhaps Malchiah, the son of Rechab (1Ch 4:14, comp. with 1Ch 2:55); Nehemiah, son of Azbuk, ruler of Beth-zur (1Ch 2:16, comp. with 1Ch 2:45); and perh. Baruch, son of Zabba, or Zaccai (1Ch 2:20), if for Zaccai we read Zaccur as the mention of "the other, or second, piece," makes probable, as well as his proximity to Meremoth in this second piece, as Zaccur was to Meremoth in their first pieces (1Ch 2:2; 1Ch 2:4).

2. (Sept. Φαρές v. r. Φόρος) A Graecized form (1Es 8:30) for the PAROSH SEE PAROSH (q.v.) of the Heb. text (Ezr 8:3).

## Pharira[[@Headword:Pharira]]

             (Φαριρά v.r. Φαριδά), a corrupt form (1Es 5:33) of the name PERIDA SEE PERIDA (q.v.) of the Heb. text (Neh 7:57).

## Pharisee[[@Headword:Pharisee]]

             a designation (in the N.T. and Josephus) of one of the three sects or orders of Judaism in the time of Christ, the other two being the Essenes and the Sadducees. The following account of them is from Scriptural and Talmudical notices, with whatever light the comparison affords.

I. Name of the Sect, and its Signification. — The name Φαρισαῖος — Pharisee is the Greek form of the Hebrew פָּרוּשׁ (parush, passive participle of פָּרִשׁ, to separate, plur. פְּרוּשַׁים, Aramaic פְּרוּשְׁין), and properly denotes one who is separated, i.e., by special practices; or, as the dictionary called Aruch (s.v.) defines it, "one who separated himself from Levitical impurity and Levitically impure food" (comp. also Talmud, Chagigah, 18 b; Sabbath, 13 a). The derivation of it from פָּרִשׁ, in the sense of unfolding, explaining, and the assertion that the followers of this sect were called Pharisees — interpreters of the Bible, in contradistinction to the Sadducees, who adhered to the letter of the Scriptures, as well as the more generally received notion that they were so called because they separated from the rest f the people, believing themselves to be more holy, are at variance with the most ancient and most trustworthy authorities upon this subject. Besides, to take פָּרוּשׁ as meaning interpreter is contrary to its grammatical form, which, if transitive, ought to be מפרשOf course the separation from that which was Levitically impure necessarily implied separation from those who were defiled by Levitically impure objects. It must be observed that the name Pharisees is given to'them in the Mishna (Jebamoth, 4:6, etc.) by their opponents the Sadducees, and that the names by which they were designated among themselves are חֲכָמַים, sages, or, more modestly תִּלְמַידֵי חֲכָמַים, disciples of the sages, but more generally

חֲבִרְים, associates. By the term Pharisees, פְּרוּשַׁים, or its equivalent Claberim, חֲבֵרַים, i.e., associates, is therefore meant all those Jews who separated themselves from every kind of Levitical impurity, and united  together to keep the Mosaic laws of purity. As it was natural that all the students of the law would, as a matter of course, be the first to join this association, the appellation Chaber, חָבֵר, member, associate, or פָּרוּשׁ, Pharisee, became synonymous with student, disciple, lawyer, scribe, while those who refused to unite to keep the laws were regarded as עִם הָאָרֵוֹ, country people, common people, illiterates, irreligious.

II. The Qualfications for Menbership of the Pharisaic Association. — The most essential conditions which were enacted from every one who wished to become a Chaber or member of the Pharisaic association were two. Each candidate was required to promise in the presence of three members that —

(i) He would set apart all the sacred tithes on the produce of the land, and refrain from eating anything which had not been tithed, or about the tithing of which there was any doubt; and

(ii) He would scrupulously observe the most essential laws of purity which so materially affected the eating of food and all family affairs.

To understand these laws, which may seem trivial and arbitrary, as well as to see the extraordinary influence which they exercised upon the whole religious and social life of the Jewish nation in all its ramifications, the following facts must be borne in mind: The Mosaic law enjoins that besides the priestly heave-offering (תְּרוּמָה) every Israelite is annually to give to the Levites a tithe of all the produce (Num 18:21-24), which the Jewish canons call the first tithe ( רָאשׁוֹן מִעֲשֵׂר); that a second tithe (מִעֲשֵׂר שֵׁנַי), as it is termed in the same canons, is to be taken annually from the produce to Jerusalem, either in kind or specie, and consumed by the owner in the metropolis in festive celebration (Deu 12:5-18), and that every third year this second tithe is to be given to the poor (Deu 14:28-29), whence it is denominated the poor tithe (עָנַי מִעֲשֵׂר) in the ancient canons. Moreover, as each seventh year was a Sabbatic or fallow year, which yielded no harvest, it was fixed that in the first. second, fourth, and fifth years of the septennial cycle the second tithe is to be eaten by the owner in Jerusalem, while in the third and sixth years it is to be distributed among the poor, and be the poor tithe. When it is remembered that these tithal laws, which were originally enacted for Palestine, were in the post-exilian period extended to Egypt, Ammon,  Moab, and to every land in which the Jews had possessions, that they had more of a religious than civil import, that the portion of produce reserved as tithes was holy, that the eating of holy things was a deadly sin, and that the non-separation of the tithes rendered the whole produce unlawfuil, thus affecting every article of food, the paramount importance of the first condition which the Pharisees, who were the conservators of the divine law, exacted from the candidates for fellowship will readily be understood (comp. Mishna, Bekoroth, 30 b).

Of equal importance, and equally affecting the whole fabric of social and religious life, are the Mosaic laws upon the strength of which the second condition was exacted. These laws, which so rigidly enforce the eschewing of unclean food and defiling objects, even without the amplifications and expansion which obtained in the course of time, extend to and affect almost every actioi in public life and every movement in family intercourse. Thus not only are numbers of animals proscribed as food, but their very carcasses are branded as unclean, and he who touches them is temporarily de. filed, and pollutes every one and everything wherewith he comes in contact (Lev 5:2; Leviticus 11). A man that has an issue not only defiles everything upon which he lies, sits, or which he touches, but his very spittle is polluting (Lev 15:1-13). The same is the case with a man who comes in contact with a corpse (Num 19:14-22), with a woman in menstruum and childbirth (Lev 12:1-8; Lev 15:19-31), and with a husband after conjugal intercourse (Lev 15:18). Individuals thus defiled were forbidden to come into the sanctuary (Num 19:20), and were visited with the severe punishment of excision if they ate the flesh of peace-offering (Lev 7:20-21). Now the slightest reflection upon the workings of these laws will show that thousands upon thousands were daily unclean according to the Mosaic institutions, that these thousands of unclean men and women legally defiled myriads of people and things by contact with them, either wittingly or unwittingly, and that it therefore became absolutely necessary for those who were conscientiously desirous of discharging their religious duties in a state of legal purity to adopt such precautionary measures as would preclude the possibility of violating these laws. Hence the Jewish canons ordained that since one does not know whether he has been defiled by contact with any unclean person or thing, every Chaber or member of the Pharisaic association is "to wash his hands before eating his ordinary food, second tithes, or the heave- offering; to immerse his whole body before he eats the portions of holy  sacrifices; and to bathe his whole body before touching the water absolving from sin, even if it is only his hands which are unclean. If one immersed himself for ordinary food, and designed it only for ordinary food, he could not eat second tithes; if he immersed for second tithes, and meant it only for second tithes, he could not eat of the heave-offering; if he immersed for the heave-offering, and meant by it the heave-offering, he was not allowed to eat the portions of the holy sacrifice; if he immersed for the holy sacrifice, and meant it for the holy sacrifice, he could not as vet touch the water absolving from sin; but he who immersed for the more important could share in the less important" (Mishna, Chagigah, 2:5, 6).

This gave rise to four degrees of purity, and to four divisions in the Pharisaic associations, so that every Chaber or member belonged to that rank whose prescriptions of purity he practiced. Each degree of purity required a greater separation from the above-named Mosaic defilements. The impure subjects themselves were termed the fathers of impurity, that which was touched by them was designated the first generation of impurity, what was touched by this again was called the second generation of impurity, and so on. Now ordinary food, the first degree of holiness, became impure when touched by the second generation; heave-offering, the second degree of holiness, became defiled when touched by the third generation; the flesh of sacrifices, the third degree of holiness, when coming in contact with the fourth generation, and so on. These degrees of purity had even to be separated from each other, as the lower degree was impure in respect to the higher one. The same removal, both from defilement without and the different gradations within, was required of each member of the Pharisaic order corresponding to the degree to which he belonged. Hence "the garments of an עִם הָאָרֶוֹ, Antha-Aretz ['man of earth,' or a publican, a sinner, as he is termed in the N.T., who neglected to pay the tithes and observe the laws of Mosaic purity], defile the Pharisee [i.e., him who lived according to the first degree of purity], the garments of a Pharisee defile those who eat of the heaveoffering [i.e., the second degree], the garments of those who eat the heave-offering defile those who eat the sacred sacrifices [i.e., the third degree], and the garments of those who eat the sacred sacrifices defile those who touch the water absolving from sin [i.e., the fourth degree]" (comp. Mishna, Chagigah, 2:7, with Taharoth, 7:5).

The above-mentioned two conditions exacted from candidates for membership of the Pharisaic association are thus expressed in the Mishna: "He who takes upon himself to be conscientious, tithes whatever he eats,  and whatever he sells, and whatever he buys, and does not become the guest of an Amha-Aretz [i.e., a non-Pharisee]; . . . and he who takes upon himself to become a member of the Pharisaic association must neither sell to an Amha-Aretz moist or dry fruit, nor buy of him moist fruit, nor become the guest of an Amha-Aretz, nor receive him as guest, in his garments, into his house" (Demai, 2:2, 3; comp. Mat 23:23; Luk 17:12). It is in accordance with this regulation that Christ enjoins that an offender is to be regarded "as a heathen man and publican" (Mat 18:17), that the apostle Paul commands "not to eat" with a sinner (1Co 5:11), and it is for this reason that Christ was upbraided by the Pharisees for associating and eating with publicans and sinners (Mat 9:9-11; Mat 11:19; Mar 2:16; Luk 5:30; Luk 7:34), with the neglecters of tithes and the transgressors of the laws of purity, which was not only in violation of the then prevailing Pharisaic and national law, but contrary to the Mosaic enactments. But he came to teach that "not that which goeth into the mouth [i.e, untithed food or edibles handled by Levitically unclean persons] defileth a man, but that which cometh out of the mouth, this defileth a man" (Mat 15:11); and that it is not outward washing but inward purity which is acceptable. For this reason "he sat down to meat with a Pharisee, and did not first wash before dinner" (Luk 11:37-40); which, as we have seen, was in contravention of the very first degree of purity among the association. It must, however, be remarked that the Jews were not peculiar in their laws of purity and defilement. Other nations of antiquity had similar statutes. Thus, among the ancient Indians, one who had an issue was obliged to bathe and pray to the sun (Maunu, 2:181); among the Hierapolytans in Syria every inmate of the house in which a death took place was thirty days unclean, and could not go to the temple during that time (Lucian, De Syr. dea, 53); the Greeks, too, were defiled by contact with a corpse, and could not resort to the temple (Theophrast. Charact. 16; Elurip. Iphig. Taur. 367; Diog. Laer. 8:33); both the Parsees and the Greeks regarded a woman in childbirth as unclean (Kleuker, Zend-Avesta, 3:222, 223; Eurip. Iphig. Taur. 367); and "no Egyptian would salute a Greek with a kiss, nor use a Greek knife, spits, caldrons, nor taste the meat of an ox which had been cut by a Greek knife. They drank out of bronze vessels, rinsing them perpetually. And if any one accidentally touched a pig he would plunge into the Nile without stopping to undress" (Herodot. 2:37, 41, 47).

III. The Tenets and Practices of the Pharisees. — To state the doctrines and statutes of the Pharisees is to give a history of orthodox Judaism; since Pharisaism was after the return from the Babylonian captivity, and is to the present day, the national faith of the orthodox Jews, developing itself with and adapting itself to the ever-shifting circumstances of the nation. SEE RABBINISM.

Of the other two sects, viz. the Essenes and the Sadducees, the former represented simply an intensified form of Pharisaism, SEE ESSENES, while the latter were a very small minority. SEE SADDUCEES.

 The Pharisees, as the erudite Geiger has conclusively shown. were the democratic party, the true representatives of the people, whose high vocation they endeavored to develop by making them realize, both in their practices and lives, that "God has given to all alike the kingdom, priesthood, and holiness" (2Ma 2:17); in opposition to the small caste of the priestly aristocracy of Sadducees, who set the highest value upon their spiritual office, and who, by virtue of their hereditary rights, tried to arrogate everything to themselves, and manifested little sympathy with the people at large. Hence the Pharisaic enactments were such as to make the people realize that they were a people of priests, a holy nation; that by becoming a diligent student of'the law, and by preparing one's self for the office of a rabbi or teacher, every such person. though not literally of the priestly caste, may be a priest in spirit, and occupy quite as important and useful a position as if he were actually of the Aaronic order, and even arrange his mode of life according to the example of those who minister in holy things. Thus the very name חֶבֶר, ἐταιρία, which in olden times denotes a priestly fraternity (Hos 4:17; Hos 6:9), and was so used by the Jews on the Maccabaean coins (חבר היהודים), was adopted by the Pharisees for their lay association. Their social meals were invested with a solemn character to resemble the social meals of the priests, made up from the sacrifices in the Temple. If the priests took care that the sacrifices which they offered.up, and portions of which constituted their social meal, especially on the Sabbath and festivals, should be clean and without blemish, the Pharisees also took the utmost precaution that their meals should be free from the different degrees of defilement: they washed before partaking thereof, recited prayers before and after the repast, had a cup of blessing, and offered incense. It is only from this point of view that some of the differences between the Pharisees and the Sadducees can be explained; as, for instance, the ideal connection of places for Sabbatic purposes, called עֵירוֹב, mixture, adopted by the former and rejected by the latter.

In  consequence of the rigorous laws about the observance of the Sabbath (Exo 16:29; Jer 17:21, with Neh 13:15, etc.), it was enacted that no Israelite is to walk on the Sabbath beyond a certain distance, called a Sabbath-day's journey, nor carry anything from one house to another. The Sadducees, or priestly party, who celebrated their meals on the Sabbath in different places, could go from one place to another, and carry to and fro anything they liked, because they regarded these meals as constituting part of their priestly and sacrificial service, which set aside the sanctity of the Sabbath. But the Pharisees, who made their Sabbatic repast resemble the priestly social meals, had to encounter difficulties arising from the rigorous Sabbatic laws. The distance which they had sometimes to walk to join a company in the social meal was more than a Sabbath-day's journey; the carrying from one place to another of the things requisite for the solemnities was contrary to the'enactments about the sanctity of the day. Hence they contrived the ideal connection of places (עֵירוֹב), which was effected as follows: Before the Sabbath commenced (i.e. Friday afternoon), an article of food was deposited by each member in the court selected for the social gathering, so that it might thereby become the common place for all; the streets were made to form one large dwellingplace with different gates, by means of beams laid across on the tops of the houses, and doors or gates put in the front; and meals were put in a house at the end of the distance permitted to walk, in order to constitute it a domicile, and thus another Sabbath-day's journey could be undertaken from the first terminus. By this means the Pharisees could evade the law, and, like the priests, meet together in any place to celebrate their social meals on the Sabbath, and carry anything that was wanted for its sacred festival, as they had three common meals on the Sabbath (שלוש סעודות). On the Friday eve the entrance of the Sabbath was greeted with a cup of wine, or the cup of blessing, over which every member recited benedictions (קידוש), expressing the holiness of the day as well as the holiness of Israel; whom God sanctified to himself and made a people of priests, a royal nation; and then the sacred and social meal was eaten. The second meal was eaten on noon of the Sabbath, and the third began with the setting sun, and in the middle of it the Sabbath departed.

When lights were kindled a blessing was again pronounced over a cup of wine (הבדלה), and burning incense was offered up to accompany the exit of the holy day, which was regarded as a departing friend. The paschal meal was the model for these social and sacred repasts. But the light in  which this very model sacrifice is to be viewed was a point of dispute between the priestly party or the Sadducees and the Pharisees. Because the paschal lamb formed the social meal of the laity, the priestly party maintained that it is not to be regarded as a sacrifice for the congregation, urging ill support of their notion the fact that the lambs were not numerically fixed like the other sacrifices in the Temple, but were regulated accordiung to the number of families, and that they must therefore be viewed simply as family sacrifices, to be eaten by the respective owners, and must not set aside the sanctity of the Sabbath, i.e., ought not to be offered on the 14th of Nisan, if the first dlay of the Passover falls on the Sabbath. Hillel, however, or the Pharisaic party whom he represented, succeeded in carrying their point, and in putting the sacred but private offerings of the Passover on an equality with the Temple sacrifices, and it was ordained, in opposition to the priestly party, that they are to set aside the sanctity of the Sabbath; thus making the social family meal of the laity, which the Passover constituted, as sacred as the fraternal meal of the priests, consisting of the sacred sacrifices offered in the Temple (Jerusalem Pesachim, cap. 6; Babylon Pesachim, 66 a; Geiger, Judische Zeitschrift [Breslau, 1863], 2:42 sq.). Having carried this point, the Pharisees also gave to their meals of the Sabbath and other holy days a sacrificial character after the model of the Passover.

As a people of priests and kings, the Pharisees considered themselves the guardianls of the divine law and the ancestral customs, trusting implicitly that he who selected them to be his peculiar people would protect and shield them and theirs from all outward dangers which threatened the state. They were firmly penetrated by the conviction that as long as they were faithful to their God no power on earth, however formidable, would be permitted successfully to ravish his holy heritage. Hence they repudiated the time-serving policy of the aristocratic Sadducees, who maintained that a man's destiny was in his own hands, and that human ingenuity and state- craft ought to be resorted to in political matters.

Practicaliy, Josephus represents the Pharisees as leading a temperate life, renouncing both excessive riches and immoderate pleasure, and striving above all to acquire a knowledge of that law and to practice those precepts which would fit them for the life to come (Ant. 18:1, 3); the same may be seen from the following declaration of the Talmud: The more flesh on the body the more worms [when it is (lead], the more riches the more cares, the more wives the more witches, the more handmaids the more unchastity,  the more manservants the more robbery; but the more meditation in the divine law the better the life, the more schooling the more knowledge, the more counsel the more intelligence, the more benevolence the more satisfaction; he who acquires a good name acquires it for himself in this world, but he who acquires a knowledge of the divine law acquires for himself life in the world to come" (Aboth, 2:17). In aiding the people to realize their high vocation, and to prepare themselves for the kingdom of heaven by obedience to the divine law, the Pharisees endeavored to facilitate that obedience by putting a mild interpretation upon some of the rigorous Mosaic enactments, and to adapt them to ever-changing circumstances. Thus they explain the expression נְבֵלָה carcass, in Lev 7:24, literally, and maintain that the statute in the verse in question only declares the flesh of an animal which was torn and died a natural death to be defiling by contact, but not the skin, bones, etc.; and that, except the human corpse and the dead bodies of a few reptiles in which the skin and flesh are to a certain extent identical, the skin and bones of all animals, whether clean and legally slaughtered for meat, or unclean and dying accidentally, do not defile, but may be made up into parchment, different utensils, etc.

The haughty and aristocratic Sadducees, on the other hand, who stood on their priestly dignity, and cared little for the comforts of the people, took the term נְבֵלָה in the unnatural sense of an animal approaching the condition of becoming a carcass, i.e., being so weak that it must soon expire, and maintained that an animal in such a condition may be slaughtered before it breathes its last; that its flesh must then be considered as a carcass, and is defiling, while the fat, skin, bones, etc., may be used for divers purposes (Jerusalem Megilla, 1:9; Babylon Sabbath, 108 a). It requires but little reflection to perceive how materially and divergently these different views must have affected the whole state of society, when it is remembered that according to the Sadducees the touching of any book written upon the parchment made from the skin of an unclean animal, or contact with one of the numerous utensils made from the leather, bones, veins, etc., of animals not Levitically clean and not legally slaughtered, imparted defilement. Again, the Pharisees, with a due regard for the interests of the people, and following the requirements of the time, explained the right of retaliation, "eye for eye, tooth for tooth, hand for hand, foot for foot," etc. (Exo 21:23, etc.), as requiring pecuniary compensation, while the Sadducees took it literally (Baba Kama, 83 b; 84 a, b; Megillath Taanith, cap. 4, Tosephta). The same consideration for the spiritual and temporal well-being of the people led the  Pharisees to enact that in cases of danger, when the prescribed prayers cannot be offered, they are to offer a short prayer as follows: "Do thy will in heaven above, and give peace of mind to those who fear thee on earth, and whatsoever pleaseth thee do. Blessed art thou, O Lord, who hearest prayer!" (Berakoth, 29 b). What a striking resemblance between this and some parts of the Lord's prayer! It was this humane and pious care for the interests of the people that made the Pharisees so popular and beloved, and accounts for the remark of Josephus that they had such influence with the multitude that if they said anything, against a king or a high-priest they were at once believed (Ant. 13:10, 5).

On a few leading theological points the Pharisees were decidedly pronounced, and to these we particularly call attention, as they were largely influential under the Christian economy.

a. In regard to a future state, Josephus presents the ideas of the Pharisees in such a light to his Greek readers that, whatever interpretation his ambiguous language might possibly admit, he obviously would have produced the impression on Greeks that the Pharisees believed in the transmigration of souls. Thus his statement respecting them is, "They say that every soul is imperishable, but that the souls of good men only pass over (or transmigrate) into another body — μεταβαίνειν εἰς ἕτερον σῶμα — while the souls of bad men are chastised by eternal punishment" (War, 2:8,14; comp. 3:8, 5; Ant. 18:1, 3; and Bottcher, De Inferis, page 519, 552). There are two passages in the Gospels which might. countenance this idea: one in Mat 14:2, where Herod the tetrarch is represented as thinking that Jesus was John the Baptist risen from the dead (though a different color is given to Herod's thoughts in the corresponding passage, Luk 9:7-9); and another in Joh 9:2, where the question is put to Jesus whether the blind man himself had sinned, or his parents, that he. was born blind? Notwithstanding these passages, however, there does not appear to be sufficient reason for doubting that the Pharisees believed in a resurrection of the dead very much in the same sense as the early Christians.

This is most in accordance with Paul's statement to the chief priests and council (Act 23:6) that he was a Pharisee, the son of a Pharisee, and that he was called in question for the hope and resurrection of the dead-a statement which would have been peculiarly disingenuous if the Pharisees had merely believed in the transmigration of souls; and it is likewise almost implied in Christ's teaching, which does not insist on the doctrine of a future life as anything  new, but assumes it as already adopted by his hearers, except by the Sadducees, although he condemns some unspiritual conceptions of its nature as erroneous (Mat 22:30; Mar 12:25; Luk 20:34-36). On this head the Mishna is an illustration of the ideas in the Gospels, as distinguished from any mere transmigration of souls; and the peculiar phrase "the world to come," of which ὁ αἰὼν ὁ ἐρχόμενος was undoubtedly only the translation, frequently occurs in it ( הָעוֹלָם הִבָּא Aboth, 2:7; 4:16; comp. Mar 10:30; Luk 18:30). This phrase of Christians, which is anterior to Christianity, but which does not occur in the O.T., though fully justified by certain passages to be found in some of its latest books, is essentially different from Greek conceptions on the same subject; and generally, in contradistinction to the purely temporal blessings of the Mosaic legislation, the Christian ideas that this world is a state of probation, and that every one after death will have to render a strict account of his actions, were expressed by Pharisees in language which it is impossible to misunderstand: "This world may be likened to a court-yard in comparison of the world to come; therefore prepare thyself in the antechamber that thou mayest enter into the dining-room" (Aboth, 4:16). "Everything is given to man on security, and a net is spread over every living creature; the shop is open, and the merchant credits; the book is open, and the hand records; and whosoever chooses to borrow may come and borrow: for the collectors are continually going around daily, and obtain payment of man, whether with his consent or without it; and the judgment is true justice; and all are prepared for the feast" (3:16). "Those who are born are doomed to die, the dead to live, and the quick to be judged; to make us know, understand, and be informed that he is God; he is the Former, Creator, Intelligent Being, Judge, Witness, and suing party, and will judge thee hereafter. Blessed be he; for in his presence there is no unrighteousness, forgetfulness, respect of persons, nor acceptance of a bribe; for everything is his. Know also that everything is done according to the account, and let not thine evil imagination persuade thee that the grave is a place of refuge for thee: for against thy will wast thou formed. and against thy will wast thou born; and against thy will dost thou live, and against thy will wilt thou die; and against thy will must thou hereafter render an account, and receive judgment in the presence of the Supreme King of kings, the Holy God, blessed is he" (4:22). Still it must be borne in mind that the actions of which such a strict account was to be rendered were not merely those referred to by the spiritual prophets Isaiah and Micah (Isa 1:16-17; Mic 6:8). nor even those enjoined in the  Pentateuch, but included those fabulously supposed to have been orally transmitted by Moses on Mount Sinai, and the whole body of the traditions of the elders. They included, in fact, all those ceremonial "works," against the efficacy of which, in the deliverance of the human soul, Paul so emphatically protested. SEE RESURRECTION.

b. In reference to the opinions of the Pharisees concerning the freedom of the will, a difficulty arises from the very prominent position which they occupy in the accounts of Josephus, whereas nothing vitally essential to the peculiar doctrines of the Pharisees seems to depend on those opinions, and some of his expressions are Greek, rather than Hebrew. "There were three sects of the Jews," he says, "which had different conceptions respecting human affairs, of which, one was called Pharisees. the second Sadducees, and the third Essenes. The Pharisees say that some things, and not all things, are. the work of fate; but that some things are in our own power to be and not to be. But the Essenes declare that fate rules all things, and that nothing happens to man except by its decree. The Sadducees, on the other hand, take away fate, holding that it is a thing of naught, and that human affairs do not depend upon it; but in their estimate all things are in the power of ourselves, as being ourselves the causes of our good things, and meeting with evils through our own inconsiderateness" (Ant. 18:1, 3; comp. War, 2:8, 14). On reading this passage, and the others which bear on the same subject in Josephus's works, the suspicion naturally arises that lie was biassed by a desire to make the Greeks believe that, like the Greeks, the Jews had philosophical sects among themselves. At any rate his words do not represent the opinions as they were really held by the three religious parties. We may feel certain that the influence of fate was not the point on which discussions respecting free-will turned, though there may have been differences as to the way in which the interposition of God in human affairs was to be regarded.

Thus the ideas of the Essenes are likely to have been expressed in language approaching the words of Christ (Mat 10:29-30; Mat 6:25; Mat 6:34), and it is very difficult to believe that the Sadducees, who accepted the authority of the Pentateuch and other books of the O.T., excluded God, in their conception, from all influence on human actions. On the whole, in reference to this point, the opinion of Gratz (Geschichte der Juden, 3:509) seems not improbable, that the real difference between the Pharisees and Sadducees was at first practical and political. He conjectures that the wealthy and aristocratical Sadducees in their wars and negotiations with the Syrians entered into matters of policy and calculations of  prudence, while the zealous Pharisees, disdaining worldly wisdom, laid stress on doing what seemed right, and on leaving the event to God; and that this led to differences in formal theories anil metaphysical statements. The precise nature of those differences we do not certainly know, as no writing of a Sadducee on the subject has been preserved by the Jews, and on matters of this kind it is unsafe to trust unreservedly the statements of an adversary.

c. In reference to the spirit of proselytism among the Pharisees, there is indisputable authority for the statement that it prevailed to a very great extent at the time of Christ (Mat 23:15); and attention is now called to it on account of its probable importance in having paved the way for the early diffusion of Christianity. The district of Palestine, which was long in proportion to its breadth, and which yet, from Dan to Beersheba, was only 160 Roman miles, or not quite 148 English miles long, and which is represented as having been civilized, wealthy, and populous 1000 years before Christ, would under any circumstances have been too small to continue maintaining the whole growing population of its children. But, through kidnapping (Joe 3:6), through leading into captivity by military incursions and victorious enemies (2Ki 17:6; 2Ki 18:11; 2Ki 24:15; Amo 1:6; Amo 1:9), through flight (Jer 43:4-7), through commerce (Josephus, Ant. 20:2, 3), and probably through ordinary emigration, Jews at the time of Christ had become scattered over the fairest portions of the civilized world. On the day of Pentecost, that great festival on which the Jews suppose Moses to have brought the perfect law down from heaven (Festival Prayers for Pentecost, page 6), Jews are said to have been assembled with one accord in one place in Jerusalem, "from every region under heaven." Admitting that this was al Oriental hyperbole (comp. Joh 21:25), there must have been some foundation for it in fact; and the enumeration of the various countries from which Jews are said to have been present gives a vivid idea of the widely-spread existence of Jewish communities. Now it is not unlikely, though it cannot be proved from Josephus (Ant. 20:2, 3), that missions and organized attempts to produce conversions, although unknown to Greek philosophers, existed among the Pharisees (De Wette, Exegetisches Handbuch, Mat 23:15). But, at any rate, the then existing regulations or customs of synagogues afforded facilities which do not exist now either in synagogues or Christian churches for presenting new views to a congregation (Act 17:2; Luk 4:16). Under such auspices the proselytizing spirit of the Pharisees inevitably  stimulated a thirst for inquiry, and accustomed the Jews to theological controversies. Thus there existed precedents and favoring circumstances for efforts to make proselytes, when the greatest of all missionaries, a Jew by race, a Pharisee by education, a Greek by language, and a Roman citizen by birth, preaching the resurrection of Jesus to those who for the most part already believed in the resurrection of the dead, confronted the elaborate ritual-system of the written and oral law by a pure spiritual religion; and thus obtained the cooperation of many Jews themselves in breaking down every barrier between Jew, Pharisee, Greek, and Roman, and in endeavoring to unite all mankind by the brotherhood of a common Christianity. SEE PROSELYTE.

IV. Origin, Development, Classes, and general Character of the Pharisees. — The name does not occur either in the O.T. or in the Apocrypha; but it is usually considered that the Pharisees were essentially the same with the Assidweans (i.e., chasidim — godly men, saints) mentioned in 1Ma 2:42; 1Ma 7:13-17; and in 2Ma 14:6. Those who admit the existence of Maccabsean Psalms find allusion to the Assideans in Psa 79:2; Psa 97:10; Psa 132:9; Psa 132:16; Psa 149:9, where chasidim is translated "saints" in the A.V. (see Fiirst, Handworter' buch, 1:420 b). After the return from the Babylonian captivity the priesthood formed the centre of the new religious life, and the pious in Israel who were anxious to practice the commandments of the Lord naturally attached themselves to the divinely - appointed and time-honored tribe of Levi. Besides the keeping pure from intermarriage with heathen, great and vital importance was attached to the setting aside of the soil and Temple taxes (Neh 10:33; Neh 10:36, etc.; Sir 7:31; Sir 45:20; Tob 1:6; Tob 5:13; Jdt 11:13; 1Ma 3:49), to the due observance of the Sabbath (Neh 10:31; Neh 13:19), the three pilgrim festivals. viz. the Passover (2 Chronicles 30:35; Ezr 6:19-22), Pentecost (Tob 2:1), and Tabernacles (Neh 8:14), as well as the Sabbatic year (Neh 10:31; 1Ma 6:49; 1Ma 6:53), and to the abstinence from unclean food. He who allied himself to the national party with the solemn resolve to keep those ancestral laws divinely given to the nation was called "one who had separated himself unto them from the impurity of the country people" (Ezr 6:21), or "one who had separated himself for the law of the Lord from the country people" (Ezr 9:1; Ezr 10:11; Neh 9:2; Neh 10:28).

Hence the phrase מַןנַבְדָּל, "separated from," obtained during this period aparty signification. This name became the standing appellation for those who had thus  separated themselves for the service of God, and continued to be the conservators of their ancestral religion, as may be seen from the taunt of the antinational party, who warned them to join the Greek party, telling them in the davs of the Maccabees that "since we have separated from them (ἐχωρίσθημεν ἀπ αὐτῶν, the translation of נַבְדָּל) many evils have come upon us" (1Ma 1:11). Those who yielded to the temptation, and, relinquishing the national party, joined the antinational portion, were denominated (הַתְעָרֵב) the mixed (Ezr 9:1), or (עֵרֶב) the mixture (Neh 13:3). Hence the period before Alcimus was afterwards regarded as the non-mixture (ἀμιξία), while his own was looked upon as the mixture (ἐπιμιξ, 2Ma 14:3; 2Ma 14:38). Afterwards, when the priestly party, or the Sadducees, who were at first the centre of the national movement, assumed a haughty position, stood upon their sacerdotal dignity, cared little for the real spiritual and temporal wants of the people, but only sought their own aggrandizement and preservation, allying themselves for this purpose with foreign nations, and espousing antinational sentiments, the real national portion of the people united themselves more firmly than ever, independently of the priests, to keep the law, and to practice their ancestral customs; and it is this party whom the opposite section called by the Aramaic name פְּרוּשַׁין- Φαρισαῖοι, instead of its original Hebrew equivalent נַבְדְּלַים, the separated (Ezr 6:21; Ezr 9:1; Ezr 10:1; Neh 9:2; Neh 10:28).

In the time of queen Alexandra (q.v.) the Pharisees attained almost supreme power. By the appearance of piety and thorough knowledge of the law, which they well knew how to affect (so as even to pass for prophets, Josephus, Ant. 17:2, 4), the Pharisees at an early day secured the popular favor (Josephus, Ant. 13:10, 5; 13:15, 5; 18:1, 3; War, 1:5, 2; comp. Luk 11:43), and that of the women (Josephus, Ant. 17:2, 4, where, however, only the wives of king Herod are spoken of; but comp. Lightfoot. Hor. Hebr. page 230 sq.), and thereby acquired considerable political influence, which became very manifest even during the history of the Jewish dynasty (Josephus, Ant. 13:10, 6; 13:16, 2; War, 1:5, 2). This influence became greatly increased by the; extension of the Pharisees over the whole land (Luk 5:17), and the majority which they composed in the Sanhedrim (comp. Act 5:34; Act 23:6 sq.). In political conflicts they generally followed democratic principles, and sometimes carried them to an extreme, trusting to their combined influence for success. (Their number reached more than six thousand under the Herods, Josephus, Ant. 17:2, 4.)  Many of them must have suffered death for political agitation (Josephus, Ant. 17:2, 4). In the time of Christ they were divided doctrinallv into several schools, among which those of Hillel and Shammai were most noted, the former being more moderate, the latter more strict, in their observances.

Of the history of the Pharisees after the resurrection of Christ and the foundation of the Christian Church little need be said. Their opposition to the Gospel continued as eager as before, and, though they are seldom mentioned by name in the Acts of the Apostles, that opposition is frequently brought before us when "the council" is spoken of (Act 4:15; Act 5:27; Act 6:12; Act 22:30; comp. Act 23:6). That "council" is the Sanhedrim, and of the seventy-two doctors of which it was composed, the more influential part appears to have consisted of Pharisees. We see then the same spirit of enmity to Christian truth manifested by it as had been displayed during the life of the Redeemer; and the history of Paul before his conversion is only a more marked illustration than ordinary of the manner in which the whole body would have "persecuted the Church of God and wasted it." It is not to be imagined that this enmity would abate as the infant Church grew stronger. Everything that we know of human nature and religious bigotry leads to the opposite conclusion; and in the terrible fanaticism with which, when Titus besieged Jerusalem, the Jewish people rushed upon their fate, in the unflinching zeal which they displayed, in the desperate efforts which they made to avert the destruction which was "the wrath come upon them to the uttermost," and in the awful frenzy with which they sacrificed themselves amid their falling palaces and burning Temple, it is impossible not to recognise the last convulsive outburst of Pharisaic heroism and despair.

With the definitions and explanations of such an extensive and gorgeous ritual as that of the Mosaic law; with the application and adaptation thereof to all the vicissitudes of the commonwealth, with the different degrees of holiness and uncleanness attached to the performance or neglect of each precept and rite, with the diverse dispositions and idiosyncrasies of the multitude about the respective merits of outward observances and a corresponding inward feeling, the Pharisees would have been superhuman if they had escaped the extravagances which in the course of time have more or less developed themselves in the established religions based upon a more spiritual code and a less formal ritual. Thus the enactment that " the flesh of quadrupeds must not be cooked or in any way mixed with milk for food," deduced from injunctions in Exo 23:19; Exo 34:26;  Deu 14:21; or the enactment about the compulsory recitation of the Shema twice a day," i.e., the declaration about the unity of the Deity (Deu 6:4-9), at a stated time; or the discussion on "the lighting of candles on the eve of the Sabbath," which is the duty of every Jew; or "the interdict to eat an egg which had been laid on any feast-day, whether such day was or was not the day after the Sabbath," has its parallel in other and later systems.

The Christian Church, without any basis for it in the N.T., has at times employed a casuistry which may fairly compete with that of the Pharisees, who had to define an inspired code of minute rites and ceremonies. From Peter Lombard to Gabriel Biel the question was warmly discussed among all the Christian casuists, What is to be done with a mouse which has eaten of the consecrated wafer? The Established Church of England has deduced from the words "Let all things be done decently and according to order" (1Co 15:40) the petty regulation that "no man shall cover his head in the ohurch or chapel in the time of divine service, except lie have some infirmity, in which case let him wear a nightcap or coif" (Constitutions and Canons Ecclesiastical, 18); has enacted that "no minister, when he celcbrateth the communion, shall wittingly administer the same to any but to such as kneel under pain of suspension" (ibid. 27); that "upon Wednesdays and'Fridays weekly, though they be not holy-days, the minister, at the accustomed hours of service, shall resort to the church or chapel, and, warning being given to the people by tolling of a bell, shall say the litany prescribed in the Book of Common Prayer: whereunto we wish every householder dwelling within half a mile of the church to come or send one at the least of his household fit to join with the minister in prayers" (15); and that "no ecclesiastical person shall wear any coif or wrought nightcap, but only plain nightcaps of black silk, satin, or velvet; . . . in private houses and in their studies the said persons ecclesiastical may use any comely and scholar-like apparel, provided that it be not cut or pinkt; and that in public they go not in their doublet and hose, without coats or cassocks; and that they wear not any light-colored stockings" (74).

This, however, only shows the tendency of all ritualism to degrade the human intellect by minute requisitions. That the multitudinous and detailed rites and ceremonies imposed by the Mosaic law, and amplified by the requirements of time, should have given rise among many Pharisees to formalism, outward religiousness, self-complacency, ostentation, superstition, and hypocrisy, was to be expected, judging from the general tendency of gorgeous ritualism in more modern days. A learned'Jew charges against them rather the holiness of works than  hypocritical holiness ("Werkheiligkeit, nicht Scheinheiligkeit," Herzfeld, Geschichte des Volkes Israel, 3:359). At any rate they must be regarded as having been some of the most intense formalists whom the world has ever seen; and, looking at the average standard of excellence among mankind, it is nearly certain that men whose lives were spent in the ceremonial observances of the Mishna would cherish feelings of selfcomplacency and spiritual pride not justified by intrinsic moral excellence. The supercilious contempt towards the poor publican, and towards the tender penitential love that bathed Christ's feet with tears, would be the natural result of such a system of life. We are therefore not surprised that our Savior saw these pernicious features in the ranks of Pharisaism, and that he found occasion to expose and to reprove most unsparingly their externalism (Mat 23:27; Luk 7:39) and hypocrisy (Mat 23:13). But to conclude from this that all the Pharisees were either self-righteous and superstitious, or a set of hypocrites, is as unjust as it would be to brand every section in modern churches with the infirmities and extravagances of which individual members are guilty, and which are either denounced by their own more enlightened and spirituallvminded brethren, or exposed by the opposing sections. The language which the Pharisees themselves employed to denounce the proud, the formalists, the self-righteous, and the hypocrites in their own sect, is, to say the least, quite as strong as that which our Saviour used. In confirmation of this, we need only give the poignant Talmudic classification of the Pharisees. "There are seven kinds of Pharisees," says the Talmud:

"1. The Shechemite Pharisee (פרוש שכמי), who simply keeps the law for what he can profit thereby, just as Shechem submitted to the rite of circumcision that he might thereby obtain Dinah, the daughter of Jacob (Gen 34:19);

2. The Tumbling Pharisee (נקפי פרוש), who, in order to appear humble before men, always hangs down his head, and scarcely lifts up his feet when he walks, so that he constantly tumbles;

3. The Bleeding Pharisee (פרוש קוזאו), who, in order not to look at a woman, walks about with his eyes closed, and hence injures his head frequently, so that he has bleeding wounds;

4. The Mortar Pharisee (פרוש מדוכיא), who wears a cap in the form of a mortar to cover his eyes, that he may not see any impurities and indecencies;

5. The What-am-I-yet-to-do Pharisee (פרוש אדעה מה חובתי), who, not knowing much about the law, as soon as he has done one thing, asks, 'What is my duty now? and I will do it' (comp. Mar 10:17-22);

6. The Pharisee from Fear (פרוש מיראה), who keeps the law because he is afraid of a future judgment; and

7. The Pharisee from Love (פרוש מאהבה), who obeys the Lord because he loves him with all his heart" (Babylon Sota, 22 b; comp. Jerusalem Berachoth, cap. 9). It must also be admitted that it was among the Pharisees the glorious ideas were developed about the Messiah, the kingdom of heaven, the immortality of the soul, the world to come, etc. It was the Pharisees who, to some extent at least, trained such men as the immortal Hillel, "the just and devout Simeon, who waited for the consolation of Israel," and who, taking up the inlant Saviour into his arms, offered up thanks to God (Luk 2:25-35); Zacharias, "who was righteous before God" (Luk 1:6); Gamaliel, the teacher of Saul of Tarsus; Paul, the great apostle of the Gentiles, etc. Our Savior himself occupied Pharisaic ground, and used the arguments of the Pharisees in vindication of his conduct and doctrines. Thus, wien Jesus was charged by the Pharisees with allowing his disciples to break the Sabbath by plucking ears of corn in the field on this holy day, he quoted the very maxim of the Pharisees that "the Sabbath is made for man, and not man for the Sabbath" (Mar 2:27; comp. Joma, 85 b); and his proof is deduced according to the Pharisaic exegetical rule denominated נזרה שוה, analogy. When David was hungry, he ate of the priestly bread, and also gave some to those who were with him. Accordingly one who is hungry may satisfy his hunger with that which is otherwise only allowed to the priests. Now the priests perform all manner of work on the Sabbath without incurring the guilt of transgression; why, then, should one who is hungry not be allowed to do the same? (Mat 12:1-7).

We only add that the apostle Paul, who must have known all the denunciations of Christ against the Pharisees, never uttered a disrespectfll word against this sect, but, on the contrary. made it a matter of boast that he belonged to them (Act 23:6; Act 26:5; Php 3:5). Yet candor must acknowledge that great moral  derelictions in practice often coexist with much that is beautiful in theory and the uncontradicted rebukes of our Saviour against the Pharisees of his time prove an enormous depravity on their part. He denounced them in the bitterest language; and in the sweeping charges of hypocrisy which he made against them as a class, he might even, at first sight, seem to have departed from that spirit of meekness, of gentleness in judging others, and of abstinence from the imputation of improper motives, which is one of the most characteristic and original charms of his own precepts. See Mat 15:7-8; Mat 23:5; Mat 23:13-15; Mat 23:23; Mar 7:6; Luk 11:42-44; and comp. Mat 7:1-5; Mat 11:29; Mat 12:19-20; Luk 6:28; Luk 6:37-42. Indeed, it is difficult to avoid the conclusion that his repeated denunciations of the Pharisees mainly exasperated them into taking measures for causing his death; so that in one sense he may be said to have shed his blood, and to have laid down his life in protesting against their practice and spirit. (See especially Luk 6:53 and 54 in the 11th chapter of Luke, which follow immediately upon the narration of what he said while dining with a Pharisee.) Hence to understand the Pharisees is, by contrast, an aid towards understanding the spirit of unlcorrupted Christianity. This divergence is so wide and fundamental that we shall best apprehend the genius of Phariseeism by developing the contrast somewhat in detail (see Delitzsch, Jesus und Hillel [Erlangen, 1866]).

(1.) In relation to the O.T. dispensation, it was the Saviour's great effort to unfold the principles which had lain at the bottom of that dispensation, and, carrying them out to their legitimate conclusions, to "fulfil the law" (πληρῶσαι, Mat 5:17, to " fulfil," not as too often supposed to mean, to "confirm"). But, in contrast to this, the Pharisees taught such a servile adherence to the letter of the law, that its remarkable character as a pointing forward to something higher than its letter was completely overlooked, and that its moral precepts, intended to elevate men, and to lead them on to the thought of a moral stage more glorious than that at which they then stood, were made rather the instruments of contracting and debasing their ideas of morality. Thus, strictly adheriig to the letter, "Thou shalt not kill," they regarded anger and all hasty passion as legitimate (Mat 5:21-22). Adhering with equal strictness to the words ' Thou shalt not commit adultery," all impure thoughts and deeds which fell short of this were considered by them to be allowable (Mat 5:27-28). And, once more, acquiescing in the letter, "Whosoever shall put away his wife, let him give her a letter of  divorcement," they so interpreted the precept that, if only a letter of divorcement were given, a wife might be put away for any cause however trifling (Mat 5:31-32). Thus, the whole spirit of the O.T. dispensation was misunderstood by them. They did not see that it was adapted to a particular stage in the history of man; that its merit consisted, not in being perfect, but in being better than what would have existed without it; and that it contained in itself the pledge that it must one day yield, as a system, to the full evolution of those principles at which it aimed, and to which, from time to time, it gave expression. When accordingly He came, whose great effort it was to break through the letter, in order that lie might set free the spirit, which the circumstances of men had rendered it necessary to enclose and confine for a season, their hearts were steeled from the first against him, and they attacked him as a blasphemer against the God of Israel and his law.

(2.) While it was the aim of Jesus to call men to the law of God itself as the supreme guide of life, the Pharisees multiplied minute precepts and distinctions to such an extent, upon the pretence of maintaining it intact, that the whole life of the Israelite was hemmed in And burdened on every side by instructions so numerous and trifling that the law was almost, if not wholly, lost sight of. These "traditions," as they were called, had long been gradually accumulating. Their object may in the first instance have been a good one. The law had been given under circumstances very different from those in which the Jewish people found themselves more and more placed as the Christian aera approached. The relations of life had been far simpler; the influence exerted over Israel by neighboring nations less refined; while the national authorities, except in times when the worship of the true God was altogether thrown aside, had united in keeping all admixture of foreign elements at a distance. That was no longer possible, and it became almost necessary therefore to explain the application of the law to the changed and ever-changing condition of the people (comp. Dollinger, Christenthum und Judenthum, page 750). Commenting upon the law therefore was unavoidable: and many of the comments given were no doubt really what they were designed to be, "a fence to the law." But these "fences" too soon assumed, as indeed it was natural that they should, an importance superior to that of the law itself, while at the same time they were continually increasing in number, till at last a complete system of casuistry was formed, in which the most minute incidents of life were embraced, and which rendered the very conception of broad and general principles of duty an  impossibility. Of the trifling character of these regulations innumerable instances are to be found in the Mishna, but, as it is not quite clear that the Talmudical was the same as the Pharisaic theology, we omit these, and remind our readers only of some of those mentioned in the N.T. Such, then, were their washings before they would eat bread, and the special minuteness with which the forms of this washing were prescribed; their bathing when they returned from the market, their washing of cups and pots, brazen vessels, and couches (Mar 7:2-4); such were their fastings not only at the seasons which the law prescribed, but twice in the week (Luk 18:12) — on Thursday, when, according to their tradition, Moses had ascended Mount Sinai, and on Monday, when he had come down from it (Eisenmenger, Entdecktes Judenthum, 1:311); such were their tithings, not only of the property which the law provided should be tithed, but even of the most insignificant herbs — mint and anise and cummin (Mat 23:23; comp. Luk 18:12); and such, finally, were those minute and vexatious extensions of the law of the Sabbath, which must have converted God's gracious ordinance of the Sabbath's rest into a burden and a pain (Mat 12:1-13, Mar 3:1-6; Luk 13:10-17, etc.).

(3.) It was a leading aim of the Redeemer to teach men that true piety consisted not in forms, but in substance, not in outward observances, but in an inward spirit; not in small details, but in great rules of life. The whole system of Pharisaic piety led to exactly opposite conclusions. Under its influence "the weightier matters of the law, judgment, mercy, and faith," wera undervalued and neglected (Mat 23:23; Luk 11:42), the idea of religion as that which should have its seat in the heart disappeared (Luk 11:38-41); the most sacred obligations were evaded (Mar 7:11); vain and trifling questions took the place of serious inquiry into the great principles of duty (Mat 19:3, etc.); and even the most solemn truths were handled as mere matters of curious speculation or means to entrap an adversary (Mat 22:35, etc., Luk 17:20, etc.).

(4.) The lowliness of piety was, according to the teaching of Jesus, an inseparable concomitant of its reality, but the Pharisees sought mainly to attract the attention and to excite the admiration of men. They gave alms in the most ostentatious manner; they ofter prayed standing at the corners of the streets; they dis. figured their faces when they fasted (Mat 6:2; Mat 6:6; Mat 6:16) To draw attention to their religious zeal they made broad their phylacteries and enlarged the borders of their garments (Mat 23:5).  Blind to the true glory of ministering to others rather than being ministered to, they sought their glory in obtaining the chief seats in the synagogues, the first places at the tables to which they were invited, greetings of honor in the markets, and the title of Rabbi, Rabbi (Mat 23:6; Luk 14:7). Indeed, the whole spirit of their religion was slummed up, not in confession of sin and humility, but in a proud self-righteousness at variance with any true conception of man's relation either to God or his fellow- creatures — “God, I thank thee that I am not as other men are, extortioners, unjust, adulterers, or even as this publican" (Luk 18:11).

(5.) It was a natural consequence of all this, that with such views of the principles and spirit of religion its practical graces should be overthrown, and it was so. Christ inculcated compassion for the degraded, helpftlness to the friendless, liberality to the poor, holiness of heart, universal love, a mind open to the truth. The Pharisees regarded the degraded classes of society as classes to be shunned, not to be won over to the right (Luk 7:39; Luk 15:2; Luk 18:11), and frowned from them such as the Redeemer would fain have gathered within his fold (Joh 7:49). Instead of having compassion on the friendless, they made them a prey (Mat 23:13). With all their pretences to piety, they were in reality avaricious, sensual, and dissolute (Mat 23:25; Joh 8:7). They looked with contempt upon every nation but their own (Luk 10:29). Finally, instead of endeavoring to fulfil the great end of the dispensation whose truths they professed to teach, and thus bringing men to the Hope of Israel, they devoted their energies to making converts to their own narrow views, who, with all the zeal of proselytes, were more exclusive and more bitterly opposed to the truth than they were themselves (Mat 22:15).

In view of these facts, while acknowledging much that was just and commendable in their doctrines (Mat 23:2-3), we are compelled to acquiesce in that general judgment which has made the name of "Pharisee" a proverb of ecclesiastical reproach-a character too often reproduced under Christianity itself.

V. Literature. — Besides the Mishna, the Talmud, and the Midrashim, which embody the sentiments of the Pharisees, we refer to Brucker, Hist. Crit. Philosophice, 2:744-759; Milman, Hist. of the Jews, 2:71; Ewald, Geschichte des Volkes Israel, 4:415-419; Biedermann, Pharisaer und Sadducaer (Zur. 1854); Wellhausen, Die Pharisaer und die Sadducaer (Greifsw. 1874); and the Jahrhundert des Heils, page 5, etc., of Gfrorer,  who has insisted strongly on the importance of the Mishna, and has made great use of the Talmud generally. Grossmann has endeavored to present a harmony of the Jewish-Alexandrine doctrines with those of the Palestine Pharisees in his work, De Pharis. Jud. Alexand. (Hal. 1846), 2:4; but it is very improbable that the Pharisees of Palestine agreed with the Jewish philosophers of Alexandria in their principles, when the latter were adherents of Plato, and diligent students of Homer and Hesiod (Grossmann, De Philos. Sadduc. 3:8). See also the following works by modern learned Jews: Herzfeld, Geschichte des Volkes Israel (Nordhausen, 1857), 2:258, etc.; Jost, Geschichte des Judenthums und seiner Secten (Leipsic, 1857), 1:197, etc.; Gratz, Geschichte der Juden (2d ed. ibid. 1863), 3:72, etc., 454, etc.; and, above all, Geiger, Urschrift und Uebersetzungen der Bibel (Breslau, 1857), page 103, etc.; also in the Zeitschrift der deutschen morgenlandischen Gesellschaft (Leipsic, 1862), 16:714, etc.; and in his Judische Zeitschrift fur Wissenschaft und Leben (Breslau, 1863), 2:11, etc.; and reprinted separately (Breslau, 1863). SEE SECTS, JEWISH.

## Pharmacy[[@Headword:Pharmacy]]

             a name applied to the arts of the magician and enchanter in the early ages of the Christian Church. The Council of Ancyra forbade pharmacy, that is, the magical art of inventing and preparing medicaments to do mischief; and appointed five years' penance for any one that receives a magician into his house for that purpose. Basil's canons condemn such arts under the same character of pharmacy and witchcraft, and assigns thirty years' penance to them. Tertullian plainly asserts that never did a magician or enchanter escape unpunished in the Church. Those who practiced the magical art were sometimes termed pharmaci, and their magical potions pharmacce.

## Pharosh[[@Headword:Pharosh]]

             (Ezr 8:3). SEE PAROSH.

## Pharpar[[@Headword:Pharpar]]

             (Heb. Panpar', פִרְפִּר, swift; Sept. Φαρφάρ v.r. Φαρφαρά, Α᾿φαρφά ; Vulg. Pharpar), one of the two rivers of Damascus mentioned in the wellknown exclamation of Naaman, "Are not Abana and Pharpar, rivers of Damascus, better than all the waters of Israel?" (2Ki 5:12). The name does not occur elsewhere in Scripture, nor is it found in ancient  classic authors. Eusebius and Jerome merely state that it is a river of Damascus (Onomast. s.v. Farfar). Plinv savs that "Damascus was a place fertilized by the river Chrysorrhoas, which is drawn off into its meadows and eagerly imbibed" (5:16); and Strabo says of this river that "it commences from the city and territory of Damascus, and is almost entirely drained by watercourses; for it supplies with water a large tract of country" (16:755). But none of these writers speak of any second river.

Various opinions have been entertained regarding the Pharpar. Benjamin of Tudela states that, while the Abana runs through the city, the Pharpar runs between the gardens and the orchards in the outskirts (Early Travels, Bohn, page 90). He evidently refers to the two branches of the same river. The river Barada takes its rise in the upland plain of Zebdany, at the base ofthe loftiest peak of Anti-Lebanon. Its principal source is a fountain called Ain Barada. It cuts through the central chain in a sublime gorge, and flows in a deep wild glen down the eastern declivities. Its volume is more than doubled by a large fountain called Fijeh, which gushes from a cave in the side of the glen. The river leaves the mountains and enters the great plain of Damascus about three miles west of the city. The main stream flows though the city; but no fewer than seven large canals are taken from it at different elevations to irrigate the surrounding orchards and gardens. The largest of these is called Na(hr Taula, "the river Taura," and is probably that which Benjamin of Tudela identified with the Pharpar (1.c.). The Arabic version of the Bible reads Taura for Pharpar in 2Ki 5:12; but the words of Naaman manifestly imply the existence of two distinct rivers. Some have supposed that because the Barada has two great fountains, Naaman alluded to these; and Dr. Wilson would identify the Barada with the Pharpar, and Ain Fijeh with the Abana (Lands of the Bible, 2:371, 373); but in reply we say that Naaman speaks of two "rivers," and not "fountains." SEE ABANA

A short distance south of the city of Damascus flows the river Awaj. It has two principal sources — one high up on the eastern side of Hermon, just beneath the central peak; the other in a wild glen a few miles southward, near the romantic village of Beit Jann. The streams unite near Sasa, and the river flows eastward in a deep rocky channel, and falls into a lake, or rather large marsh, called Bahret Hijftneh, about four miles south of the lake into which the Barada falls. Although the Awaj is eight miles distant from the city, yet it flows across the whole plain of Damascus; and large ancient canals drawn from it irrigate the fields and gardens almost up to the walls.  The total length of the Awaj is nearly forty miles; and in volume it is about one fourth that of the Barada. The Barada and Awaj are the only rivers of any importance in the district of Damascus; and there can be little doubt that the former is the Abana, and the latter the Pharpar. The identity of the Awaj and Pharpar was suggested by Munro in 1833 (Summer Ramble, 2:54), and confirmed by Dr. Robinson (Bibliotheca Sacra. May 1849. page 371); but its sources, course, and the lake into which it falls, were first explored by Dr. Porter in the year 1852 (ibid. January 1854, and April 1854, page 329).

He then heard, for the first time, the name Barbar applied to a glen on the east side of Hermon, which sends a small tributary to the Awaj; and it seems highly probable that we have in this name a relic of the ancient Pharpar. The Arabic may be regarded as equivalent to the Hebrew (see Five Years in Damascus, 1:299; Biblioth. Sac. 1.c. page 54). The mountain region round the sources of the river was occupied in a remote age by the warlike Maachathites (1Ch 19:6-7; Jos 12:5). Subsequently it formed part of the tetrarchy of Abilene (Luk 3:1; Josephus, Ant. 19:5, 1). Farther down, the river Pharpar divided the territory of Damascus from Iturea (q.v.). The whole district through which the river flows is now called Wady el-Ajam, "the valley of the Persians ; the scenery is bare and mountainous, but some parts of it are extremely fertile, and it contains upwards of fifty villages, with ,a population of 18,000 souls (see Jour. of Sac. Lit. 1853; Ritter, Pal. und Syr. 4:132 sq.). SEE DAMASCUS.

The tradition of the Jews of Damascus, as reported by Schwarz (Palest. page 54, also pages 20, 27), is curiously subversive of our ordinary ideas regarding these streams. They call the river Fijeh (that is, the Barada) the Pharpar, and give the name Amana or Karmion (an old Talmudic name) to a stream which Schwarz describes as running from a fountain called el- Barady, a mile and a half from Beth Djana (Beit Jenn), in a north-east. direction, to Damascus (see also the reference to the Nubian geographer by Gesenius, Thesaur. page 1132 a).

## Pharr, Walter Smiley[[@Headword:Pharr, Walter Smiley]]

             a Presbyterian minister, was born in Cabarras County, N.C., April 28, 1790. He was educated at Hampden Sidney College, Prince Edward County, Virginia; studied theology, under the care of Moses Hoge, D.D.; was licensed by Hanover Presbytery, and ordained by Concord Presbytery November 18, 1820. His first charge was Waxhaw Church, S.C., and he  subsequently preached for Prospect, Rama, and Mallard Creek churches, in North Carolina, all within the bounds of Concord Presbytery. He died December 27, 1866. Mr. Pharr was a sound theologian, a plain and successful preacher and pastor, much beloved and confided in by all who knew him. See Wilson, Presb. Hist. A lmanac, 1867, page 450. (J.L.S.)

## Pharzite[[@Headword:Pharzite]]

             (Heb. with the art. hap-Partsi', הִפִּרַצַי; Sept. ὁ Φαρεσί v.r. Φαρές), the patronymic of a family among the Hebrews (Num 26:20), the descendants of Pharez (q.v.).

## Phasaelis[[@Headword:Phasaelis]]

             (Φασαηλίς, Josephus; Φασηλίς, Ptolemy, 5:16, 7; Phaseli., Pliny, 13:4, 19; 21:5, 11), a city in the plain of the Jordan, built by Herod the Great in honor of his brother Phasaelus (Josephus, Ant. 16:5, 2; 17:8, 1; 18:3, 2; War, 2:9, 1). It is now Tell Fusail, a small hill with ruins at its base. The site is inhabited by a few people who cultivate their gardens. These are irrigated by a brook, the fountain of which is an hour more to the west, hidden as it were under the high cliffs below Daumeh, and under the shade of a dense jungle (see Robinson, Researches, 2:305). Brocardus and Mar. Samedo (Secr. Fidel. Cruc. III, 14:3) identify this little stream, now called Ain Fusail, with the brook Cherith (see Reland, Palaest. page 953; Bachiene, Heil. Geogr. I, 1:126-130).-Van de Velde, Memoir, page 339.

## Phasaelis (2)[[@Headword:Phasaelis (2)]]

             The present Khunrbet Fasail is laid down on the Ordnance Map at twelve and a' half miles north of Riha (Jericho), and is briefly described in the Memoirs accompanying (2:392).

## Phaseah[[@Headword:Phaseah]]

             [some Pha'seah] (Neh 7:51). SEE PASEAH.

## Phaselis[[@Headword:Phaselis]]

             (Φασηλίς), a town on the coast of Asia Minor, on the confines of Lycia and Pamphylia, and consequently ascribed by the ancient writers sometimes to one and sometimes to the other. It was one of the towns to which the Romans wrote commanding all Jewish exiles who had taken refuge there to be given up to Simon the high-priest (1Ma 15:23). Its commerce was considerable in the 6th century B.C., for in the reign of Amasis it was one of a number of Greek towns which carried on trade somewhat in the mranuer of the Hanseatic confederacy in the Middle Ages. They had a common temple, the Hellenium, at Naucratis, in Egypt, and nominated προστάται for the regulation of commercial questions and the decision of  disputes arising out of contracts, like the preudhommes of the Middle Ages, who presided over the courts of piepoudre (pieds poudres, peddlers) at the different staples. In later times Phaselis was distinguished as a resort of the Pamphylian and Cilician pirates. Its port was a convenient one to make, for the lofty mountain of Solyma (now Takhtalu), which backed it at a distance of only five miles, is nearly eight thousand feet in height, and constitutes an admirable landmark for a great distance. Phaselis itself stood on a rock of fifty or one hundred feet elevation above the sea, and was joined to the mainland by a low isthmus, in the middle of which was a lake, now a pestiferous marsh. On the eastern side of this were a closed port and a roadstead, and on the western a larger artificial harbor, formed by a mole run out into the sea. The remains of this may still be traced to a considerable extent below the surface of the water.

The masonry of the pier which protected the small eastern port is nearly perfect. In this sheltered position the pirates could lie safely while they sold their booty, and also refit, the whole region having been anciently so thickly covered with wood as to give the name of Pityusa to the town. For a time the Phaselites confined their relations with the Pamphylians to the purposes just mentioned; but they subsequently joined the piratical league, and suffered in consequence the loss of their independence and their town lands in the war which was waged by the Roman consul Publius Servilius Isauricus in the years B.C. 77-75. But at the outset the Romans had to a great extent fostered the pirates, by the demand which sprang up for domestic slaves upon the change of manners brought about by the spoliation of Carthage and Corinth. It is said that at this time many thousand slaves were passed through Delos — which was the mart between Asia and Europe — in a single day; and the proverb grew up there, ῎Εμπορε, κατάπλευσον· ἐξελοῦ πάντα πέπραται. But when the Cilicians had acquired such power and audacity as to sweep the seas as far as the Italian coast, and interrupt the supplies of corn, it became time to interfere, and the expedition of Servilius commenced the work which was afterwards completed by Pompey the Great (see Smith, Dict. of Class. Geog. s.v.).

It is in the interval between the growth of the Cilician piracy and the Servilian expedition that the incidents related in the First Book of Maccabees occurred. After naming Ptolemy, Demetrius (king of Syria), Attalus (king of Pergamus), Ariarathes (of Pontus), and Arsaces (of Parthia) as recipients of these missives, the author adds that the consul also  wrote: εἰς πάσας τὰς χώρας καὶ Σαμψάμῃ (Grotius conjectures Λαμψάκῳ, and one MS. has Μεσανίσση) καὶ Σπαρτιάταις καὶ εἰς Δῆλον καὶ εἰς Μύνδον καὶ εἰς Σικυῶνα καὶ εἰς τὴν Καρίαν καὶ εἰς Σάμον καὶ εἰς τὴν Παμφυλίαν καὶ εἰς τὴν Λυκίαν καὶ εἰς Α῾λικαρνασσόν, καὶ εἰς ῾Ρόδον καὶ εἰς Φασηλίδα καὶ εἰς Κῶ καὶ εἰς Σίδην καὶ εἰς ῎Αραδον καὶ εἰς Γόρτυναν καὶ Κνίδον, καὶ Κω῏/προν καὶ Κυρήνην (1Ma 15:23). It will be observed that all the places named, with the exception of Cyprus and Cyrene, lie on the highway of marine traffic between Syria and Italy. The Jewish slaves, whether kidnapped by their own countrymen (Exo 21:16), or obtained by raids (2Ki 5:2), appear in early times to have been transmitted to the west coast of Asia Minor by this route (see Eze 27:13; Joe 3:6).

The existence of the mountain Solyma, and a town of the same name, in the immediate neighborhood of Phaselis, renders it probable that the descendants of some of these Israelites formed a population of some importance in the time of Strabo (Herod. 2:178; Strab. 14, c. 3; Livy, 37:23; Mela, 1:14; see Beaufort,. Karamania, pages 53-56).

## Phasiron[[@Headword:Phasiron]]

             (Φασιρών : Vulg. Phaseron v.r. Pasi, ron), the name of the head of an Arab tribe, " the children of Phasiron" (1Ma 9:66), defeated by Jonathan, but of whom nothing more is known.

## Phassaron[[@Headword:Phassaron]]

             (Φασσαρόν, v.r. Φασσοῦρος and Φάσσορος; Vulg. Phasurius), a Greicized form (1Es 5:25) of the Heb, name PASHUR SEE PASHUR (q.v.).

## Phebe[[@Headword:Phebe]]

             SEE PHOEBE

## Pheenolium[[@Headword:Pheenolium]]

             (Φαινόλιον). SEE CHASUBL.

## Phelan, William, D.D[[@Headword:Phelan, William, D.D]]

             a somewhat noted Irish divine of the Protestant establishment, was born at Clonmel in 1789, and was educated at Trinity College, Dublin, where he was admitted sizar in 1806. In 1814 he was made second master of the endowed school of Derry; in 1817 he was elected fellow of his college, and  in 1819 Donellan lecturer. In 1824 he became rector of Killyman, Armagh, and in 1825 of Ardtrea. He died in 1830. His Remains were published, with a biographical memoir, by the bishop of Limerick (2d ed. Lond. 1832, 2 volumes, 8vo). See Darling, Cyclop. Bibliogr. s.v.

## Phelet[[@Headword:Phelet]]

             SEE BETH-PHELET

## Phelipeaux, Jean[[@Headword:Phelipeaux, Jean]]

             a French theologian, was born at Angiers in the 17th century. He studied in Paris, and there took his degrees in theology even to the doctorship. Bossuet, having heard him dispute in the Sorbonne. formed so favorable an opinion of him that he placed him in the position of preceptor to his nephew, the abbe Bossuet, the future bishop of Troyes. Both were in Rome in 1697, when the affair of Quietism was agitated; they followed it with singular ardor, and with a kind of passion the expression of which Bossuet was more than once obliged to moderate. Phelipeaux wrote, June 24, 1698, "No better and more persuasive piece of news can be sent us than that of the disgrace of the relatives and friends of M. de Cambray." His pupil showed no less animosity. "He is a wild beast," said he, November 25, in speaking of Fenelon — "he is a wild beast, that must be pursued until he is overthrown and unable to do any. harm." Phelipeaux, entirely occupied with this affair, wrote numerous memoirs, and besieged the court of Rome with solicitations, at the same time carrying on a secret correspondence with M. de Noailles, archbishop of Paris. On his return to France (1699) he became canon, official, and grand-vicar of Meaux. He died at Meaux July 3, 1708. After his death was published the Relation de l'origine du progres et de la condemnation du Quietisme repandu en France, avec plusieurs anecdotes curieuses (s. 1. 1732-1733, 2 parts, 12mo). All that is said in it against the manners of Madame Guyon is corroborated by no proof, and was refuted in 1733 by the abbe of La Bletterie. As for Fenelon, one cannot doubt that the design of the author was to injure his reputation; "his work," says De Bausset, "reveals the most marked partiality and the most odious rage." Besides. it was suppressed by a decree of the council. See Moreri, Grand Dict. Hist.; De Bausset, Hist. de Fenelon; Barbier, Dict. des Anonymes, 2d edit., No. 16,089. — Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, 39:821.

## Phelonium[[@Headword:Phelonium]]

             (φελόνιον), a cloak, which in the Greek Church corresponds to the chasuble in the Latin Church. This ecclesiastical vestment is worn by ,the priests, and that worn by the patriarch is embellished with triangles and crosses. This is supposed to have been the sort of garment which Paul left at Troas, and his anxiety for its restoration is to be at,tributed, we are told, to its sanctity as an ecclesiastical robe.

## Phelps, AUSTIN, D.D[[@Headword:Phelps, AUSTIN, D.D]]

             a Congregational minister and professor, was born at West Brookfield, Massachusetts, January 7, 1820. He graduated from the University of Pennsylvania in 1837; and was pastor of Pine Street Church, Boston, 1842- 48; and professor of sacred rhetoric in Andover Theological Seminary, 1848-79. He died at Bar Harbor, Maine, October 13, 1890. He was the author of The Still Hour (1859): — Hymns and Choirs (1860): — The New Birth (1867): — Sabbath Hours (1870): — Studies of the Old Testament (1879): — The Theory of Preaching (1881): — Men and Books (1882): — My Portfolio (eod.): — English Style (1883): — My Study (1885): — My Note Book (1890). See Appletons' Cyclop. of Amer. Biography.

## Phelps, Eliakim, D.D[[@Headword:Phelps, Eliakim, D.D]]

             a Congregational minister, was born at Belchertown, Massachussetts, March 20, 1790. From 1811 to 1813 he was a member of Brown University, but graduated in 1814 from Union College. He was ordained at Brookfield, October 23, 1816, as the colleague of Reverend Ephraim Ward, and continued to minister there until October 25, 1826. During the succeeding three years he was principal of the Ladies' High-school at Pittsfield. In February, 1830, he was installed pastor of the Presbyterian Church at Geneva, N.Y., and held that position until September 1835. From 1836 he was secretary of the American Education Society in Philadelphia, and of the same in New York to 1845. For one year he was acting-pastor at Kingston, R.I., and served in the same relation at Putnam, Conn. from 1856 to 1858. His residence from 1871 to 1874 was at Andover, Massachusetts, and from 1874 to 1880 at Weelawken, N.J. During 1831-35 he was a commissioner of Auburn Theological Seminary, N.Y., and for the last year of that term was presidenty of the commissioners. He died at Weehalwksen, N.J., December 29, 1880. Dr. Phelps published a volume of addresses, entitled The Ministry We Need, besides pamphlets, etc. See Cong. Year-book.. 1881, page 31.

## Phelps, Elizabeth Stuart[[@Headword:Phelps, Elizabeth Stuart]]

             an American lady, noted as the author of a number of moral and religious story-books, was born at Andover, Massachusetts, in 1815. She was the daughter of Dr. Mose§ Stuart, the celebrated professor of O.-T. exegesis at the Andover divinity school, and wife of Dr. Austen Phelps. She died at Boston November 30, 1852. We have not space here for a list of her writings, but those interested will find it in Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors, s.v.

## Phelps, Joseph T[[@Headword:Phelps, Joseph T]]

             a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born in Anne Arundel County, Maryland, September 21, 1818; was converted at sixteen, and in 1840 became a member of the Baltimore Conference, and for eighteen years travelled in Maryland, Virginia, and Pennsylvania. His last appointment in the Baltimore Conference was Harper's Ferry. In 1858 he took a supernumerary relation, and moved to Ohio. At the ensuing Conference he was, at his own request, located. In 1860-61 he was employed by the presiding elder on Clarksfield Circuit, and in 1863 he was admitted into the North Ohio Conference, and travelled the following circuits: Sullivan, one year; Republic, two years; Perkins, two years; and Centerton, one year. His last appointment was Republic. "He was a man of general intelligence, of goodly presence, and unassuming manners. He was a very good and acceptable preacher, a true Christian gentleman, and success attended his ministerial labors." He died near Republic, Seneca County, Ohio, April 23, 1870. See General Minutes of the Ann. Conferences.

## Phelps, Servis W[[@Headword:Phelps, Servis W]]

             a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born in 1846. After completing his studies at Lowville Academy, where he was converted, he joined the New York Conference in 1868. He was first appointed to New Bremen, and then to Barnes's Corners, where, under his ministrations, more than fifty persons were added to the Church. His health suddenly failed him, and at the Conference of 1870 he was compelled to take a supernumerary relation. He died in Martinsburgh, N.Y., February 28, 1871. Phelps was naturally kind and benevolent, and possessed many excellent qualities as a minister. He had high opinions of the ministerial office, and aimed to exemplify them in his entire life and influence. See Minutes of the Ann. Conferences.

## Phelps, Thomas[[@Headword:Phelps, Thomas]]

             a Wesleyan preacher and missionary, was leorn at Rudford, Gloucestershire, England, in 1817. He was of humble parentage, and did not enjoy more than the usual advantages of a common-school education. In 1849 he was selected as a laborer in the Jamaica mission. He promptly accepted the work, and though more or less disabled by severe attacks of tropical fever, he yet continued faithful in the discharge of his duties. He died peacefully at Port Morant, August 13, 1852. "Phelps's amiable disposition, and his habits of industry and punctuality, secured for him the love and esteem of the brethren with whom he was associated, and his brief ministry was not without fruit. His pulpit labors were acceptable; and his diligent attention to other pastoral duties obtained for him the love of the people among whom he was stationed." See Wesleyan Magazine (September 1853), page 869.

## Phelypeaux, Georges-Louis[[@Headword:Phelypeaux, Georges-Louis]]

             a French prelate, was born in 1729 in the chateau d'Herbaut, diocese of Orleans. He entered holy orders, became commendatory abbe of the royal abbey of Thouronel, and was appointed in 1757 archbishop of Bourges, and in 1770 chancellor of the Order of the Holy Ghost. He distinguished himself as much by the activity of his pastoral zeal as by his inexhaustible beneficence. He founded several colleges in the principal cities of his diocese, instituted bureaus of charity, and succeeded in considerably diminishing mendicity. See Blin de Sainmore, Eloge Hist. de G.-L.  Phelypeaux (1778, 8vo); Fauchet, Oraison Punebre de G.-L. Phelypeaux. — Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, 39:824.

## Phenice[[@Headword:Phenice]]

             [some Phe'nice]:

a. (Act 27:12). SEE PHOENIX.

b. (Act 11:19; Act 15:3). SEE PHENICIA.

## Phenicia[[@Headword:Phenicia]]

             SEE PHOENICIA.

## Phenolion[[@Headword:Phenolion]]

             SEE PHAENOLIUM.

## Phenomenalism[[@Headword:Phenomenalism]]

             SEE SCEPTICS, LATEST PHASES OF.

## Phenomenon[[@Headword:Phenomenon]]

             SEE PHENOMENON.

## Pherecydes[[@Headword:Pherecydes]]

             (Φερεκύδης), an ancient Greek philosopher, was a native of the island of Syros, one of the Cyclades, and flourished in the 6th century B.C. He is said by Diogenes Laertius to have been a rival of Thales, and to have learned his wisdom from the sacred books of the Plhenicians, or from the Egyptians and Chaldaeans. He is also reputed to have been a disciple of Pittacus, and to have taught Pythagoras. He wrote a cosmogony in a kind of prose much resembling poetry, under the title ῾Επτάμυχος, the meaning of which is doubtful. In a manner rather poetic than philosophic, he endeavored in this work to show the origin of all things from three eternal principles: Time, or Kronos; Earth, as the formless and passive mass; and Ether, or Zeus, as the formative principle. He taught the doctrine of the existence of the human soul after death; but it is uncertain whether he held the doctrine of the transmigration of souls, afterwards promulgated by his disciple Pythagoras. Of his work only fragments are extant, which have been collected and elucidated by Sturtz (Gera, 1798; 2d ed. Leips. 1824). See Smith, Dict. of Gr. and Rom. Biog. and Mythol. s.v.; Butler, Hist. of Anc. Phil. volume 2; Cudworth, Intell. System of the Universe (see Index in volume 3).

## Pheresite[[@Headword:Pheresite]]

             (1Es 8:69) or Pher'ezite (Jdt 5:19; 2Es 1:21), different modes of rendering (Φερεζαῖος) the name PERIZITE SEE PERIZITE (q.v.).

## Phiala[[@Headword:Phiala]]

             (Φιάλη ), LAKE, a small body of water described by Josephus, and believed by him to supply the fountain at Banias ( War, 3:10, 7). It is the present Birket er-Ranm, east of Banias; first examined by Irby andi Mangles (1818, Travels, p. 287); identified by Thomson (Biblioth. Sacra, iii, 189-192), See also Ritter, Erdkunde. 15:154 sq., 174 sq.; Wilson, Lands of the Bible, 2:180; Lynch, Official Report, page 110; Robinson, Later Bibl. Res. page 399. — Van de Velde, Memoir, page 340.

## Phibionita[[@Headword:Phibionita]]

             is a local name of the Gnostics (q.v.), and is probably a corruption of Phrebionitc, which was acquired from Valentinus, the founder of the sect, who was a native of Phrebonitis, on the coast of Egypt (see Epiphanius, Haeres. 26:3; 31:2).

## Phibus[[@Headword:Phibus]]

             is the name of a number of Jews who distinguished themselves in Hebrew literature. We mention the following as most important:

1. SAMUEL, of Warcislaw, flourished in the last quarter of the 17th century, was rabbi at Furth and Schldlow, and wrote, בֵּית שְׁמוּאֵל, a commentary on the codex Eben-Ezer, making use of other commentaries on the same, as the טורי זהבof Chajim Kohen, etc. (Dyrhenfurt, 1689; corrected edition, Furth, 1694; Wilna-Grodno, 1819): — a corimentary on the codex Orach Chajim: — a commentary on Jore Dea: — Discourses on the Pentateuch, which have not been printed.

2. SAMUEL ben-Joseph ha-Kohen Falk, of Vienna, died in Palestine, where he went after the Jews had been expelled from Vienna in 1670. He wrote, לֶקֵט שְׁמוּאֵל, a kind of haggadistic dictionary of proper names, wherem he speaks in alphabetical order of אִהֲרן אָבוֹת אָרָם, etc., collected from different sources (Venice, 1694): דְּרוּשׁ שְׁמוּאֵל, discourses on the Pentateuch (ibid. 1714). See Wolf, Bibl. Hebr. 3:1122 sq.

3. URI ben-Aharon ha-Levi, a typographer at Amsterdam, was born in 1623, and was still living in 1713. He published the Hebrew Old Testament, with many additions of Jacob Blitz, and a Preface in Judmeo- German by the editor (Amsterd. 1679). He also published Neuer Abendsegen, a prayer-book, in Judaeo-German (ibid. 1677). See Gratz, Gesch. d. Juden, 10:329 sq.

4. URI ben-David, flourished in the middle of the 17th century, was rabbi at Polnow, in Lithuania, and wrote אור תּורָה, an exegetical and allegorical commentary on the Pentateuch, with additions of Sam. El. Edeler (Lublin, 1672). See Wolf, Bibl. Hebr. 1:131, 3:84.

5. URI ha-Kohen, rabbi at Metz, wrote halachic discussions, haggadic dissertations, and discourses, under the title of הֲלָכָה בַרוּרָה, (Metz, 1793).

6. URI ben-A. Low, of Breslau, is the author of, מלּים מדְרִשׁ, a Hebrew- German Dictionary (Dyrhenfurt, 1773): לקּוּטַי אורות, in two parts, the first gives the six hundred and thirteen precepts according to the  Pentateuch, the second, under the title פּתְגִּם הִמֶּלֶךְ, contains these precepts in a metrical form (ibid. 1812).

7. URI ben-Simeon, of Beelen, who lived in the middle of the 16th century, published יחם הָאָבות, remarkable epitaphs of pious and distinguished Israelites in Palestine, written for pilgrims. After it had been published by an anonymous author in 1537, Uri Phobus recast the whole, and published it in 1564 at Safed, After having visited and seen himself the different places. It was then published again in Venice in 1599, and often. It was translated into Latin by Hottinger, in his Cippi Hebraici (Heidelberg, 1659-1662) into French by Carmoly (in Revue Orient. [Brussels, 1843- 1844] 3:85-99): — לוח, a Calendarium, which has been translated into Latin by Jac. Christmann, under the title Calendarium, Palestinorum et universorum Judeorum ad annos 40 supputatum, auctore Ui fil. Sim. Judaeo Palastino, nunc primum ex sermone Hebraeo in Latinum conversum, ac scholiis utilibus maximeque necessariis illustratum (Frankf. a.M. 1594). See Wolf, Bibl. Hebr. 1:133 sq.; 3:84 sq. Furst, Bibl. Jud. 3:95 sq. (B.P.)

## Phichol[[@Headword:Phichol]]

             (Heb. Pikol', פַּיכֹל, of doubtful meaning [see below]; Sept. Φιχώλ v.r. Φικόλ; Josephus Φίκωλος), the proper, or, more probably, the titular name of the commander of the troops of Abimelech, the Philistine king of Gerar in the patriarchal period. SEE ABIMEILECH.

If the Abimelech of the time of Isaac was the son of the Abimelech of the time of Abraham, we may conclude that the Phichol who attended on the second Abimelech (Gen 21:22) was the successor of the one who was present with the first at the interview with Abraham (Gen 26:26). Josephus mentions him on the second occasion only. On the other hand the Sept. introduces Ahuzzath, Abimelech's other companion, on the first also. By Gesenius the name is treated as Hebrew, and as meaning the "m mouth of all." By Furst (Heb. Lex. s.v.) it is derived from a root פָּכִל, to be strong. But Hitzig (Philistdaer, § 57) refers it to the Sanscrit pitshula, a tamarisk, pointing out that Abraham had planted a tamarisk in Beersheba. and comparing the name with Elah, Berosus, Tappuach, and other names of persons and places signifying different kinds of trees; and with the name Φίγαλος, a village of Palestine (Josephus, Ant. 12:4, 2), and (Φιγαλία in Greece.  Stark (Gaza, etc. page 96) more cautiously avoids such speculations. The natural conclusion from these mere conjectures is that Phichol is a Philistine name, the derivation and meaning of which are lost to us.

## Phil(l)potts, Henry, D.D[[@Headword:Phil(l)potts, Henry, D.D]]

             an English prelate of much note, was the son of a respectable hotel-keeper of Gloucester, and was born in that city in 1777. At the age of fifteen he was elected to a scholarship at Corpus Christi College, Oxford, and having taken the degree of B.A., gained the chancellor's prize for an English essay in 1795. He was elected in the following year to a fellowship at Magdalen College, which he vacated on his marriage in 1804 with Miss Surtees, a niece of the late lord chancellor Eldon. In 1806 he became chaplain to Dr. Barrington, bishop of Durham, and in that capacity distinguished himself by a controversy which he maintained against the learned Roman Catholic historian of England, Dr. Lingard (q.v.), and subsequently by the publication of some pamphlets, vindicating the established clergy in the North from the attacks of lords Grey and Durham. For these services he was rewarded with the rich living of Stanhope. In 1825 he again entered the lists of controversy as the opponent of Mr. Charles Butler's Book of the Catholic Church. In 1827 he published his celebrated Letter on Catholic Emancipation addressed to Mr. Canning, soon after which he was promoted (in 1828) to the deanery of Chester, which he exchanged in October 1830, for the bishopric of Exeter. As a member of the House of Lords, bishop Phillpotts proved the zealous champion of Tory principles, and consequently opposed the Reform Bill, the Irish Church Temporalities Bill, the Poor-law Bill, the Ecclesiastical Commission, the National  Education Bill, and every measure of a liberal tendency. Dr. Phillpott was for many years in that assembly the recognized episcopal head and representative of the extreme HighChurch party, and by his writings and speeches warmly advocated the revival of convocation, and of other innovations on the established system of ecclesiastical affairs. In 1849 he rejected Mr. Gorham, who was nominated by the crown to a living in Devoushire, on the ground that he held erroneous opinions as to the effects of infant baptism; and though he was supported by the ecclesiastical courts, their judgment was set aside on appeal by a decision of the judicial committee of the privy council in 1850. On this Dr. Phillpotts published a Letter in which'he formally excommuisiacated the archbishop of Canterbury, who had been a party to the decision (see Edirb. Rev. 95:59- 65). SEE OKRHATI CASE. In the following year he held a synod of his clergy at Exeter, which was pronounced illegal by the officers of the crown, and has never since been summoned. He died in 1869. The list of Dr. Phillpotts's controversial pamphlets occupies no less than twelve pages in the new catalogue of the British Museum. His best-known publications are given in Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors, s.v. See English Cyclop. s.v.; Men of the Time, s.v.; Blackwood's Mag. 24:1; 29:157; Dublin University Mag. 20:223; Firaser's Mag. 2:687; Lond. Athen. 1861, 1:151.

## Philadelphia[[@Headword:Philadelphia]]

             [strictly Philadelphi'a] (Φιλαδέλφεια, brotherly love), one of the.seven cities of Asia Minor to which the admonitions in the Apocalypse were addressed (Rev 1:11; Rev 2:7). The town stood about twenty-five miles south-east from Sardis, in N. lat. 320 28', E. long. 280 30', in the plain of Hermus, about midway between the river of that name and the termination of Mount Tmolus. It was the second in Lydia (Ptolemy, 5:2; Pliny, Hist. Nat. 5:30), and was built by king Attalus Philadelphus from whom it took its name. In B.C. 133 the place passed, with the dominion in which it lay, to the Romans. The soil was extremely favorable to the growth of vines, celebrated by Virgil (Georg. 2:98) for the soundness of the wine they produced; and in all probability Philadelphia was built by Attalus as a mart for the great wine-producing region, extending for 500 stadia in length by 400 in breadth. Its coins have on them the head of Bacchus or a female Bacchant. Strabo compares the soil with that in the neighborhood of Catana, in Sicily; and modern travellers describe the appearance of the country as resembling a billowy sea of disintegrated lava, with here and there vast trap-dikes protruding.

The original population of Philadelphia seems to have been Macedonian, and the national character to have been retained even in the time of Pliny. There was, however, as appears from Rev 3:9, a synagogue of Hellenizing Jews there, as well as a Christian Church-a circumstance to be expected when we recollect that Antiochus the Great introduced into Phrygia 2000 families of Jews, removing them from Babylon and Mesopotamia, for the purpose of counteracting the seditious temper of the Phrygians; and that he gave them lands and provisions, and exempted them from taxes (Josephus, Ant. 12:3, 4). The locality continued to 'be subject to constant earthquakes, which in the time of Strabo (13:628) rendered even the town-walls of Philadelphia unsafe; but its inhabitants held pertinaciously to the spot, perhaps from the profit which naturally accrued to them from their city being the staple of the great wine-district. But the expense of reparation was constant, and hence perhaps the poverty of the members of the Christian Church (οιδα. . . ὅτι μικρὰν ἔχεις δύναμιν, Rev 3:8), who no doubt were a portion of the urban popullation, and heavily taxed for public purposes, as well as subject to private loss by the destruction of their own property.  Philadelphia was not of sufficient importance in the Roman times to have law-courts of its own, but belonged to a jurisdiction of which Sardis was the centre. It continued to be a place of importance and of strength down to the Byzantine age; and of all the towns in Asia Minor it withstood the Turks the longest. It was taken by Bajazet I in A.D. 1392. Furious at the resistance which he had met with, Bajazet put to death the defenders of the city, and many of the inhabitants besides (see G. Pachym. page 290; Mich. Due. page 70; Chalcond. page 33).

## Philadelphia (2)[[@Headword:Philadelphia (2)]]

             still exists as a Turkish town, under the name of Allah-shehr, "city of God," i.e., Hightown. The region around is highly volcanic, and, geologically speaking, belongs to the district of Phrygia Catacecaumene, on the western edge of which it lies. The situation of Philadelphia is highly picturesque, especially when viewed from the north-east, for it is principally built on four or five hills, extremely regular in figure, and having the appearance of truncated pyramids. At the back of these, which are all of nearly the same height, rise the lofty ridges of Tmolus; and though the country around is barren and desolate, the city itself is wanting neither in wood nor verdure. The climate of Philadelphia is pleasant and healthy. It is elevated 952 feet above the level of the sea, and is open to the salutary breezes from the Catacecaumene — a wild desert tract of highly volcanic country extending as far to the east as Peltae. This district is even vet famous for the growth of the vine, which delights in a light sandy soil; and, though incapable of extensive cultivation, has a few fertile oases. Close to Philadelphia the soil is rich, and fruits as well as corn are abundant. The Cogamos abounds in fresh-water turtle, which are considered delicacies, and highly prized accordingly. The revenues of the city depend on its corn, cotton, and tobacco. The cotton grows in small pods about the size of a medlar, and not unlike it in form.

The town itself, although spacious, is miserably built and kept, the dwellings being remarkably mean, and the streets exceedingly filthy. Across the summits of the hill behind the town and the small valleys between them runs the town-wall, strengthened by circular and square towers, and forming also an extensive and long quadrangle in the plain below. The ancient walls are partly standing and partly in ruins; but it is easy to trace the circuit which they once enclosed, and within which are to be found innumerable fragments of pillars and  other remains of antiquity. The missionaries Fisk and Parsons, in 1822, were informed by the Greek bishop that the town contained 3000 houses, of which he assigned 250 to the Greeks, and the rest to the Turks. On the same authority it is stated that there are five churches in the town, besides twenty others which were too old or too small for use. Six minarets, indicating as many mosques, are seen in the town; and one of these mosques is believed by the native Christians to have been the church in which assembled the primitive Christians addressed in the Apocalypse. There are few ruins; but in one part there are still found four strong marble pillars, which supported the dome of a church. The dome itself has fallen down, but its remains may be observed, and it is seen that the arch was of brick. On the sides of the pillars are inscriptions, and some architectural ornaments in the form of the figures of saints. One solitary pillar of high antiquity has often been noticed as reminding beholders of the remarkable words in the Apocalyptic message to the Philadelphia Church: "Him that overcometh will I make a pillar in the temple of my God; and he shall go no more out" (Rev 3:12). It is believed that the Christian inhabitants of Philadelphia are on the increase. The city is the seat of a Greek bishop, and the last incumbent of the see did much to spread among his clergy a desire for theological learning; but education is in a very low state, and Mr. Arundell states that the children had been allowed to tear up some ancient copies of the Gospels. See Smith, Sept. Ecclesiarum Asiae, page 138; Arundell, Seven Churches; Richter, Wahlfahrten, page 513; Schubert, Morgenland, 1:353-357; Missionary Herald, 1821, page 253; 1839, pages 210-212; Chandler, Travels, page 310.

It has been supposed by some that Philadelphia occupied the site of another town named Callatebus, of which Herodotus speaks, in his account of Xerxes's march; but the position and fertility of that spot do not correspond. At the same time the Persian king, in his two days' march from Cydrara to Sardis, must have passed very near the site of the future Philadelphia (Strabo, 12, c. 8; Herod. 7:31). SEE ASIA MINOR

.

## Philadelphians[[@Headword:Philadelphians]]

             or "the Philadelphian Society," is the name of a sect which was founded in 1695, and claimed.to have for its object "the advancement of piety and divine philosophy." It originated with Jane Leade (q.v.) and John Pordage (q.v.). Another of the Philadelphians was the learned physician Francis Lee,who edited the "Theosophical Transactions" of the society. Another  eminent member was Dr. Lot Fisher, who caused all the works of Jane Leade and her associates to be translated into Dutch. A fourth principal coadjutorwas Thomas Bromley, author of The Sabbath of Rest, and of some works on Biblical subjects. The Philadelphian Society contributed largely to the spread of that mystical piety which is so conspicuous in the works of the good and learned William Law, and which affected in no small degree the early stages of Methodism. Mrs. Leade herself, however, combined much fanaticism with her pietism, professing (like Swedenborg in a later generation) to hold intercourse with spirits. This fanaticism imparted itself to many members of the Philadelphian Society, and imaginary apparitions of good and evil angels became for a time a prominent feature of their religious life. In other respects their mysticism was that of the ordinary character, making the contemplative life the basis of religious knowledge and practice. A small work entitled The Principles of the Philadelphians, published in 1697, gives a curious exposition of their mysticism. See Ebrard, Kirchen- u. Dogmengesch. 4:163; Mosheim, Eccles. Hist. volume 3; Meth. Rev. April 1865, page 305; Illgen, Zeitsch. fur hist. Theol. 1865, 2:171; Amer. Presb. Rev. January 1866, page 191. (J.H.W.)

## Philalethes[[@Headword:Philalethes]]

             or lovers of truth, as their name implies, were a sect of infidels which arose at Kiel, in Germany, about 1847, and who wished to ignore Christianity altogether, and to use only the general forms of piety. SEE RATIONALISTS

.

## Philanthropy[[@Headword:Philanthropy]]

             (φιλανθρωπία a term compounded of φίλος, lovinq, and ἄνθρωπος, man), signifies the love of mankind. It differs from benevolence only in thisthat benevolence extends to every being that has life and sense, and is of course susceptible of pain and pleasure; whereas philanthropy cannot comprehend more than the human race. It differs from friendship, as this affection subsists only between a few individuals, while philanthropy comprehends the whole human species. It is a calm sentiment, which perhaps hardly ever rises to the warmth of affection, and certainly not to the heat of passion.

Christian philanthropy is universally admitted to be superior to that of any other ethical or religious system; and if we inquire what are the causes of  this superior prominence given to active benevolence in the Christian scheme of ethics, we shall find, as in other instances. that the peculiar character of the ethical fruit depends on the root of religion by which the plant is nourished, and the theological soil in which it was planted. For surely it requires very little thought to perceive that the root of all that surpassing love of the human brotherhood lies in the well-known opening words of the most catholic of prayers — "Our Father, which art in heaven;" the aspect also of sin as a contumacy, and a rebellion, and a guilt, drawing down a curse, necessarily leads to a more aggressive philanthropy, with the view of achieving deliverance from that curse; but, above all, the doctrine of the immortality of the soul, and the terrible consequences necessarily involved in the idea of an eternal banishment from the sunshine of the divine presence, has created an ainount of social benevolence and missionary zeal which under any less potent stimulus would have been impossible. The miseries of the more neglected and outcast part of humanity present an entirely different aspect to the calm Epicurean and to the zealous Christian. To the Christian the soul of the meanest savage and of the most degraded criminal is still an immortal soul. Christian ethics requires us to love our enemies without betraying our rights, and this will become more and more practicable in the degree that international recognition becomes more common, and a large Christian philanthropy more diffused.

In the history of education philanthropy has acquired a special meaning. The influence exercised by Rousseau was not less great on education than on politics, and was as visible in the pedagogues of Germany and Switzerland as in the men of the French Revolution. It is to the brilliant and one-sided advocacy, by the author of Emnile, of a return to nature in social life and in the training of the young, that Basedow owed his novel and enthusiastic educationalism, which he put to the practical test in the institution which was opened under his auspices at Dessau in 1774, and which was called Philanthropina. Other establishments of the same kind were founded in different parts of Germany, but the only one which still survives is Salzmann's Institute at Schiepfenthal, near Gotha, opened in 1784. These philanthropina are of interest to us because they sought the religious and moral training of the young on an entirely original plan. Until the davs of these Philanthropists the Church had had the sole educational care of the rising generation, but these came forward to assume this responsibility, and to treat the child in a peculiar and altogether novel  manner. The religious fervor was to be developed like love for any given study, and, instead of influencing the heart. religion became an intellectual acquisition. As philanthropism agreed no less with the absolutism of Russia than with the liberty of Switzerland, so, in the general private devotional exercises, nothing should be done which would not be approved of by every worshipper of God, whether he were a Christian, Jew, Mohammedan, or a deist. In the temple of the Father of all, crowds of dissenting fellow-citizens will worship as brethren, and afterwards they will, with the same fraternal disposition, go, one to hear the holy mass, the other to pray with real brethren, 'Our Father,' the third to pray with real brethren, 'Father of us.' While the former education had viewed the minds of children as vessels into which a certain amount of knowledge and faith was to be infused, whether it was easy or difficult, philanthropism viewed these vessels as. the chief thilg, and the amount of knowledge as only secondary. In other words, knowledge was regarded merely as a means of training the human mind; and the aim was the natural development of all man's powers and faculties" (Kahnis, Hist. of Germ. Prot. page 47). See the Quart. Rev. Jan. 1875, art. 6; Blackie, Hist. of Europ. Morals, pages 236, 263; Wuttke, Christian Ethics (see Index in volume 7).

## Philarches[[@Headword:Philarches]]

             This word occurs as a proper name in the A.V. at 2Ma 8:32, where it is really the name of an office, phylarch (ὁ φυλάρχης- ὁ φύλαρχος, 'the commander of the cavalry"). The Greek text seems to be decisive as to the true rendering; but the Latin version ("et Philarchen qui cum Timotheo erat . . .") might easily give rise to the error, which is very strangely supported by Grimm, ad loc.

## Philaret[[@Headword:Philaret]]

             OF Moscow, a modern Russian prelate of much celebrity, was born of pious parentage at Kolouma in 1782. His lay name was Vasili Drosdow. He received his education in the Theological Seminary of Moscow. He commenced his public career as tutor of the Greek and Latin languages. His oratorical gifts being soon observed, he was appointed preacher in 1806 at the Sergian monastery of Troizka, and after having removed to St. Petersburg, entered the monastic life, in order to open to himself the higher avenues of the Church, which only the white clergy can enter. In 1810 he was translated to the Academy of Alexander Newskj as bachelor of  theological science; in 1811 he was made archimandrite, and in 1812 became rector of the St. Petersburg Theological Academy. In 1817 he was raised to the bishopric, and was appointed successively bishop of Twer, Iaroslaw, and Moscow. In the episcopal see of Moscow, to which he was appointed in 1821, he remained until his death, November 19, 1867. As the senior Russian prelate, the eminent orator and professor, the theologian justly renowned in the Christian world, the strict supporter of the Church, and the true statesman, Philaret, from his tenderest youth until the last day of his prolonged life, was animated by a burning and constant love for Russia. In the fulfilment of the mission which fell to his lot, he elevated himself by his spirit above the time, and did not allow himself to be captivated by any narrowness of mind. All that knew him know likewise that in the height of his intelligence he considered the relative importance of all the manifestations in the Christian world. whether within or without the orthodox Church. He would not permit the appellation of heretics to such of the Christian dissenters as had come into existence since the oecumenical councils, and consequently had not been condemned by them. He was exempt from fanaticism in his administrations, and yet he knew the limits and measures of that which stood below. His inexhaustible intellect, sound counsels, and thorough acquaintance with the religious and social life of the people made him the friend of the crowned heads of Russia; and he was by them selected as confidential adviser in all important questions concerning the good of the empire. Alexander I even told him who was to be the successor to his throne before the future emperor knew of it.

In the late Crimean war his words and sacrificing example revived a patriotic feeling throughout the land; and to him is ascribed the manifesto which led to the abolishment of the anti-Christian serfdom. For over twenty-five years he was not present at the Holy Synod, yet all important documents concerning spiritual affairs were submitted to him; and his vivid words called out sympathy with the poor co-religionists in the island of Crete. In 1813 Philaret received a decoration from the emperor Alexander I for his oratory. Sermons, lectures, etc., of his have been printed in large numbers and translated into foreign languages. The synodial printing establishment at Moscow alone printed 360 of his compositions to the number of 2,000,223 copies. Metropolitan Philaret was really one of the greatest scholars of his Church. Almost all the now living communicants of the orthodox Russo-Greek Church have learned its doctrines from the Catechism arranged by him. His greatest work is his History of the Russian Church, of which a German translation was brought out in 1872. This  history was really the first work of importance in Russian ecclesiastical annals. It was published from 1850 to 1859, and, by order of the Holv Synod, was introduced into the ecclesiastical seminaries (institutions ranking between the ecclesiastical schools and ecclesiastical academies). Within ten vears four editions were published. The author divides the history of the Russian Church into five periods: the first closes with the inroads of the Mongolians in 1237; the second embraces the time of the subjection of Russia by the Mongolians, 1238 to 1409; the third extends to the establishment of a patriarchate, 1587; the foumrth to the abolition of the patriarchate in 1719; the fifth comprises the administration of the Church of the Holy Synod. (The value of the German translation is considerably enhanced by an appendix containing Philaret's treatise on the Liturgy of the Oriental Greek Church and the Catechism of the Orthodox Christian Doctrine.) Philaret published, besides this history of the Russian Church, the following works: A System of Christian Doctrines (2 volumes): — A Work on the Saints of Russia: — Cyril and Methodius, the Apostles of the Slavi: — The Liturgy of the Russian Church befbre the Invasion of the Mongolians: — A Work on the Church Fathers (3 volumes, and an extract from it as a text-book): — A Commentary to the Epistle to the Galatiauns: — An Outline of the Theological Literature of Russia (2 volumes): — Sermons, Homilies, and Addresses (4 volumes), of which a detailed account is given by Otto in his Russian Literature. Of his personal appearance and kindness of heart dean Stanley makes mention in his East. Ch. Lectures, page 525. As a preacher, the dean describes Philaret as one of the first of the present Church of Russia, "whose striking manner renders his sermons impressive even to those who cannot follow the language." See Meth. Qu. Rev. July 1873. page 498 sq.; Union Rev. March, 1869; Appleton's Annual Cyclop. 1867, art. Moscow; Theoloyisches Literaturblatt (Bonn, 1873, January and April); Zion's Herald (Boston), April 2, 1868; Otto, Russian Literature, page 324 sq.: Dixon, Free Russia, page 29 sq. (J.H.W.)

## Philaret (2)[[@Headword:Philaret (2)]]

             archbishop of Tschernigow, who died in 1866, was one of the most learned historians of the Russian Church. He is the author of a work on Cyril and Methodius, the Apostles of the Slavs (1846; Germ. transl. Milan, 1848). He also wrote on the Service of the Russian Church in the Pre-Mongolian Time (1847): — History of the Russian Church (4th ed. 1862, 5 volumes): Review of Russian Literature from 862 to 1858 (1859 2 volumes). (B.P.)

## Philaret, Theodorus Romanoff[[@Headword:Philaret, Theodorus Romanoff]]

             third patriarch of Russia, a near relative by his mother of the last czar of the blood of Rurik, was born in the 16th century. This relationship caused him, in 1599, to be made a monk by Boris Godounof. Elevated in 1605 to the episcopal chair of Rostof by Dmitri, he was in 1610 sent on an embassy to Poland, where he was retained, against the law of nations, a prisoner for nine years. On his return to Moscow, in 1619, he found his son czar, who  appointed him, June 24, of this year, patriarch, and shared with him his sovereignty, so that all the ukases were given in their name, and in all solemnities each had a throne, one as high as the other. This interference of the patriarch in political affairs was fatal to Russia. Michael Romanoff had been called to the throne on the express condition of reigning with the colcurrence of the chamber of the boyards and of the states-general, which, from 1613 to 1619, had come to be regarded as a legislative assembly. Philaret exiled the most distinguished boyards, and reduced the states- general to a merely consultative relation. Into spiritual affairs he carried the same retrograde spirit. Without caring for the advice of Oriental patriarchs, he ordained, in 1620, that every member of a Christian confession who should embrace the Russian religion must be baptized again, a regulation which is still in force. He died at Moscow October 1, 1633. His pastoral epistles have been collected in the A ncienne Bibliotheque Russe, volume 16. See Chronique de Nikon; Ilst. of'the Patriarch Philutrete (in Russian) (Moscow, 1802, 8vo); Satiehtchefet Solovief, History of Russia; EugBne, Diet. Hist. s.v.; Philarbte, archi). of Kharkof, Hist. de l'Eglise Russe; Dolgoroukow, La Verite sur la Russie, chapter 6. — Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, 39:838.

## Philaster[[@Headword:Philaster]]

             (PHILASTRIUS), a noted hberesiologist of the ancient Latin Church, flourished in the first quarter of the 4th century. He was probally a native of Italy, and came on the stage of theological activity when the Arian controversy was waxing hot, and he was soon interested in it as a most ardent orthodox presbyter seeking the conversion of strayed sheep of the flock. He travelled far and near, seeking everywhere the conversion of the Arians, both high and low. Thus, e.g., he went to Milan to convince bishop Auxentius of the error of his wavs. He was so well liked by the clergy that he was finally elected bishop of Brescia (Brixia), and as such took part in the Council of Aquileia in 361. He died July 18, 387. Philaster's greatest work is his Liber de hceresibus (in 156 chapters) (edited by Fabricius, Hamb. 1728; by Galland. Bibliotheca, 7:475-521; and by (Ehler in volume 1 of his Corpus haereseolog. pages 5-185). There is an affinity of Philaster with Epiphanins, but it is usually accounted for on the ground of the dependence of the former on the latter. This seems to have been the opinion of Augustine (Epistola 222 ad Quodvultdeum). But Lipsius derives both from a common older source, viz. the work of Hippolytus against thirty-two heresies, and explains the silence of Epiphanius (who mentions  Hippolytus only once) by the unsctupulousness of the authorship of the age, which had no hesitation in decking itself with borrowed plumes. Philaster was very liberal with the name of heresy, extending it to 156 systems. 28 before Christ, and 128 after. He includes peculiar opinions on all sorts of subjects: "Haeresis de stellis coelo affixis, haeresis de peccato Cain, haeresis de Psalterii inequalitate, haeresis de animalibus quatuor in prophetis, haeresis de Septuaginta interpretibus, hseresis de Melchisedech sacerdote, haeresis de uxoribus et concubinis Salomonis!" Philaster's writings first appeared in print at Basle in 1528, edited by Sichardus; they were reprinted in 1539 at Basle, and at other places. In 1677 they were inserted in the Bibliotheca Patrum Maxima, 5:701 sq. But the best edition is by Fabricius (Hamb. 1721), with a Vita Philastri. See Schrockh, Kirchengesch. 9:363-382; Schaff, Ch. Hist. 3:931 sq.; Alzog, Patrologie, § 63. (J.H.W.)

## Phileas Of Thumite[[@Headword:Phileas Of Thumite]]

             an Eastern prelate, flourished in the 3d century as bishop of Thumitae, in Egypt. He was of noble family, and in his native place filled the highest offices, and was distinguished for his piety and learning. On account of his faith, he was persecuted at Alexandria, and died as a martyr about 307 or 311. He left a work in praise of martyrdom. See Fabricius, Bibl. Grceca, 7:306; Mohler, Patrologie, 1:678 sq.; Routh, Rel. Sac. 3:381 sq.

## Philemon[[@Headword:Philemon]]

             (Φιλήμων, affectionate), a Christian to whom Paul addressed his epistle in behalf of Onesimus. A.D. 57. He was a native probably of Colosse, or at all events lived in that city when the apostle wrote to himi; first, because Onesimus was a Colossian (Col 4:9); and, secondly, because Archippus was a Colossian (Col 4:17), whom Paul associates with Philemon at the beginning of his letter (Phm 1:1-2). Wieseler (Chronologic, page 452) argues, indeed, from Col 4:17, that Archippus was a Laodicean; but the εἴπατε in that passage on which the poilnt turns refers evidently to the Colossians (of whom Archippus was one therefore), and not to the Church at Laodicea spoken of in the previous verse, as Wieseler inadvertently supposes. Theodoret (Proaem. in Epist. ad Phil.) states the ancient opinion in saying that Philemon was a citizen of Colossme, and that his house was pointed out there as late as the 5th century. The legendary history supplies nothing on which we can rely. It is  related that Philemon became bishop of Colossae (Constit. Apost. 7:46), and died as a martyr under Nero. From the title of" fellow-workman" (συνεργός) given him in the first verse, some (Michaelis, Einleit. 2:1274) make him a deacon, but without proof. But, according to Pseudo- Dorotheus, lie had been bishop in Gaza (see Witsius, Mliscel. Leidens. page 193 sq.). The Apphia mentioned in the epistle was nearly connected with Philemon, but whether or not she was his wife there are no means of determlining (comp. esp. Hofmann, Introd. in Epist. ad Colos. page 52 sq.; Bertholdt, Einleit. 6:3631 sq.). It is apparent from the letter to him that Philemon was a man of property and influence, since he is represented as the head of a numerous household, and as exercising an expensive liberality towards his friends and the poor in general. He was indebted to the apostle Pa!l as the medium of his personal participation in the Gospel. All interpreters agree in assigning that significance to σεαυτ ν μοι προσοφείλεις in Phm 1:19.

It is not certain under what circumstances they became known to each other. If Paul visited Colosse when he passed through Phrygia on his second missionary journey (Act 16:6), it was undoubtedly there, and at that time, that Philemon heard the Gospel and attached himself to the Christian party. On the contrary, if Paul never visited that city in per son, as many critics infer from Col 2:1, then the best view is that he was converted during Paul's protracted stay at Ephesus (Act 19:10), A.D. 51-54. That city was the religious and commercial capital of Western Asia Minor. The apostle labored there with such success that "all they who dwelt in Asia heard the word of the Lord Jesus." Phrygia was a neighboring province, and among the strangers who repaired to Ephesus, and had an opportunity to hear the preaching of Paul, may have been the Colossian Philemon. It is evident that on becoming a disciple, he gave no common proof of the sincerity and power of his faith. His character, as shadowed forth in the epistle to him, is one of the noblest which the sacred record makes known to us. He was full of faith and good works, was docile, confiding, grateful, was forgiving, sympathizing, charitable, and a man who on a question of simple justice needed only a hint of his duty to prompt him to go even beyond it (ὑπὲρ ὃ λέγω ποιήσεις.). Anly one who studies the epistle will perceive that it ascribes to him these varied qualities; it bestows on him a measure of commendation which forms a striking contrast with the ordinary reserve of the sacred writers. It was through such believers that the primitive Christianity evinced its divine origin, and spread so rapidly among the nations. SEE PAUL.

## Philemon, Epistile To[[@Headword:Philemon, Epistile To]]

             This is the shortest and (with the exception of Hebrews) the last of Paul's letters as arranged in most editions of the N.T. In the following treatment of it we combine the Scriptural statements with modern researches.

I. Authorship. — That this epistle was written by the apostle Paul is the constant tradition of the ancient Church. It is expressly cited as such by Origen (Homil. 19 in Jeremiah 1:185, ed. Huet.); it is referred to as such by TertullianL (Nov. Marc. 5:21); and both Eusebius (Hist. Eccles. 3:25) and Jerome (Prooem. in Ep. ad v. 442) attest its universal reception as suich in the Christian world. The latter, indeed, informs us that some in his day deemed it unworthy of a place in the canon, in consequence of its being occupied with subjects which, in their estimation, it did not become an apostle to write about, save as a mere private individual; but this he, at the same time, shows to be a mistake, and repudiates the legitimacy of such a standard for estimating the genuineness or authority of any book. That this epistle should not have been quoted by several of the fathers who have quoted largely from the other Pauline epistles (e.g. Irenaeus, Clement of Alexandria, and Cyprian), may be accounted for partly by the brevity of the epistle, and partly by their not having occasion to refer to the subjects of which it treats. We need not urge the expressions in Ignatius, cited as evidence of that apostolic father's knowledge and use of the epistle; though it is difficult to regard the similarity between them and the language in 5:20 as altogether accidental (see Kirchhofer, Quoellensammlung, page 205). The Canon of Muratori, which comes to us from the 2d century (Credner, Geschichte des Kanons, page 66), enumerates this as one of Paul's epistles. Tertullian says that Marcion admitted it into his collection. Sinope, in Pontus, the birthplace of Marcion, was not far from Colossse where Philemon lived, and the letter would find its way to the neighboring churches at an early period. It is so well attested historically, that, as De Wette says (Einleitung ins Neue Testament), its genuineness on that ground is beyond doubt.

Nor does the epistle itself offer anything to conflict with this decision. It is impossible to conceive of a composition more strongly marked within the same limits by those unstudied assonances of thought, sentiment, and expression, which indicate an author's hand, than this short epistle as compared with Paul's other productions. Paley has adduced the undesigned coincidences between this epistle and that to the Colossians with great  force, as evincing the authenticity of both (Horae Paulinae, c. 14); and Eichhorn has ingeniously shown how a person attempting, with the Epistle to the Colossians before him, to forge such an epistle as this in the name of Paul, would have been naturally led to a very different arrangement of the historical circumstances and persons from what we find in the epistle which is extant (Einleit. ins N.T. 3:302).

Baur (Paulus, page 475) would divest the epistle of its historical character, and make it the personified illustration from some later writer of the idea that Christianity unites and equalizes in a higher sense those whom outward circumstences have separated. He does not impugn the external evidence. But, not to leave his theory wholly unsupported, he suggests some linguistic objections to Paul's authorship of the letter, which must be pronounced unfounded and frivolous. He finds, for example, certain words in the epistle which are alleged to be not Pauline; but, to justify that assertion, he must deny the genuineness of such other letters of Paul as happen to contain these words. He admits that the apostle could have said σπλάγχνα, but thinks it suspicious that he should say it three times. A few terms he adduces which are not used elsewhere in the epistles; but to argue from these that they disprove the apostolic origin of the epistle is to assume the absurd principle that a writer, after having produced two or three compositions, must for the future confine himself to an unvarying circle of words, whatever may be the subject he discusses, or whatever the interval of time between his different writings. The arbitrary and purely subjective character of such criticisms can have no weight against the varied testimony admitted as decisive by Chriiaan scholars for so many ages, upon which the calnonical authority of the Epistle to Philemon is founded. They are worth repeating only as illustrating Baur's own remark that modern criticism in assailing this particular book runs a greater risk of exposing itself to the imputation of an excessive distrust, a morbid sensibility to doubt and denial, than in questioning the claims of any other epistle ascribed to Paul. SEE PAUL.

II. Person Addressed. — The epistle is inscribed to Philemon; and with him are joined Apphia (probably his wife), Archippus (his son or brother), and the Church which is in their house, though throughout the epistle it is Philemon alone who is addressed. Philemon was a personal friend and apparently a convert of the apostle (Phm 1:13; Phm 1:19); one who had exerted himself for the cause of the Gospel and the comfort of those who had embraced it (Phm 1:2-7). His residence was probably at Colossae (comp.  Col 4:9; Col 4:17); but whether he held any office in the Church there remains uncertain. In the Apostolical Constitutions (7:46) he is said to have been ordained bishop of the Church, but this is not sustained by any other testimony, and is expressly denied by the author of the commentary on St. Paul's epistles ascribed to Hilary. SEE PHILEMON

Wieseler is of opinion that Philemon was a Laodicean; and that this epistle is that mentioned (Col 4:16) as sent by the apostle to the Church in Laodicea. His ground for this is that the epistle is addressed to Archippus as well as Philemon, and he assumes that Archippus was bishop of the Church at Laodicea; partly on the authority of Theodoret, who says he resided at Laodicea; partly on that of the Apostolical Constitutions (7:46), which say he was bishop of the Church there; and partly on the connection in which the reference to him in Col 4:17 stands with the reference to the Church at Laodicea, and the injunction given to the Colossians to convey a message to him concerning fidelity to his office, which it is argued would have been sent to himself had he been at Colossae. But the authorities cited have no weight in a matter of this sort; nor can the mere juxtaposition of the reference to Archippus with the reference to the Church at Laodicea prove anything as to the residence of the former; and as for the injuncton to counsel Archippus, it is more likely that it would oe given by the apostle in a letter to the Church to which he belonged than to another Church. On the other hand, supposing Philemon to have been at Laodicea, it is not credible that the apostle would have requested the Colossians to send to Laodicea for a letter addressed so exclusively to him personally, and relating to matters in which they had no immediate interest, without at least giving Philemon some hint that he intended the letter to be so used. The letter to the Church at Laodicea was doubtless one of more general character and interest than this. SEE LAODICANS, EPISTLE TO

III. Time and Place of Writing. — This is generally held to be one of the letters (the others are Ephesians, Colossians, Philippians, and Hebrews) which the apostle wrote during his first captivity at Rome. The arguments which show that he wrote the Epistle to the Colossians in that city and at that period involve the same conclusion in regard to this; for it is evident from Col 4:7; Col 4:9, as compared with the contents of this epistle, that Paul wrote the two letters at the same time, and forwarded them to their destination by the hands of Tychicus and Onesimus, who accompanied each other to Colossse. A few modern critics, as Schulz,  Schott, Bottger, Meyer, maintain that this letter and the others assigned usually to the first Roman captivity were written during the two years that Paul was imprisoned at Cesarea (Act 23:35; Act 24:27). But this opinion, though supported by some plausible arguments, can be demonstrated with reasonable certainty to be incorrect. SEE COLOSSIANS, EPISTLE TO THE

The time when Paul wrote may be fixed with much precision. The apostle at the close of the letter expresses a hope of his speedy liberation. He speaks in like manner of his approaching deliverance in his Epistle to the Philippians (Php 2:23-24), which was written during the same imprisonment. Presuming, therefore, that he had good reasons for such an expectation, and that he was not disappointed in the result, we mav conclude that this letter was written by him early in the year A.D. 58.

IV. Design and Effect. — Our knowledge respecting the occasion and object of the letter we must derive from declarations or inferences furnished by the letter itself. For the relation of Philemon and Onesinmus to each other, the reader will see the articles on those names. Paul, so intimately connected with the master and the servant, was anxious naturally to effect a reconciliation between them. He wished also (waiving the ἀνῆκον, the matter of duty or right) to give Philemon an opportunity of manifesting his Christian love in the treatment of Onesimus, and his regard, at the same time, for the personal convenience and wishes, not to say official authority, of his spiritual teacher and guide. Paul used his influence with Onesimus (ἀνέπεμψα, in Phm 1:12) to induce him to return to Colossae, and place himself again at the disposal of his master. Whether Onesimus assented merely to the proposal of the apostle, or had a desire at the same time to revisit his former home the epistle does not enable us to determine. On his departure Paul put into his hand this letter as evidence that Onesimus was a true and approved disciple of Christ, and entitled as such to be received, not as a servant, but above a servant, as a brother in the faith, as the representative and equal in that respect of the apostle himself, and worthy of the same consideration and love. It is instructive to observe how entirely Paul identifies himself with Onesimus, and pleads his cause as if it were his own. He intercedes for him as his own child, promises reparation if he had done any wrong, demands for him not only a remission of all penalties, but the reception of sympathy, affection, Christian brotherhood; and, while he solicits these favors for another,  consents to receive them with the same gratitude and sense of obligation as if they were bestowed on himself. SEE ONESIMUS

The result of the appeal cannot be doubted. It may be assumed from the character of Philemon that the apostle's intercession for Onesimus was not unavailing. There can be no doubt that, agreeably to the express instructions of the letter, the past was forgiven; the master and the servant were reconciled to each other; and if the liberty which Onesimus had asserted in a spirit of independence was not conceded as a boon or right, it was enjoyed at all events under a form of servitude which henceforth was such in name only. So much must be regarded as certain; or it follows that the apostle was mistaken in his opinion of Philemon's character, and his efforts for the welfare of Onesimus were frustrated. Chrysostom declares, in his impassioned style, that Philemon must have been less than a man, must have been alike destitute of sensibility and reason (ποῖος λίθος, ποῖον θήριον), not to be moved by the arguments and spirit of such a letter to fulfil every wish and intimation of the apostle. Surely no fitting response to his pleadings for Onesimus could involve less than a cessation of everything oppressive and harsh in his civil conditioun, as far as it depended on Philemon to mitigate or neutralize the evils of a legalized system of bondage, as well as a cessation of everything violative of his rights as a Christian. How much farther than this an impartial explanation of the epistle obliges us or authorizes us to go has not yet been settled by any very general consent of interpreters. Many of the best critics construe certain expressionms (τὸ ἀγαθόν in Phm 1:14, and ὑπὲρ ὃ λέγω in Phm 1:21) as conveying a distinct expectation on the part of Palll that Philemon would liberate Onesimus. Nearly all agree that he could hardly have failed to confer on him that favor, even if it was not requested in so many words, after such an appeal to his sentiments of humanity and justice. Thus it was, as Dr. Wordswomrth remarks (St. Paul's Epistles, page 328), "by Christianizing the master that the Gospel enfranchised the slave. It did not legislate about mere names and forms, but it went to the root of the evil, it spoke to the heart of man. When the heart of the master was filled with divine grace, and was warmed with the love of Christ, the rest would soon follow. The lips would speak kind words, the hands would do liberal things. Every Onesimus would be treated by every Philemon as a beloved brother in Christ." SEE SLAVERY

V. Contents. — The epistle commences with the apostle's usual salutation to those to whom he wrote; after which he affectionately alludes to the  good reputation which Philemon, as a Christian, enjoyed, and to the joy which the knowledge of this afforded him (Phm 1:1-7). He then gently and gracefully introduces the main subject of his epistle by a reference to the spiritual obligations under which Philemon lay to him, and on the ground of which he might utter as a command what he preferred urging as a request. Onesimus is then introduced; the change of mind and character he had experienced is stated; his offence in deserting his master is not palliated; his increased worth and usefulness are dwelt upon, and his former master is entreated to receive him back, not only without severity, but with the feeling due from one Christian to another (Phm 1:8-16). The apostle then delicately refers to the matter of compensation for any loss which Philemon might have sustained, either through the dishonesty of Onesimus or simply through the want of his service; and though he reminds his friend that he might justly hold the latter his debtor for a much larger amount (seeing he owed to the apostle his own self), he pledges himself, under his own hand, to make good that loss (Phm 1:17-19). The epistle concludes with some additional expressions of friendly solicitude; a request that Philemon would prepare the apostle a lodging, as he trusted soon to visit him; and the salutations of the apostle and some of the Christians by whom he was surrounded at the time (Phm 1:20-25).

VI. Character. — The Epistle to Philemon has one peculiar feature — its aesthetical character it may be termed — which distinguishes it from all the other epistles, and demands a special notice at our hands. It has been deservedly admired as a model of delicacy and skill in the department of composition to which it belongs. The writer had peculiar difficulties to overcome. He was the common friend of the parties at variance. He must conciliate a man who supposed that he had good reason to be offended. He must commend the offender, and yet neither deny nor aggravate the imputed fault. He must assert the new ideas of Christian.equality in the face of a system which hardly recognised the humanity of the enslaved. He could have placed the question on the ground of his own personal rights, and yet must waive them in order to secure an act of spontaneous kindness. His success must be a triumph of love, and nothing be demanded for the sake of the justice which could have claimed everything. He limits his request to a forgiveness of the alleged wrong, and a restoration to favor and the enjoyment of future sympathy and affection, and yet would so guard his words as to leave scope for all the generosity which benevolence might prompt towards one whose condition admitted of so much  alleviation. These are contrarieties not easy to harmonize; but Paul, it is confessed, has shown a degree of self-denial and a tact in dealing with them which, in being equal to the occasion, could hardly be greater. This letter, says Eichhorn, is a voucher for the apostle's urbanity, politeness, and knowledge of the world. His advocacy of Onesimus is of the most insinuating and persuasive character, and yet without the slightest perversion or concealment of any fact. The errors of Onesimus are admitted, as was necessary, lest the just indignation of his master against him should be roused anew; but they are alluded to in the most admirable manner: the good side of Onesimus is brought to view, but in such a way as to facilitate the friendly reception of him by his master, as a consequence of Christianity, to which he had, during his absence, been converted; and his future fidelity is vouched for by the noble principles of Christianity to which he had been converted. The apostle addresses Philemon on the softest side: who would wilfully refuse to an aged, a suffering, and an unjustly imprisoned friend a request? And such was he who thus pleaded for Onesimus. The person recommended is a Christian, a dear friend of the apostle's, and one who had personally served him: if Philemon will receive him kindly, it will afford the apostle a proof of his love, and yield him joy. What need, then, for long urgency? The apostle is certain that Philemon will, of his own accord, do even more than he is asked. More cogently and more courteously no man could plead (Einleit. ins N.T. 3:300).

There is a letter extant of the younger Pliny (Epist. 9:21) which he wrote to a friend whose servant had deserted him, in which he intercedes for the fugitive, who was anxious to return to his master, but dreaded the effects of his anger. Thus the occasion of the correspondence was similar to that between the apostle and Philemon. It has occurred to scholars to compare this celebrated letter with that of Paul in behalf of Onesimus; and as the result they hesitate not to say that, not only in the spirit of Christian love, of which Pliny was ignorant, but in dignity of thought, argument, pathos, beauty of style, eloquence, the communication of the apostle is vastly superior to that of the polished Roman writer.

VII. Commentaries. — The following are the special exegetical helps on this epistle: Jerome, Conmmentarii (in Opp. 7:741); also Pseudo-Hicron. id. (ibid. 11); Chrysostom, Homiliae (in Opp. 11:838; also ed. Raphelius, in the latter's Annotationes, 2); Alcuin, Explanatio (in Opp. I, 2); Calvin, Commentarius (in Opp.; also in English, by Pringle, in the latter's Comment. on Tim. and by Edwards, in the Bib. Repos. 1836) ; Brentz,  Commentarii (in Opp. 7); Pamelius, Commentlriolus (Rabani Mauri, Opp. 5); Major, Enarratio (Vitemb. 1565, 8vo); Danatus, Commentarius (Genev. 1579, 8vo); Hyperius, Commentarius [includ. Timothy and Titus] (Tigur. 1582, fol.); Feuardant (R.C.), Commentarius (Paris, 1588, 8vo); Rollock, Commentarius (Genev. 1602, 8vo)); Attersoll, Commentary (Lond. 1612, 1633, fol.); Gentilis, Commentarius (Norib. 1618, 4to); Dyke, Exposition (Lond. 1618, 4to; also in Dutch, in his Wercke, Amst. 1670, page 793); Rapine (R.C.), Exposition [French] (Par. 1632, 8vo); Jones, Commentary [includ. Heb.] (Lold. 1635, fol.); Himmel, Commnentarius (Jen. 1641, 4to); Vincent (l.c.), Explicatio (Par. 1647, 8vo); Crucius, Verklaaring (Harlem, 1649, 8vo); Habert (R.C.), Expositio [includ. Timothy and Titus] (Par. 1656, 8vo); Franckenstein, Observationes (Hal. 1657, 4to; Lips. 1665, 12mo); Taylor, Commentarius (Lond. 1659, fol.); Hummel, Explanatio (Tigur. 1670, fol.); Fecht, Expositio (Rost. 1696. 4to); Schmid, Paraphrasis (Hamb. 1704, 4to, and later); Smalridge, Sermon (in Sermons, Oxf. 1724, fol.); Lavater, Predigt. (St. Gall, 1785 sq., 2 volumes, 8vo); Klotzsch, De occasione, etc. (Viteb. 1792, 4to); Niemeyer, Program. (Hal. 1802, 4to); Wildschut, De dictione, etc. (Tr. ad Rh. 1809, 8vo); Buckminster, Sermon (in Sermons, Bost. 1815); Hagenbach, Interpretatio (Basil. 1829, 4to); Parry, Exposition (Lond. 1834, 12mo); Rothe, Interpretatio (Brem. 1844, 8vo); Koch, Commentar (Zur. 1846, 8vo); Kuhne, Auslegung (Leips. 1856, 8vo) ; Ellicott, Commentary (Lond. 1857, 8vo); Hackett, Revised Translation (Amer. Bible Union, 1860, 12mo); Bleek, Vorlesungen [includ. Ephesians and Colossians] (Berl. 1865, 8vo); Lightfoot, Notes [includ. Colossians] (Loud. 1875, 8vo). SEE EPISTLE

## Philetus[[@Headword:Philetus]]

             (Φίλητος, beloved), an apostate Christian, possibly a disciple of Hymenaeus, with whom he is associated in 2Ti 2:17, and who is named without him in an earlier epistle (1Ti 1:20). A.D. 58-64. Waterland (Importance ofthe Doctrine of the Holy Trinity, chapter 4, in his Works, 3:459) condenses in a few lines the substance of many dissertations which have been written concerning their opinions, and the sentence which was inflicted upon at least one of them. "They appear to have been persons who believed the Scriptures of the O.T., but misinterpreted them, allegorizing away the doctrine of the resurrection, and resolving it all into figure and metaphor. The delivering over unto Satan seems to have been a form of excommunication declaring the person reduced to the state of a  heathen; and in the apostolical age it was accompanied with supernatural or miraculous effects upon the bodies of the persons so delivered." Walch is of opinion that they were of Jewish origin; Hammond counnects them with the Gnostics; Vitringa (with less probability) with the Sadducees. They understood the resurrection to signify the knowledge and profession of the Christian religion, or regeneration and conversion, according to Walch, whose dissertation, De Hymenaeo et Phileto, in his Miscellanuea Sacra, 1744, pages 81-121, seems to exhaust the subject. Among writers who preceded him may be named Vitringa, Observ. Sacr. 4:9, pages 922-930; Buddoeus, Ecclesia Apostolica, 5:297-305. See also, on the heresy, Burton, Bampton Lectures, and dean Ellicott's notes on the pastoral epistles; and Potter on Church Government, chapter 5, with reference to the sentence. The names of Philetus and Hymenaeus occur separately among those of Caesar's household whose relics have been found in the Columbaria at Rome. SEE HYMENAEUS

## Philip[[@Headword:Philip]]

             (Φίλιππος, lover of horses), the name of several men mentioned in the Apocrvpha and Josephus. Those named in the N.T. will be noticed separately below.

1. The father of Alexander the Great (1Ma 1:1; 1Ma 6:2), king of Macedonia, B.C. 359-336. SEE ALEXANDEIT (the Great).

2. A Phrygian, left by Antiochus Epiphanes as governor at Jerusalem (B.C. cir. 170), where he behaved with great cruelty (2Ma 5:22), burning the fugitive Jews in caves (6:11), and taking the earliest measures to check the growing power of Judas Maccabaeus (8:8). He is commonly (but it would seem incorrectly) identified with,

3. The foster-brother (σύντροφος, 9:29) of Antiochus Epiphanes, whom the king upon his death-bed appointed regent of Syria and guardian of his son Antidchus V, to the exclusion of Lysias (B.C. 164; 1Ma 6:14-15; 1Ma 6:55). He returned with the royal forces from Persia (vi, 56) to assume the government, and occupied Antioch. But Lysias, who was at the time besieging "the Sanctuary" at Jerusalem, hastily made terms with Judas, and marched against him. Lysias stormed Antioch, and, according to Josephus (Ant. 12:9, 7), put Philip to death. In 2 Macc. Philip is said to have fled to Ptol. Philometor on the death of Antiochus (2Ma 9:29), though the  book contains traces of the other account (13:23). SEE ANTRIOCHUS (Epiphanes).

4. Philip V, king of Macedonia, B.C. 220-179. His wide and successful endeavors to strengthen and enlarge the Macedonian dominion brought him into conflict with the Romans when they were engaged in the critical war with Carthage. Desultory warfare followed by hollow peace lasted till the victory of Zama left the Romans free for more vigorous measures. Meanwhile Philip had consolidated his power, though he had degenerated into an unscrupulous tyrant. The first campaigns of the Romans on the declaration of war (B.C. 200) were not attended by any decisive result, but the arrival of Flamininus (B.C. 198) changed the aspect of affairs. Philip was driven from his commanding position, and made unsuccessful overtures for peace. In the next year he lost the fatal battle of Cynoscephalae, and was obliged to accede to the terms dictated by his conquerors. The remainder of his life was spent in vain endeavors to regain something of his former power, and was imbittered by cruelty and remorse. In 1Ma 8:5 the defeat of Philip is coupled with that of Perseius as one of the noblest triumphs of the Romans.

## Philip (2)[[@Headword:Philip (2)]]

             (M. JULIUS PHILIPPUS), emperor of Rome, a native of Bostra, in Trachonitis, according to some authorities, after serving with distinction in the Roman armies, was promoted by the later Gordian to the command of the imperial guards after the death of Misitheus, A.D. 243. In the following year he accompanied Gordian in his expedition into Persia, where he contrived to excite a mutiny among the soldiers by complaining that the emperor was too young to lead an army in such a difficult undertaking. The mutineers obliged Gordian to acknowledge Philip as his colleague; and in a short time Philip, wishing to reign alone, caused Gordian to be murdered. In a letter to the senate he ascribed the death of Gordian to illness, and the senate acknowledged him as emperor. Having made peace with the Persians, he led the army back into Syria, and arrived at Antioch for the Easter solemnities. Eusebius, who with other Christian writers maintains that Philip was a Christian, states as a report that he went with his wife to attend the Christian worship at Antioch, but that Babila, bishop of that city,  refused to permit him to enter the church, as being guilty of murder, upon which Philip acknowledged his guilt, and placed himself in the ranks of the penitents. This circumstance is also stated by John Chrysostom. From Antioch Philip came to Rome, and the following year, 245, assumed the consulship with T.F. Titianus, and marched against the Carpi, who had invaded Moesia, and defeated them. In 247 Philip was again con. sul, with his son of the same name as himself, and their consulship was continued to the following year, when Philip celebrated with great splendor the thousandth anniversary of the building of Rome. An immense number of wild beasts were brought forth and slaughtered in the amphitheatre and circus. In the next year, under the consulship of Emilianus and Aquilinus, a revolt broke out among the legions on the Danube, who proclaimed emperor a centurion named Carvilius Marinus, whom, however, the soldiers killed shortly after. Philip, alarmed at the state of these provinces, sent thither Decius as commander, but Decius had no sooner arrived at his post than the soldiers proclaimed him emperor. Philip marched against Decius, leaving his son at Rome. The two armies met near Verona, where Philip was defeated and killed, as some say by his own troops. On the news reaching Rome, the praetorians killed his son also, and Decius was acknowledged emperor in 249. Eutropius states that both Philips, father and son, were numbered among the gods. It is doubtful whether Philip was really a Christian, but it seems certain, as stated by Eusebius and Dionysius of Alexandria, that under his reign the Christians enjoyed full toleration, and were allowed to preach publicly. Gregory of'Nyssa states that during that period all the inhabitants of Neo-Caesarea,in Pontus, embraced Christianity, overthrew the idols, and raised temples to the God of the Christians. It appears that Philip during his five years' reign governed with mildness and justice, and was generally popular.

## Philip (3)[[@Headword:Philip (3)]]

             a Scotch prelate, was in the see of Brechin in 1351. See Keith, Scottish Bishops, page 162.

## Philip (St.) Benozzi (San Filippo Beniti, or Benizzi)[[@Headword:Philip (St.) Benozzi (San Filippo Beniti, or Benizzi)]]

             stands at the head of the Order of the Servi, or Serviti. at Florence. He was not the founder of the order, having joined it fifteen years after its establishment, but he is their principal saint. SEE SERVITI.

## Philip (St.) Of Neri[[@Headword:Philip (St.) Of Neri]]

             SEE NERI, FILIPPO

## Philip Herod[[@Headword:Philip Herod]]

             (Φίλιππος ῾Ηηρώδης), a son of Herod the Great by Mariamune, the daughter of Simon the high-priest. He was the first husband of Herodias, who was taken from him by his brother Herod Antipas (Mat 14:3; Mar 6:17; Luk 3:19). A.D. ante 25. Having been disinherited by his father, Philip appears to have lived a private life. He is called Herod by Josephus (Ant. 17:1, 2; 4, 2; 18:5. 1; War, 1:28, 4; 30, 7). SEE HEROD.

## Philip Of Caesarea[[@Headword:Philip Of Caesarea]]

             is a pseudo-name of one Theophilus of Ciesarea, who flourished in the second half of the 2d century, and kept the account of the council held in the city after which he is named in A.D. 196. SEE THEOPHILUS.

## Philip Of Gortyna[[@Headword:Philip Of Gortyna]]

             a Christian writer of the 2d century, flourished as bishop of the Church at Gortyna, in Crete, and was spoken of in the highest terms by Dionysius of Corinth in a letter to the Church at Gortyna and the other churches in Crete (apud Euseb. Hist. Eccles. 4:23), as having inspired his flock with manly courage, apparently during the persecutions of Marcus Aurelius. Philip wrote a book against Marcion (q.v.), which was highly esteemed by the ancients, but is now lost; Trithemilus speaks of it as extant in his day, but  his exactness as to whether books were in existence or not is not great. He also states that Philip wrote Ad Diversos Epistolce and Varii Tractatus, but these are not mentioned by the ancients. See Eusebius, Hist. Eccles. 4:21, 23, 25; Jerome, De tiris Illustr. c. 30; Trithemius, De Scriptor. Eccles. c. 19; Cave, Hist. Litt. ad ann. 172 (ed. Oxford, 1740-1743), 1:74; Lardner, Works (see Index). — Smith, Dict. of Gr. and Rom. Biog. s.v.

## Philip Of Moscow[[@Headword:Philip Of Moscow]]

             a Russian prelate of much distinction, flourished in the second half of the 16th century. Of his early history we know scarcely anything. He held several of the most important ecclesiastical trusts of Russia to the satisfaction of both clergy and government, and was finally. during the reign of Ivan the Terrible, made primate of the Russo-Greek Church. Philip soon came into collision with his roval master because of the personal cruelties in which the czar indulged, and for his honesty of purpose and frankness of declaration, Philip suffered martyrdom. "It is a true glory of the Russian Church, and an example to the hierarchy of all churches, that its one martyred prelate should have suffered, not for any high ecclesiastical pretensions, but in the simple cause of justice and mercy. 'Silence,' he said, as he rebuked the czar, 'lays sin upon the soul, and brings death to the whole people. . . . I am a stranger and a pilgrim upon earth, as all my fathers were, and I am ready to suffer for the truth. Where would my faith be if I kept silence? . . . Here we are offering up the bloodless sacrifice to the Lord; while behind the altar flows the ifinocent blood of Christian men.' As he was dragged away from the cathedral, his one word was 'Pray.' As he received his executioner in the narrow cell of his prison in the convent of Luer, he only said, 'Perform thy mission.'" See Stanley, Hist. of the Eastern Church, page 437. (J.H.W.)

## Philip Of Opus[[@Headword:Philip Of Opus]]

             Suidas (s.v. Φιλόσοφος) has this remarkable passage: “——, a philosopher who divided the Leges (s. De Legibus) of Plato into twelve books (for he is said to have added the thirteenth himself), and was a hearer of Socrates and of Plato himself; devoting himself to the contemplation of the heavens (σχολάσας τοῖς μετεώροις '). He lived in  the days of Philip of Macedon." Suidas then gives a long list of works written by Philip. It is evident that the passage as it stands in Suidas is imperfect, and that the name of the author of the numerous works which he mentions has been lost from the commencement of the passage. It appears, however, from the extract occupying its proper place in the Lexicon according to its present heading, that the defect existed in the source from which Suidas borrowed. Kuster, the editor of Suidas (not. in loc.), after long investigation, was enabled to supply the omission by comparing a passage in Diogenes Laertius (3:37), and to identify “the philosopher" of Suidas with Philip of the Locrian town of Opus, near the channel which separates Euboea from the mainland. The passage in Laertius is as follows: "Some say that Philip the Opuntian transcribed his (Plato's) work, De Legibus, which was written in wax (i.e., on wooden tablets covered with a coat of wax). They say also that the Ε᾿πινόμις (the thirteenth book of the De Legibus) is his," i.e., Philip's. The Epinomiis, whether written by Philip or by Plato, is usually included among the works of the latter. Diogenes Laertius elsewhere (3:46) enumerates Philip among the disciplesof Plato. See Fabricius, Bibl. Graec. 3:104.

## Philip Of Side[[@Headword:Philip Of Side]]

             (ὁ Σιδίτης or ὁ σιδέτης , or ὁ ἀπο Σίδης), a Christian writer of the first half of the 5th century, was born probably in the latter part df the 4th century. He was a native of Side, in Pamphylia, and according to his own account in the fragment published by Dodwell (see below), when Rhodon. who succeeded Didymus in charge of the catecheticai school of Alexandria, transferred that school to Side, Philip became one of his pupils. If we suppose Didymuns to have retained the charge of the school till his death, A.D). 396, at the advanced age of eighty-six, the removal of the school cannot have taken place long before the close of the century, and we may infer that Philip's birth could scarcely have been earlier than A.D. 380. He was a kinsman of Troilus of Side, the rhetorician, who was tutor to Socrates the ecclesiastical historian, and was indeed so eminent that Philip regarded his relationship to him as a subject of exultation (Socrates, Hist. Ecc 7:27). Having entered the Church, he was ordained deacon, and had much intercourse with Chrysostom; in the titles of some MSS. he is styled his Syncellus, or personal attendant, which makes it probable that he was, from the early part of his ecclesiastical career, connected with the Church at Constantinople. Liberatus (Breviar. c. 7) says he was ordained deacon by Chrysostom; but Socrates, when speaking of his intimacy with that eminent man, does not say he was ordained by him. Philip devoted himself to literary pursuits, and collected a large library. He cultivated the Asiatic or diffuse style of composition, and became a voluminous writer. At what period of his life his different works were produced is not known. His Ecclesiastical History was, as we shall see, written after his disappointment in obtaining the patriarchate; but as his being a candidate for that high office seems to imply some previous celebrity, it may be inferred that his work or works in reply to the emperor Julian's attacks on Christianity were written at an earlier period. On the death of Atticus, patriarch of Constantinople, A.D. 425, Philip, then a presbyter, apparently of the great Church of Constantinople, and Proelus, another presbyter, were proposed, each by his own partisans, as candidates for the vacant see; but the whole people were bent upon the election of Sisinnius, also a presbyter, though not of Constantinople, but of a Church in Elaea one of the suburbs (Socrates, Hist. Ecc 7:26). The statement of Socrates as to the unanimity of the popular wish leads to the inference that the supporters  of Philip and Proclus were among the clergy. Sisinnius was the successful candidate; and Philip, mortified at his defeat, made in his Ecclesiastical History such severe strictures on the election of his more fortunate rival that Socrates could not venture to transcribe his remarks; and has expressed his strong disapproval of his headstrong temper. On the death of Sisinnius (A.D. 428) the supporters of Philip were again desirous of his appointment, but the emperor, to prevent disturbances, determined that no ecclesiastic of Constantinople should succeed to the vacancy; and the ill- fated heresiarch Nestorius, from Antioch, was consequently chosen. After the deposition of Nestorius at the Council of Ephesus (A.D. 431), Philip was a third time candidate for the patriarchate, but was again unsuccessful. Nothing is known of him after this. It has been conjectured that he was dead before the next vacancy in the patriarchate, A.D. 434, when his old competitor Proclus was chosen. Certainly there is no notice that Philip was again a candidate; but the prompt decision of the emperor Theodosius in Proclus's favor prevented all competition, so that no inference can be drawn from Philip's quiescence.

Philip wrote, Multa volumina contra Imperatorem Julianum Apostata (Liberatus. Breviar. c. 7; comp. Socrat. H.E. 7:27). It is not clear from the expression of Liberatus, which we have given as the title, whether Philip wrote many works, or, as is more likely, one work in many parts, in reply to Julian: — ῾Ιστορία Χριστιανική, Historia Christianae. The work was very large, consisting of thirty-six Βίβλοι or Βιβλία, Libri, each subdivided into twenty-four τόμοι or λόγοι, i.e., sections. This voluminous work seems to have comprehended both sacred and ecclesiastical history, beginning from the creation, and coming down to Philip's own day, as appears by his record of the election of Sisinnius, already noticed. It appears to have been finished not very long after that event. Theophanes places its completion in A.M. 5922, Alex. aera =A.D. 430; which, according to him, was the year before the death of Sisinnius. That the work was completed before the death of Sisinnius is probable from the apparent silence of Philip as to his subsequent disappointments in obtaining the patriarchate; but as Sisinnius, accortding to a more exact chronology, died A.D. 428, we may conclude that the work was finished in or before that year, and, consequently, that the date assigned by Theophanes is rather too late. The style was verbose and wearisome, neither polished nor agreeable; and the matter such as to display ostentatiously the knowledge of the writer rather than to conduce to the  improvement of the reader. It was in fact, crammed with matter of every kind, relevant and irrelevant questions of geometry, astronomy, arithmetic, and music; descriptions of islands, mountains, and trees, rendered it cumbersome and unreadable. Chronological arrangement was disregarded. The work is lost, with the exception of three fragments. One of these, De Scholae Catecheticae Alexandrines Successione, on the succession of teachers in the catechetical school of Alexandria, was published from a MS. in the Bodleian Library at Oxford, by Dodwell, with his Dissertationes in Irenaeun (Oxf. 1689, 8vo), and has been repeatedly reprinted. It is given in the ninth volume of the Bibliotheca Patrum of Galland, page 401. Another fragment in the same MS., De Constantino Maximiano, et Licinio Augustis, was prepared for lpublication by Crusius, but has never, we believe, been actually published. The third fragment, τὰ γενόμενα ἐν Περσίδι μεταξὺ Χριστιανῶν ῾Ελλήρων τε καὶ Ι᾿ουδαίων, Act Disputationis de Christo, in Perside, inter Christianos, Gentiles, et Judceos habitse, is (or was) in the Imperial Library at Vienna. Philip was present at the disputation. See Socrates, H.E. 7:26, 27, 29, 35; Liberatus, l.c.; Phot. Bibl. cod. 35; Theophan. Chronog. page 75, ed. Paris; page 60, ed. Venice; 1:135, ed. Bonn; Tillemont, Hist. des Empereurs, 6:130; Cave, Hist. Litt. ad ann. 418, 1:395; Oudin, De Scriptoribus Eccles. volume 1, col. 997; Fabricius, Bibl. Graec. 6:739, 747, 749; 7:418; 10:691; Galland, Biblioth. Patrum, volume 9, Pol. c. 11; Lambecius, Commentar. de Biblioth. Caesaraea, lib. s. volume 5, col. 289; volume 6, pars 2, col. 406, ed, Kollar.

## Philip Of The (Most Holy) Trinity[[@Headword:Philip Of The (Most Holy) Trinity]]

             a famous missionary to Persia land the Indies, was born at Avignon in 1603, and died in 1671.

## Philip The Apostle[[@Headword:Philip The Apostle]]

             (Φίλιππος ὁ ἀποστολος), one of the twelve originally appointed by Jesus. SEE APOSTLE

1. Authentic History. — The Gospels contain comparatively scanty notices of this disciple. A.D. 25-28. He is mentioned as being of Bethsaida, the city of Andrew and Peter (Joh 1:44), and apparently was among the Galilaean peasants of that district who flocked to hear the preaching of the Baptist. The manner in which John speaks of him, the repetition by him of the selfsame words with which Andrew had brought to Peter the good  news that the Christ had at last appeared, all indicate a previous friendship with the sons of Jonah and of Zebedee, and a consequent participation in their Messianic hopes. The close union of the two in John vi and xii suggests that he may hlave owed to Andrew the first tidings that the hope had been fulfilled. The statement that Jesus found him (Joh 1:43) implies a previous seeking. To him first in the whole circle of the disciples were spoken the words so full of meaning, "Follow me" (ibid.). Philip was thus the fourth of the apostles who attached themselves to the person of Jesus — of those who "left all and followed him." As soon as he has learned to know his Master, he is eager to communicate his discovery to another who had also shared the same expectations. He speaks to Nathanael, probably on his arrival in Cana (see Joh 21:2; comp. Ewald, Gesch. 5:251), as if they had not seldom communed together of the intimations of a better time, of a divine kingdom, which they found in their sacred books. We may well believe that he, like his friend, was an "Israelite indeed in whom there was no guile." In the lists of the twelve apostles in the synoptic Gospels, his name is as uniformly at the head of the second group of four as the name of Peter is at that of the first (Mat 10:3; Mar 3:18; Luk 6:14); and the facts recorded by John give the reason of this priority. In those lists again we find his name uniformly coupled with that of Bartholomew, and this has led to the hypothesis that the latter is identical with the Nathanael of Joh 1:45, the one being the personal name, the other, like Barjonah or Bartimaeus, a patronymic. Donaldson (Jashmar, page 9) looks on the two as brothers, but the precise mention of τὸν ἴδιον ἄδελφον) in Joh 5:41, and its omission here, is, as Alford remarks (on Mat 10:3), against this hypothesis.

Philip apparently was among the first company of disciples who were with the Lord at the commencement of his ministry, at the marriage of Cana, on his first appearance as a prophet in Jerusalem (John 2). When John was cast into prison, and the work of declaring the glad tidings of the kingdom required a new company of preachers, we may believe that he, like his companions and friends, received a new call to a more constant discipleship (Mat 4:18-22). When the Twelve were specially set apart to their office, he was numbered among them. The first three Gospels tell us nothing more of him individually. John, with his characteristic fulness of personal reminiscences, records a few significant utterances. The earnest, simple-hearted faith which showed itself in his first conversion, required, it would seem, an education; one stage of this may be traced, according to  Clement of Alexandria (Strom. 3:25), in the history of Mat 8:21. That Church father assumes that Philip was the disciple who urged the plea, "Suffer me first to go and bury my father," and who was reminded of a higher duty by the command, "Let the dead bury their. dead; follow thou me." When the Galilaean crowds had halted on their way to Jerusalem to hear the preaching of Jesus (Joh 6:5-9), and were faint with hunger, it was to Philip that the question was put, "Whence shall we buy bread that these may eat?" "And this he said," John adds, "to prove him, for he himself knew what he would do." The answer, "Two hundred pennyworth of bread is not sufficient for them that every one may take a little," shows how little he was prepared for the work of divine power that followed. It is noticeable that here, as in John 1, he appears in close connection with Andrew. Bengel and others suppose that this was because the charge of providing food had been committed to Philip, while Chrysostom and Theodore of Mopsuestia rather suppose it was because this apostle was weak in faith.

Another incident is brought before us in Joh 12:20-22. Among the pilgrims who had come to keep the Passover at Jerusalem were some Gentile proselytes (Hellenes) who had heard of Jesus, and desired to see him. The Greek name of Philip may have attracted them. The zealous love which he had shown in the case of Nathanael may have. made him prompt to offer himself as their guide. But it is characteristic of him that he does not take them at once to the presence of his Master. "Philip cometh and telleth Andrew, and again Andrew and Philip tell Jesus." The friend and fellow-townsman to whom probably he owed his own introduction to Jesus of Nazareth is to introduce these strangers also.

There is a connection not difficult to be traced between this fact and that which follows on the last recurrence of Philip's name in the history of the Gospels. The desire to see Jesus gave occasion to the utterance of words in which the Lord spoke more distinctly than ever of the presence of his Father with him, in the voice from heaven which manifested the Father's will (Php 1:28). The words appear to have sunk into the heart of at least one of the disciples, and he brooded over them. The strong cravings of a passionate but unenlightened faith led him to feel that one thing was vet wanting. They heard their Lord speak of his Father and their Father. He was going to his Father's house. They were to follow him there. But why should they not have even now a vision of the divine glory? It was part of the childlike simplicity of his nature that no reserve should hinder the  expression of the craving, "Lord, show us the Father, and it sufficeth us" (Joh 14:8). And the answer to that desire belonged also specially to him. He had all along been eager to lead others to see Jesus. He had been with him, looking on him from the very commencement of his ministry, and yet he had not known him. He had thought of the glory of the Father as consisting in something else than the Truth, Righteousness, Love that he had witnessed in the Son. "Have I been so long time with you, and yet hast thou not known me, Philip? He that hath seen me hath seen the Father; and how sayest thou, then, Show us the Father?" (Joh 14:9). No other fact connected with the name of Philip is recorded in the Gospels. The close relation in which we have seen him standing to the sons of Zebedee and Nathanael might lead us to think of him as one of the two unnamed disciples in the list of fishermen on the Sea of Tiberias who meet us in John 21. He is among the company of disciples at Jerusalem after the asdension (Act 1:13) and on the day of Pentecost.

2. Traditionary Notices. — Besides the above all is uncertain and apocryphal. Philip is mentioned by Clement of Alexandria as having had a wife and children, and as having sanctioned the marriage of his daughters instead of binding them to vows of chastity (Strom. 3:52; Euseb. H.E. 3:30); and he is included in the list of those who had borne witness of Christ in their lives, but had not died what was commonly looked on as a martyr's death (Strovm. 4:73). There is nothing improbable in the statement that he preached the Gospel in Phrygia (Theodoret, in Psalms 116; Niceph. H.E. 2:36). Polycrates (in Euseb. H.E. 3:31), bishop of Ephesus, speaks of him as having fallen asleep in the Phrygian Hierapolis, as having had two daughters who had grown old unmarried, and a third, with special gifts of inspiration (ἐν Α῾γίῳ Πνεύματι πολιτευσαμένη), who had died at Ephesus. There seems, however, in this mention of the daughters of Philip, to be some confusion between the apostle and the evangelist. Eusebius in the same chapter quotes a passage from Caius, in which the four daughters of Philip, prophetesses, are mentioned as living with their father at Hierapolis, and as buried there with him, and himself connects this fact with Act 21:8, as if they referred to one and the same person. Polycrates in like manner refers to him in the Easter Controversy, as an authority for the Quartodeciman practice (Euseb. H.E. 5:24). It is noticeable that even Augustine (Serm. 266) speaks with some uncertainty as to the distinctness of the two Philips.  Epiphanius (26:13) mentions a Gospel of Philip as in use among the Gnostics. SEE GOSPELS, SPURIOUS.

The apocryphal "Acta Pilippi" are utterly wild and fantastic, and if there is any grain of truth in them, it is probably the bare fact that the apostle or the evangelist labored in Phrygia, and died at Hierapolis. He arrives in that city with his sister Mariamne and his friend Bartholomew. The wife of the proconsul is converted. The people are drawn away from the worship of a great serpent. The priests and the proconsul seize on the apostles and put them to the torture. John suddenly appears with words of counsel and encouragement. Philip, in spite of the warning of the Apostle of Love reminding him that he should return good for evil, curses the city, and the earth opens and swallows it up. Then his Lord appears and reproves him for his vindictive anger, and those who had descended to the abyss are raised out of it again. The tortures which Philip had suffered end in his death, but, as a punishment for his offence, he is to remain for forty days excluded from Paradise. After his death a vine springs ulp on the spot where his blood had fallen, and the juice of the grapes is used for the Eucharistic cup (Tischendorf, Acta Apocrypha, pages 75-94). The book which contains this narrative is apparently only the last chapter of a larger history, and it fixes the journey and the death as after the eighth year of Trajan. It is uncertain whether the other apocryphal fragment professing to give an account of his labors in Greece is part of the same work, but it is at least equally legendary. He arrives in Athens clothed, like the other apostles, as Christ had commanded, in an outer cloak and a linen tunic. Three hundred philosophers dispute with him. They find themselves baffled, and send for assistance to Ananias, the high-priest at Jerusalem. He puts on his pontifical robes, and goes to Athens at the head of five hundred warriors. They attempt to seize on the apostle, and are all smitten with blindness. The heavens open; the form of the Son of Man appears, and all the idols of Athens fall to the ground; and so on through a succession of marvels, ending with his remaining two years in the city, establishing a Church there, and then going to preach the Gospel in Parthia (ibid. pages 95-104).

Another tradition represents Scythia as the scene of his labors (Abdias, list. Apost. in Fabricius, Cod. Apoc. N.T. 1:739), and throws the guilt of his death upon the Ebionites (Acta Sanctortum, May 1).

In pictorial art Philip is represented as a man of middle age, scanty beard, and benevolent face. His attribute is a cross which varies in form — sometimes a small cross in his hand; again, a high cross in the form of a T,  or a staff with a small cross at the top. It has three significations: it may represent the power of the cross which he held before the dragon; or his martyrdom; or his mission as preacher of the cross of Christ. He is the patron-saint of Brabant and Luxembourg. His anniversary is May 1.

## Philip The Evangelist[[@Headword:Philip The Evangelist]]

             (Φίλιππος ὁ εὐαγγελιστής), one of the original seven deacons in the Christian Church. A.D. 29. The first mention of this name occurs in the account of the dispute between the Hebrew and Hellenistic disciples in Acts vi. He was one of the seven appointed to superintend the daily distribution of food and alms, and so to remove all suspicion of partiality. The fact that all the seven names are Greek, makes it at least very probable that they were chosen as belonging to the Hellenistic section of the Church, representatives of the class which had appeared before the apostles in the attitude of complaint. The name of Philip stands next to that of Stephen ; and this, together with the fact that these are the only two names (unless Nicolas be an exception; comp. NICOLAS) of which we hear again, tends to the conclusion that he was among the most prominent of those so chosen. He was, at ally rate, well reported of as "full of the Holy Ghost, and wisdom," and had so won the affections of the great body of believers as to be among the objects of their free election, possibly (assuming the votes of the congregation to have been taken for the different candidates) gaining all but the highest number of suffrages. Whether the office to which he was thus appointed gave him the position and the title of a deacon of the Church, or was special and extraordinary in its character, must remain uncertain (Goulburn, Acts of the Deacon, Lond. 1866). SEE DEACON.

The after-history of Philip warrants the belief, in any case, that his office was not simply that of the later Diaconate. It is no great presumption to think of him as contributing hardly less than Stephen to the great increase of disciples which followed on this fresh organization, as sharing in that wider, more expansive teaching which shows itself for the first time in the oration of the protomartyr, and in which he was the forerunner of Paul. We should expect the man who had been his companion and fellow-worker to go on with the work which he had left unfinished, and to break through the barriers of a simply national Judaism. So accordingly we find him in the next stage of his history. The persecution of which Saul was the leader must have stopped the "daily ministrations" of the Church. The teachers who had been most prominent were compelled to take to flight, and Philip  was among them. The cessation of one form of activity, however, only threw him forward into another. It is noticeable that the city of Samaria is the first scene of his activity (Acts 8). He is the precursor of Paul in his work, as Stephen had been in his teaching. It falls to his lot, rather than to that of an apostle, to take that first step in the victory over Jewish prejudice and the expansion of the Church, according to its Lord's command. As a preparation for that work there may have been the Messianic hopes which were cherished by the Samaritans no less than by the Jews (Joh 4:25), the recollection of the two days which had witnessed the presence there of Christ and his disciples (Joh 4:40), even perhaps the craving for spiritual powers which had been roused by the strange influence of Simon the Sorcerer. The scene which brings the two into contact with each other, in which the magician has to acknowledge a power over nature greater than his own, is interesting rather as belonging to the life of the heresiarch than to that of the evangelist. SEE SIMON MAGUS. It suggests the inquiry whether we can trace through the distortions and perversions of the "hero of the romance of heresy," the influence of that phase of Christian truth which was likely to be presented by the preaching of the Hellenistic evangelist.

This step is followed by another. He is directed by an angel of the Lord to take the road that led down from Jerusalem to Gaza on the way to Egypt. SEE GAZA. A chariot passes by in which there is a man of another race, whose complexion or whose dress showed him to be a native of Ethiopia. From the time of Psammetichus there had been a large body of Jews settled in that region, and the eunuch or chamberlain at the court of Candace might easily have come across them and their sacred books, might have embraced their faith, and become by circumcision a proselyte of righteousness. He had been on a pilgrimage to Jerusalem. He may have heard there of the new sect. The history that follows is interesting as one of the few records in the N.T. of the process of individual conversion, and orie which we may believe Luke obtained, during his residence at Coesarea, from the evangelist himself. The devout proselyte reciting the prophecy which he does not understand — the evangelist-preacher running at full speed till he overtakes the chariot — the abrupt question — the simple-hearted answer — the unfolding, from the starting-point of the prophecy, of the glad tidings of Jesus — the craving for the means of admission to the blessing of fellowship with the new society — the simple baptism in the first stream or spring — the instantaneous, abrupt departure  of the missionary-preacher, as of one carried away by a divine impulse — these help us to represent to ourselves much of the life and work of that remote past. On the hypothesis which has just been suggested, we may think of it as being the incident to which the mind of Philip himself recurred with most satisfaction. A brief sentence tells us that he continued his work as a preacher at Azotus (Ashdod), and among the other cities which had formerly belonged to the Philistines, and, following the coast-line, came to Caesarea.

Here for a long period we lose sight of him. He may have been there when the new convert Saul passed through on his way to Tarsus (Act 9:30). He may have contributed by his labors to the eager desire to be guided farther into the Truth which led to the conversion of Cornelius. We can hardly think of him as giving utp all at once the missionary habits of his life. Csesarea, however, appears to have been the centre of his activity. The last glimpse of him in the N.T. is in the account of Paul's journey to Jerusalem. It is to his house, as to one well known to them, that Paul and his companions turn for shelter. He is still known as "one of the Seven." His work has gained for him the yet higher title of Evangelist. SEE EVANGELIST. He has four daughters, who possess the gift of prophetic utterance. and who apparently give themselves to the work of teaching instead of entering on the life of home (Act 21:8-9). He is visited by the prophets and elders of Jerusalem. At such a place as Ciesarea the work of such a man must have helped to bridge over the everwidening gap which threatened to separate the Jewish and the Gentile churches. One who had preached Christ to the hated Samaritan, the swarthy African, the despised Philistine. the men of all nations who passed through the seaport of Palestine. mnight well welcome the arrival of the apostle of the Gentiles. A.D. 55.

The traditions in which the evangelist and the apostle who bore the same name are more or less confounded have been given under PHILIP THE APOSTLE. According to another, relating more distinctly to him, he died bishop of Tralles (Acta Sunc. June 6). The house in which he and his daughters had lived was pointed out to travellers in the time of Jerome (Epit. Paulce, § 8). (Comp. Ewald, Geschichte, 6:175, 208-214; Baumgarten, Apostelgeschichte, § 15, 16.) The later martvrologies, on the contrary, make him end his days in Caesarea (Acta Sanct. June 6).

## Philip The Presbyter[[@Headword:Philip The Presbyter]]

             an Eastern ecclesiastic of the 5th century, was, according to Gennadius (De Viris Illustr. c. 62), a disciple of Jerome, and died in the reign of Marcian and Avitus over the Eastern and Western empires respectively, i.e., A.D. 456. Philip wrote, 1. Commentarius in Jobum; 2. Familiares Epistolae, of which Gennadius, who had reiad them, speaks highly. These Epistolae have perished: but a Commentarius in Jobum addressed to Nectarius has been several times printed, sometimes separately under the name of Philip (Basle, 1527, two edit. fol. and 4to), and sometimes under the name and among the works of the Venerable Bede and of Jerome. Vallarsi and the Benedictine editors of Jerome give the Commentarius in their editions of that father (5, page 78, etc., ed. Benedict.; volume 11) col. 565, etc., ed. Vallarsi), but not as his. The Prologus or Prcefatio ad Nectariunm are omitted, and the text differs very widely from that given in the Cologne edition of Bede (1612, fol. 4:447. etc.), in which the work is given as Bede's, without any intimation of its doubtful authorship. Cave, Oudin, and Vallarsi agree in ascribing the work to Philip, though Vallarsi is not so decided in his opinion as the other two. See Gennadius. l.c.; Cave, Hist. Litt. ad ann. 440, 1:434; Oudin, De Scriptor. Eccles. volume 1, col. 1165;  Vallarsi, Opera Hieron. volume 3, col. 825, etc.; volume 11, col. 565, 566; Fabricius, Biblioth. Med. et Infim. Latin. 5:295, ed. Mansi.

## Philip The Solitary[[@Headword:Philip The Solitary]]

             a Greek monk, flourished in the time of the emperor Alexius I. Comnenus. Nothing further seems to be known than what mav be gleaned from the titles and introductions of his extant works. He wrote, Διόπτρα, Dioptra, s. Amussis Fidei et Vitae Christianae, written in the kind of measure called "versus politici," and in the form of a dialogue between the soul and the body. It is addressed to another monk, Callinicus, and begins with these two lines:

Πῶς κάθη; πῶς ἀμεριμνεῖς; πῶς ἀμελεῖς, ψψχγ῎ μον; ῾Ο χρόνος σου πεπλίρωται· ἔξελθε τοῦ σαρκίου.

The work, in its complete state, consisted of five books; but most of the MSS. are mutilated or otherwise defective, and want the first book. Some  of them have been interpolated by a later hand. Michael Psellus, not the older writer of that name, who died about A.D. 1078, but one of later date, wrote a preface and notes to the Dioptra of Philip. A Latin prose translation of the Dioptra by the Jesuit Jacobus Pontanus, with notes by another Jesuit, Jacobus Gretserus, was published (Ingolstadt, 1604, 4to); but it was made from a mutilated copy, and consisted of only four books, and these, as the translator admits in his Prtefitio ad Lectorem, interpolated and transposed ad libitum. Philip wrote also, Τῷ κατὰ πνεῦμα υἱῷ καὶ ἱερεῖ Κωνσταντινῳ περὶ πρεσβείας καὶ προστασίας ἀπόλογος, Epistola Apologetica ad Constantinum Filium Spiritualem et Sacerdotem, de Differentia inter Intercessionem et Auxilium Sanctorum: — Versus Politici, in the beginning of which he states with great exactness the time of his finishing the Dioptro, 12th May, A.M. 6603, aera Constantinop. in the third indiction, in the tenth year of the lunar cycleA.D. 1095, not 1105, as has been incorrectly stated. Cave has, without sufficient authority, ascribed to our Philip two other works, which are indeed given in a Vienna MS. (Codex 213, apud Lambec.) as Appendices to the Dioptra. One of these works (Appendix secunda), ῞Οτι οὐκ ἔφαγε τὸ νομικὸν πάσχα ὁ Χριστὸς ἐν τῷ δείπνῳ, ἀλλὰ τὸ ἀληθινόν, Demonstratio quod Christus in Sacra Coena non legale sed verum comederit Pascha, may have been written by Philip. Its arguments are derived from Scripture and Epiphanius. The other work, consisting of five chapters, De Fide et Coeremoniis Armeniorum, Jacobitarum, Chatzitzacriorum et Romanorum seu Francorum, was published, with a Latin version, but without an author's name, in the Auctarium Novum of Combefis (Par. 1648, volume 2, col. 261, etc.), but was, on the authority of MSS., assigned by Combefis, in a note, to Demetrius of Cyzicus, to whom it appears rightly to belong (comp. Cave, Hist. Litt. Dissertatio I, page 6; Fabricius, Bibl. Graec. 11:414). The Chatzitzarii (Χατζιζάριοι) were a sect who paid religious homage to the image of the cross, but employed no other images in their worship. The work of Demetrius appears under the name of Philip in the fourteenth (posthumous) volume of the Bibliotheca Patrum of Galland; but the editors, in their Prolegomena to the volume, c. 15, observe that they knew not on what authority Galland had assigned it to Philip. Among the pieces given as Appendices to the Dioptra, are some verses in praise of the work and its author, by one Constantine, perhaps the person addressed in No. 2, and by Bestus, or Vestus, a grammarian, Στίχοι κυριου Κωνσταντίνου καὶ Βέστου τὂυ γραμματικοῦ, Versus Dosnini Constantini et Vesti Gramnmatici. See Lambecius, Comnentar. de  Biblioth. Caesarea, lib. s. volume 5. col. 7697, and 141, cod. 213, 214, 215, and 232, ed. Kollar; Cave, Hist. Litt. ad ann. 1095, 2:163; Oudin, De Scriptor. Eccles. volume 2, col. 851.

## Philip The Tetrarch[[@Headword:Philip The Tetrarch]]

             (Φίλιππος ὁ τετράρχης), tetrarch of Batanaea, Traclionitis, and Auranitis (Luk 3:1); the two latter appear to have been regarded by Luke as included in Ituraea. Philip was the son of Herod the Great by his wife Cleopatra, and own brother of Herod Antipas; at his death his tetrarchy was annexed to Syria. From him the city Caesarea Philippi took its name (Josephus, Ant. 17:1, 3; 11:4; 18:4,6; War, 1:28, 4; 2:6, 3). Philip ruled from B.C. 4 to A.D. 34. SEE HEROD.

## Philip the Magnanimous[[@Headword:Philip the Magnanimous]]

             landgrave of Hesse, born at Marburg, November 23, 1504, was one of the most prominent characters in the history of the German Reformation. He was only five years old when his father died, and only fourteen when he was declared of age. He was present at the diet of Worms in 1521, but had, at that time, not yet decided with respect to religious matters. He was, however, one of those who insisted that the safe conduct accorded to Luther should be kept sacred. He visited Luther in his lodgings, and on his return allowed mass to be celebrated in German at Cassel. In February 1525, he opened his country to the reformation, in May he joined the Torgau Union, and in June he appeared at the Diet of Spires as one of the leaders of the Protestant party, surprising the Roman Catholic bishops by his theological learning, the imperial commissioners by his outspokenness, and king Ferdinand himself by the open threat of leaving the diet immediately if the enforcement of the edicts of Worms was was insisted upon.

The great task he had on hand was to unite the German and Swiss Protestants into one compact party, and at the Diet of Spires (1529) he succeeded in baffling all the attempts of the Roman Catholics to produce an open breach. The conference of Marburg, in the same year, was also his work, and it had, at all events, the effect of somewhat mitigating the hostility of the theologians. Nevertheless, at the diet of Augsburg (1530), the Lutherans appeared to be willing to buy peace by sacrificing the  interests of the Zwilnglians. Philip proposed war, open and immediate; but the Lutherans suspected him of being a Zwilnglian at heart, and their suspicion made him powerless. He subscribed the Confessio Augustana, but reluctantly, and with an express reservation with respect to the doctrine of the Lord's Supper. Finally, when he saw that nothing could be done, while he knew that the emperor could not be trusted, he suddenly left Augsburg.

This resoluteness, made an impression on the other Protestant princes; and in March 1531, he was able to form the Smalcaldian, League, though he was not able to procure admission to it for the Swiss Reformed. He also opened negotiations with the king of Denmark; in 1532 he compelled the emperor to grant the peace of Nuremberg; in 1534, after the brilliant victory at Laussen, he enforced the restoration of duke Ulrich, of Wurtemberg, by which that country was opened to the Reformation; in 1539 he began negotiations with Francis I, and in 1540 he again proposed to wage, open war on the emperor. But at this very moment his authority was greatly impaired; and his activity much clogged, by his marriage with Margaret de Von der Saal — a clear case of bigamy. The theologians, even Luther and Melanchthon, consented, provided this marriage was kept secret. The duchess of Roonlitz, the sister of Philip, would not keep silent, and the question arose what the emperor would do. The case was so much the worse, as, in 1535 Philip had issued a law which made bigamy one of the greatest crimes in Hesse.

The emperor, however, simply used the affair to completely undermine the political position of the landgrave, but the profit he drew from it was, nevertheless, no small one. During the difficult times which followed after the peace of Crespy (1544), the Protestant party had no acknowledged head; during the Smalcaldian war (1546-47), no acknowledged leader. After the war, the emperor treacherously seized the landgrave, and kept him in prison for five vears. After his release, in 1552, Philip spent all his energies in ameliorating the condition of his country, which had suffered so much from war. But he still had a lively interest in religious matters, and acted the part of a mediator, especially between the Protestants and Roman Catholics; thus he was very active in promoting the conference of Namumburg in 1544 and that of Worms in 1557. Philip died March 31, 1567. See Rommel, Philipp der Grossmuthige (Giessen, 1830, 3 volumes); Lenz, Briefwechsel Landgraf Philipp's mit Bucer (volume 1, Leipsic, 1880); Wille, Philipp der Grossmuthige u. die Restitution Herzog Ublich's von Wurtemberg (Tubingen, 1882); Plitt- Herzog, Real-Encyklop. s.v.; Lichtenberger, Ecyclop. des Sciences Religieuses, s.v. (B.P.)

## Philip, Hermann[[@Headword:Philip, Hermann]]

             a medical missionary, was born of Jewish parentage at Brunswick in 1813. While a student of medicine he joined the Prussian army, which he left after some years' service in order to join a brother of his who was in Java in the Dutch service. Philip embarked at Rotterdam for Batavia, but owing to some accident which happened after the vessel had left the harbor, he came to England. At London, through his employers, he became acquainted with a Presbyterian minister, who spoke to him of Christ and made him think of the Saviour. Philip, with the recommendation from. this minister, went to Scotland. At Glasgow he became acquainted with Dr. Duncan, who encouraged him in his inquiries. On December 9, 1839, the Kirk session of St. Luke's Church at Edinburgh admitted him a member of the Church of Christ. Philip now went through a regular course of theological studies, and commenced his missionary labors in 1841, along with the Reverend D.

Edward, among the Jews in Moldavia. Being convinced of the great advantage to a missionary of a thorough knowledge of medicine, Philip, after nine years' missionary labor, returned to Edinburgh to complete his medical education. This done, in 1850 he was sent to Algiers, under the auspices of the Scottish Society for the Conversion of Israel, as medical missionary. From Algiers, in 1852, he was sent to Alexandria, in Egypt. In 1860 Philip, who, by this time, had the degree of D.D., in addition to that of M.D., was engaged by the British Society for the Propagation of the Gospel among the Jews, and was sent to labor at Jaffa, the seaport of Palestine, where he remained for six years. When the cholera raged at Jaffa in 1865, and the population was panic-struck, and the civil and military authorities had fled, Dr. Philip was the only practitioner at Jaffa, and acted not only as physician, but also as governor amid police. The J.Malta Times of September, 1865, states that "the calls and appeals which Dr. Philip had were constant, insomuch that, when passing through the streets, the crowds thronged upon him to kiss his hands and feet; and while Christians and Jews offered up masses and prayers for him, the Mohammedans forgot their prophet, and the sound was heard in the mosques, 'There is but one God, and the doctor!'" In 1866 Dr. Philip, at his own request, was removed to another field, and sent to Leghorn, where he remained until 1870, when the door was opened to him to preach the gospel to the Jews in Rome. He died February 3, 1882. (B.P.)

## Philip, John, D.D[[@Headword:Philip, John, D.D]]

             a missionary to Africa, was born at Kirkcally, Fifeshire, Scotland, April 14, 1775. His father, who was teacher of an English school, gave him his elementary education; and his mother, who is described as "a woman of earnest and devoted piety," endeavored, with all the powerful insinuating influence of maternal persuasion, to imbue his infant mind with the fear of God and a reverence for his Word. Circumstances occasioned his removal while vet a boy to reside in the house of an uncle at Leven; and there his character rapidly developed itself in the leading features of intellectual and moral individuality that distinguished him through life. In his nineteenth year he removed to Dundee, where, having completed his term of apprenticeship to a linen-manufacturer, he relinquished that trade for the office of clerk in a factory, an office which; without regard to salary, he preferred, from the greater opportunities it afforded him for mental improvement. The Congregational minister with whose Church he connected himself conceived a strong attachment for him, and through his influence Philip was introduced to the theological college at Hoxton. After having completed the regular term of three years' study, he was licensed as a preacher and ordained in 1804. In the course of Providence he was led to visit Aberdeen, where his pulpit ministrations proved so useful that he received an invitation, which he accepted, to undertake the pastoral charge of a Congregational Church recently formed in that town. His heart had for many years been strongly set on the missionary work, when the London Missionary Society proposed to him to undertake the superintendence of their numerous missions in South Africa. The proposal, though at first strenuously opposed by his attached congregation, to whom he had then ministered for fourteen years, was at length accepted by both as the will of God, and in 1820 Dr. Philip sailed for Africa. He there assumed charge of the Church in Union Chapel, Cape Town, and for thirty years besides held the office of superintendent of the society's missions. By his labors in this  field he is principally known. But besides these direct evangelical labors, Dr. Philip made most persevering and successful efforts on behalf of the down-trodden tribes of South Africa. By his intercourse with the natives he obtained evidence of the disastrous effects of the prevailing: system, and ere long the strong arm of British power was stretched out for the defence of those who had so long been the white man's prey. These labors gained for him the title of "Liberator of Africa." Dr. Philip died in 1850, as became a. missionary, amid the people to whose spiritual and temporal welfare the energies of his life had been devoted. He published a work entitled Researches in Africa, which was received with great interest by the English government.

## Philip, Rooert, D.D[[@Headword:Philip, Rooert, D.D]]

             an English dissenting divine, was born in 1791, and was educated at Owen College, Manchester, and after ordination preached to several Independent congregations, until at last he was called to the pastorate of Maberley Chapel, London, where he died in 1858. He wrote, Christian Experience, Gu'cide to the Perplexed: — Communion. with God, Guide to the Devotional: — Eternity Realized, Guide to the Thoughtful: — The God of Glory, Guide to the Doubting: — On Pleasing God, Guide to the Conscientious: — Redemption, or the New Song in Heaven. Reverend Albert Barnes wrote an introduction to these six works. and they were published under the title of Devotional Guides (N.Y. 1867, 2 volumes, 12mo). Dr. Philip also published, Sacramental Experience, a Guide to Communicants (new ed. Loud. 1844, 18mlo): — The Marys, or Beauty of Female Holiness (1840, roy. 18mo): — The Marthas, or Varieties of Fenale Piety (1840, sm. 18mo): — The Lydias, or Development of Female Character (1841, roy. 18mo): — The Hannahs, or Maternal Influence on Sons (1841, 12mo). These were published collectively as the "Lady's Closet Library" (4 volumes, 18mo): — Manly Piety in its Principles (1837, 18mo): — Manly Piety in its Realizations (1837, 18mo), were published in 1 volume 12mo, munder the title of the "Young Man's Closet Library:" — The Comforter or the Love of the Spirit (Lond. 1836, 18mo): — The Eternal, or the Attributes of Jehovah, etc. (1846, fcp. 8vo): — The Elijah of South Africa (1852, fcp. 8vo): — Life, Times, etc., of John Bunyan (1838, 12mo): — Bunyan's Pilginm's Progress (Lond. 1843, roy. 18mo): — Life and Times of the Reverend Samuel Whitefield (1838. 8vo): — Life and Opinions of the Reverend William Milne (1839, post 8vo): — Life and Times of the Reverend John Campbell (Lond. 1841, 8vo): —  Introductory Essay to the Practical Works of the Reverend Richard Baxter (1838, 4 volumes). (J.H.W.)

## Philipoftschins or Philiponians[[@Headword:Philipoftschins or Philiponians]]

             SEE PHILIPPINS.

## Philippi[[@Headword:Philippi]]

             (Φίλλιπποι, plur. of Philip), a celebrated city of Macedonia, visited by the apostle Paul, and the seat of the earliest Christian Church formally established in Europe. The double miracle wrought there, and the fact that “to the saints in Philippi" the great apostle of the Gentiles addressed one of his epistles, must ever make this city holy groulnd. The following account of it combines the ancient notices with modern investigations.

1. Apostolic Associations. — St. Paul, when, on his first visit to Macedonia in company with Silas, he embarked at Troas, made a straight run to Samothrace, and from thence to Neapolis, which he reached on the second day (Act 16:11). The Philippi of Paul's day was situated in a plain, on the banks of a deep and rapid stream called Gangites (now Angista). The ancient walls followed the course of the stream for some distance; and in this section of the wall the site of a gate is seen, with the ruins of a bridge nearly opposite. In the narrative of Paul's visit it is said: "On the Sabbath we went out of the gate by the river (ἐξήλθομεν τῆς πὐλης παρὰ ποταμόν),where a meeting for prayer was accustomed to be" (Act 16:13). It was doubtless by this gate they went out, and by the side of this river the prayer-meeting was held. As Philippi was a military colony, it is probable that the Jews had no synagogue, and were not permitted to hold their worship within the walls. Behind the city, on the north-east, rose lofty mountains; but on the opposite side a vast and rich plain stretched out, reaching on the south-west to the sea, and on the north-west far away among the ranges of Macedonia. On the south-east a rocky ridge, some sixteen hundred feet in height, separated the plain from the bay and town of Neapolis. Over it ran a paved road connecting Philippi with Neapolis. Though the distance between the two was nine miles, yet Neapolis was to Philippi what the Piroeus was to Athens; and hence Paul is said, when journeying from Greece to Syria, to have "sailed away from Philippi;" that is, from Neapolis, its port (Act 20:6).

Philippi was in the province of Macedonia, while Neapolis was in Thrace. Paul, on his first journey, landed at the latter, and proceeded across the mountainroad to the former, which Luke calls "the first city of the division of Macedonia" (πρώτη τῆς μερίδος τῆς Μακεδονίας πόλις, Act 16:12). The word πρώτη does not, as represented in the A.V., signify "chief." Thessalonica was the chief city of all Macedonia, and Amphipolis of that division (μερίς) of it in which Philippi was situated (see Wieseler, Chron. des Apost. Zeit. page 37). Πρώτη simply means that Philippi was the "first" city of Macedonia to which Paul came (Alford, ad loc.; Conybeare and Howson, Life of St. Paul, 1:311, note). In descending the mountain-path towards Philippi the apostle had before him a vast and beautiful panorama. The whole plain, with its green meadows, and clumps of trees, and wide reaches of marsh, and winding streams, lay at his feet; and away beyond it the dark ridges of Macedonia.

The missionary visit of Paul and Silas to Philippi was successful. They found an eager audience in the few Jews and proselytes who frequented the prayerplace on the banks of the Gangites. Lydia, a trader from Thyatira, was the first convert. Her whole house followed her example. It was when going and returning from Lydia's house that "the damsel possessed with a spirit of divination" met the apostles. Paul cast out the spirit, and then those who had made a trade of the poor girl's misfortune rose against them, and took them before the magistrates, who, with all the haste and roughness of martial law, ordered them to be scourged and thrown into prison. Even this gross act of injustice redounded in the end to the glory of God: for the jailer and his whole house were converted, and the very magistrates were compelled to make a public apology to the apostles, and to set them at liberty, thus declaring theit innocence. The scene in the prison of Philippi was one of the most cheering, as it was one of the most remarkable incidents in the history of the apostolic Church.

Paul visited Philippi twice more, once immediately after the disturbances which arose at Ephesus out of the jealousy of the manufacturers of silver shrines for Artemis. By this time the hostile relation in which the Christian doctrine necessarily stood to all purely ceremonial religions was perfectly manifest; and wherever its teachers appeared, popular tumults were to be expected, and the jealousy of the Roman authorities, who dreaded civil disorder above everything else, to be feared. It seems. not unlikely that the second visit of the apostle to Philippi was made specially with the view of  counteracting this particular danger. He appears to have remained in the city and surrounding country a considerable time (Act 20:1-2).

When Paul passed through Philippi a third time hie does not appear to have made any considerable stay there (Act 20:6). He and his companion are somewhat loosely spoken of as sailing from Philippi; but this is because in the common apprehension of travellers the city and its port were regarded as one. Whoever embarked at the Piraeus might in the same way be said to set out on a voyage from Athens. On this occasion the voyage to Troas took the apostle five days, the vessel being probably obliged to coast in order to avoid the contrary wind, until coming off the headland of Sarpedon, whence she would be able to stand across to Troas with an E. or E.N.E. breeze, which at that time of year (after Easter) might be looked for.

The Christian community at Philippi distinguished itself in liberality. On the apostle's first visit he was hospitably entertained by Lydia, and when he afterwards went to Thessalonica, where his reception appears to have been of a very mixed character, the Philippians sent him supplies more than once. and were the only Christian community that did so (Php 4:15). They also contributed readily to the collection made for the relief of the poor at Jerusalem, which Paul conveyed to them at his last visit (2Co 8:1-6). It would seem as if they sent further supplies to the apostle after his arrival at Rome. The necessity for these appears to have been urgent, and some delay to have taken place in collecting the requisite funds; so that Epaphroditus, who carried them, risked his life in the endeavor to make tup for lost time (μέχρι θανάτου ἤγγισεν παραβουλευσάμενος τῇ ψυχῇ, ἵνα ἀναπληρώσῃ τὸ ὑμῶν ὑστέρημα τῆς προς μὲ λειτουργίας, Php 2:30). The delay, however, seems to have somewhat stung the apostle at the time, who fancied his beloved flock had forgotten him (see 4:10-17). Epaphroditus fell ill with fever from his efforts, and nearly died. On recovering he became homesick, and wandering in mind (ἀδημονῶν) from the weakness which is the sequel of fever; and Paul although intending soon to send Timothy to the Philippian Church, thought it desirable to let Epaphroditus go without delay to them, who had already heard of his sickness. and carry with him the letter which is included in the canon — one which was written after the apostle's imprisonment at Rome had lasted a considerable time. Some domestic troubles connected with religion had already broken out in the community. Euodias and Svntyche, who appear to be husband and wife,  are exhorted to agree with one another in the matter of their common faith; and the former is implored to extend his sympathy to certain females (obviously familiar both to Paul and to him) who did good service to the apostle in his trials at Philippi, and who in some way or other appear to be the occasion of the disagreement between the pair. Possibly a claim on the part of these females to superior insight in spiritual matters may have caused some irritation; for the apostle immediately goes on to remind his readers that the peace of God is something superior to the highest intelligence (ὑπερέχουσα πάντα νοῦν).

It would seem, as Alford says, that the cruel treatment of the apostle at Philippi had combined with the charm of his personal fervor of affection to knit up a bond of more than ordinary love between him and the Philippian Church. They alone, of all churches, sent subsidies to relieve his temporal necessities" (Php 4:10; Php 4:15; Php 4:18; 2Co 11:9; 1Th 2:2; Alford, Greek Test., Prol. 3:29). The apostle felt their kindness; and during his imprisonment at Rome wrote to them that epistle which is still in our canon. This epistle indicates that at that time some of the Christians there were in the custody of the military authorities as seditious persons, through some proceedings or other connected with their faith (ὑμῖν ἐχαρίσθη τὸ ὑπὲρ Χριστοῦ, οὐ μόνον τὸ εἰς αὐτὸν πιστεύειν ἀλλὰ καὶ τὸ ὑπὲρ αὐτοῦ πάσχειν· τὸν αὐτὸν ἀγῶνα ἔχνοτες οιον εἴδετε ἐν ἐμοὶ καὶ νῦν ἀκούετε ἐν ἐμοί, Php 1:29). The reports of the provincial magistrates to Rome would of course describe Paul's first visit to Philippi as the origin of the troubles there; and if this were believed, it would be put together with the charge against him by the Jews at Jerusalem which induced him to appeal to Caesar, and with the disturbances at Ephesus and elsewhere; and the general conclusion at which the government would arrive might not improbably be that he was a dangerous person and should be got rid of. This will explain the strong exhortation of the first eighteen verses of chapter 2, and the peculiar way in which it winds up. The Philippian Christians, who are at the same time suffering for their profession, are exhorted in the most earnest manner, not to firmness (as one might have expected), but to moderationi, to abstinence from all provocation and ostentation of their own sentiments (μηδὲν κατὰ ἐριθείαν μηδὲ κενοδοξίαν, Php 1:3), to humility, and consideration for the interests of others. They are to achieve their salvation with fear and trembling, and without quarrelling and disputing, in order to escape all blame from such charges, that is, as the Roman colonists would bring  against them. If with all this prudence and temperance in the profession of their faith, their religion is still made a penal offence, the apostle is well content to take the consequence — to precede them in martyrdom for it — to be the libation poured out upon them the victims (εἰ καὶ σπένδομαι ἐπὶ τῇ θυσίᾷ καὶ λειτουργίᾷ τῆς πίστεως ὑμῶν χαίρω καὶ συγχαίρω πᾶσιν ὑμῖν, Php 1:17). Of course the Jewish formalists in Philippi were the parties most likely to misrepresent the conduct of the new converts; and hence (after a digression on the subject of Epaphroditus) the apostle reverts to cautions against them, such precisely as he had given before-consequently by word of mouth: "Beware of those dogs" — (for they will not be children at the table, but eat the crumbs underneath) — "those doers (and bad doers too) of the law-those flesh-manglers (for circumcised I won't call them, we being the true circumcision, etc.") (3:2, 3). Some of these enemies Paul found at Rome, who "told the story of Christ insincerely" (κατήγγειλαν οὐχ ἁγνῶς, 1:17) in the hope of increasing the severity of his imprisonment by exciting the jealousy of the court. These he opposes to such as "preached Christ" (ἐκήρυξαν) loyally, and consoles himself with the reflection that, at all events, the story circulated, whatever the motives of those who circulated it. See Walch, Acta Pruli Philippensia (Jen. 1726); Todd, The Church at Philippi (Lond. 1864). SEE PHILIPPIANS, EPISTLE TO

2. Ancient History. — Strabo tells us that the old name of Philippi was Krenides (7:331); and Appian adds that it was so called from the number of "little fountains" (κρηνίδες) around the site. He also says that it had another name, Datus; but that Philip of Macedon, having taken it from the Thracians, made it a frontier fortress, and gave it his own name (De Bell. Civ. 4:105). Philip's city stood upon a hill, probably that seen a little to the south of the present ruins, which may have always formed the citadel, but was in all probability in its origin a factory of the Phoenicians, who were the first that worked the gold-mines in the mountains here, as iin the neighboring Thasos. Appian says that those were in a hill (λόφος) not far from Phiiippi, that the hill was sacred to Dionysus, and that the mines went by the name of "the sanctuary" (τὰ ἄσυλα). But he shows himself quite ignorant of the locality, to the extent of believing the plain of Philippi to be open to the river Strymon, whereas the massive wall of Pangseus is really interposed..between them. In all probability the "hill of Dionysus" and the "sanctuary" are the temple of Dionysus high up the mountains among the Satrie, who preserved their independence against all invaders down to the  time of Herodotus at least. It is more likely that the gold-mines coveted by Philip were the same as those at Scapte Hyle, which was certainly in this immediate neighborhood. Before the great expedition of Xerxes, the Thasians had a number of settlements on the main, and this among the number, which produced them eighty talents a year as rent to the state. In the year B.C. 463 they ceded their possessions on the continent to the Athenians: but the colonists, 10,000 in number, who had settled on the Strymon and pushed their encroachments eastward as far as this point, were crushed by a simultaneous effort of the Thracian tribes (Thucydides, 1:100; 4:102; Herodotus, 9:75; Pausanias, 1:29, 4). From that time until the rise of the Macedonian power, the mines seem to have remained in the hands of native chiefs; but when the affairs of Southern Greece became thoroughly embroiled by the policy of Philip, the Thasians made an attempt to repossess themselves of this valuable territory, and sent a colony to the site, then going by the name of "the Springs" (Κρηνίδες). Philip, however, aware of the importance of the position, expelled them and founded Philippi, the last of all his creations. The mines at that time, as was not wonderfil under the circumstances, had become, almost insignificant in their produce; but their new owner contrived to extract more than a thousand talents a year from them, with which he minted the gold coinage called by his name. The proximity of the gold-mines was of course the origin ,of so large a city as Philippi, but the plain in which it lies is one of extraordinary fertility. The position too was on the main road from Rome to Asia, the Via Egnatia, which from Thessalonica to Constantinople followed the same course as the existing post-road. The usual course was to take ship at Brundisium and land at Dyrrachium, from whence a route led across Epirus to Thessalonica. Ignatius was carried to Italy by this route, when sent to Rome to be cast to wild beasts. See Strabo, Fragnment. lib. 7; Thucyd. 1:100; 4:102; Herod. 9:75; Diod. Sic. 16:3 sq.; Appian, Bell. Civ. 4:101 sq.; Pausan. 1:28, 4.

The famous battle of Philippi, in which the Roman republic was overthrown, was fought on this plain in the year B.C. 42 (Dio. Cass. 46; Appian, l.c.). In honor, and as a memorial of his great victory, Augustus made Philippi a Roman “colony," and its coins bear the legend Colonia Augusta Jul. Philippensis (Conybeare and Howson, 1:312). The emperor appears to have founded the new quarter in the plain along the banks of the Gangites. As a colony (κολωνία, Act 16:12) it enjoyed peculiar  privileges. Its inhabitants were Roman citizens, most of them being the families and descendants of veteran soldiers, who had originally settled in the place to guard the city and province. They were governed by their own magistrates, called Duumviri or Pretors (in Greek στρατηγοί; Act 16:20), who exercised a kind of military authority, and were independent of the provincial governor.

3. Present Site. — Philippi (now called by the Turks Felibejik) is cut off from the interior by a steep line of hills, anciently called Symbolum, connected towards the N.E. with the western extremity of Haemus, and to;wards the S.W., less continuously, with the eastern extremity of Pangaeus. Between the foot of Symbolurn :and the site of Philippi two T'urlish cemeteries are passed, the gravestones of which are all derived from the ruins of the ancient city, anti in the immediate neighborhood of the one first reached is the modern Turkish village Bereketli. This is the nearest village to the ancient ruins. Near the second cemetery are some ruins on a slight eminence, and also a khan, kept by a Greek family. Here is a large monumental block of marble, twelve feet high and seven feet square, apparently the pedestal of a statue, as on the top a hole exists which was obviously intended for its reception. This hole is pointed out by local tradition as the crib out of which Alexander's horse, Bucephalus, was accustomed to eat his oats. On two sides of the block is a mutilated Latin inscription, in which the names of Caius Vibiuls and Cornelius Quartus may be deciphered. A stream employed in turning a mill bursts out from a sedgy pool in the neighborhood, and probably finds its way to the marshy ground mentioned as existing in the S.W. portion of the plain. After about twenty minutes' ride from the khan, over ground thickly strewed with fragments of marble columns, and slabs that have been employed in building, a river-bed sixty-six feet wide is crossed, through which the stream rushes with great force, and immediately on the other side the walls of the ancient Philippi may be traced. Their direction is adjusted to the course of the stream; and at only three hundred and fifty feet from its margin there appears a gap in their circuit, indicating the former existence of a gate. This is, no doubt, as above seen, the gate out of which the apostle and his companion passed to the "prayer-meeting" on the banks of a river, where they made the acquaintance of Lydia, the Thyatiran .seller of purple. The locality, just outside the walls, and with a plentiful supply of water for their animals, is exactly the one which would be appropriated as a market for itinerant  traders, "quorum cophinus foenumque supellex," as will appear from the parallel case of the Egerian fountain near Rome, of whose desecration Juvenal complains (Sat. 3:13).

Lydia had an establishment in Philippi for the reception of the dyed goods which were imported from Thyatira and the neighboring towns of Asia, and were dispersed by means of packanimals among the mountain clans of the Haemus and Pangaeus, the agents being doubtless in many instances her own coreligionists. High tup in Haemus lay the tribe of the Satrae, where was the oracle of Dionysusnot the rustic deity of the Attic vinedressers, but the prophet-god of the Thracians (ὁ θρῃξὶ μάντις, Eurip. Hecub. 1267). The "damsel with the spirit of divination" (παιδίσκη ἔχουσα πνεῦμα πύθωνα) may probably be regarded as one of the hierodules of this establishment, hired by Philippian citizens, and frequenting the country-market to practice her art upon the villagers who brought produce for the consumption of the town. The fierce character of the mountaineers would render it imprudent to admit them within the wails of the city; just as in some of the towns of North Africa the Kabyles are not allowed to enter, butt have a market allotted to them outside the walls for the sale of the produce they bring. Over such an assemblage only a summary jurisdiction can be exercised; and hence the proprietors of the slave, when they considered themselves injured, and hurried Paul and Silas into the town, to the agora — the civic market where the magistrates (ἄρχοντες) sat — were at once turned over to the military authorities (στρατηγοί), and these, naturally assuming that a stranger frequenting the extra-mural market must be a Thracian mountaineer or an itinerant trader, proceeded to inflict upon the ostensible cause of a riot (the merits of which they would not attempt to understand) the usual treatment in such cases. The idea of the apostle possessing the Roman franchise, and consequently an exemption from corporal outrage, never occurred to the rough soldier who ordered him to be scourged; and the whole transaction seems to have passed so rapidly that he had no time to plead his citizenship, of which the military authorities first heard the next day. But the illegal treatment (ὕβοις) obviously made a deep impression on the mind of its victim, as is evident not only from his refusal to take his discharge from prison the next morning (Act 16:37), but from a passage in the Epistle to the Church at Thessalonica (1Th 2:2), in which he reminds them of the circumstances under which he first preached the Gospel to them (προπαθόντες καὶ ὑβρισθέντες, Καθώς οἴδατε, ἐν Φιλίπποις). Subsequently at Jerusalem, under parallel  circumstances of tumult, he warns the officer (to the great surprise of the latter) of his privilege (Acts 22:55).

Philippi is now an uninhabited ruin. The remains are very extensive, but present no striking feature except two gateways, which are considered to belong to the time of Claudius. The foundations of a theatre can be traced; also the walls, gates, some tombs, and numerous broken columns'and heaps of rubbish. The ruins of private dwellings are visible on every part of the site; and at one place is a mound covered with columns and broken fragments of white marble; where a palace, temple, or perhaps a forum once stood. Inscriptions both in the Latin and Greek languages, but more generally in the former, are found. See Clarke, Travels, volume 3; Leake, Northern Greece, volume 3; Cousinery, Voyage dans la Maced.; and especially Hacket, Journey to Philippi in the Bible Union Quarterly, August 1860; Smith Dict. of Class. Geog. s.v.; Lewin, St. Paul, 1:206 sq. SEE MACEDONIA.

## Philippi, Friedrich Adolph[[@Headword:Philippi, Friedrich Adolph]]

             a noted Lutheran theologian of Germany, was born of Jewish parentage at Berlin, October 15, 1809. At the age of eighteen he entered the Berlin University to study philosophy. In 1829 he went to Leipsic for the study of philology, and in the same year joined the Lutheran Church. In 1830 he was promoted as doctor of' philosophy, and acted for two years as teacher at Dresden. In 1832 he returned to Berlin, passed his examination, and in 1833 received the "facultas docendi." He was appointed professor of ancient languages at the Joachimsthal Gymnasium, a position which he resigned after eighteen months in order to prosecute theological studies. Having passed his examination, he was in 1836 made a licentiate in theology, and commenced to lecture in 1837. In 1841 Philippi was called as professor of theology to Dorpat, in 1851 to Rostock, and died August 29, 1882. He wrote, De Celsi Adversarii Christianoraum, Philosophandi Genere (Berlin, 1836): — Der thatige Gehorsam Christi (1841): — Commentar uber den Brief Pauli an die Romer (Frankfort, 3d ed. 1866; Engl. transl. Edinburgh, 1878): — but his main work is Kirchliche Glaubenslehre (Guterslothe, 1854-82, 6 volumes), a learned and able vindication of strict Lutheran orthodoxy. After Philippi's death there were published from his manuscripts, and edited by his son, Erklarung des Briefes Pauli an die Galater (Guterslothe, 1884): — Symbolik. Akademische Vorlesungen (1883): — Predigten und Vortrage (eod.). See Mecklenburgisches Kirchen- und Zeitblatt, 1882, No. 19-21; Plitt-Herzog, Real-Encyklop. s.v.; Zuchold, Bibl. Theol. 2:993 sq. (B.P.)

## Philippi, Heinrich[[@Headword:Philippi, Heinrich]]

             a Jesuit who died at Augsburg, November 30, 1636, is the author of, Introductio Chronologica seu de Conmputo Ecclesiastico: — Quaestiones Chronologicae in Vetums Testamentum: — Chronologiae Vet. Testamenti Accuratum Examen: — Generalis Synopsis Sacrorums Temporum: — De Annis Domini, Juliana, Nabonassaris, et AEra Juliana Componendis: — Notce et Quaestiones Chronoloqicae in Pentateuchuam et Prophetar. See Jocher, Allgemeines Gelehrten-Lexikon, s.v. (B.P.)

## Philippian[[@Headword:Philippian]]

             (Φιλιππήσιος), the patrial title of an inhabitant of PHILIPPI (Php 4:15).

## Philippians, Epistle To The[[@Headword:Philippians, Epistle To The]]

             the sixth in order of the Pauline letters in the N.T. The following article treats the subject from the Scriptural as wvell as the modern point of view.

I. The canonical authority, Pauline authorship, and integrity of this epistle were unanimously acknowledged up to the end of the 18th century. Marcion (A.D. 140), in the earliest known canon. held common ground with the Church touching the authority of this epistle (Tertullian, Adr. AMucirdon, 4:5; 5:20): it appears in the Muratorian Fragment (Routh, Reliquiae Sacrae, 1:395); among the "acknowledged" books in Eusebius (H.E. 3:25); in the lists of the Council of Laodicea, A.D. 365, and the Synod of Hippo, 393; and in all subsequent lists, as well as in the Peslito and later versions. Even contemporary evidence may be claimed for it. Philippian Christians who had contributed to the collections for Paul's support at Rome, who had been eye and ear witnesses of the return of Epaphroditus and the first reading of Paul's epistle, may have been still alive at Philippi when Polycarp wrote (A.D. 107) his letter to them, in which (cl. 2, 3) he refers to Paul's epistle as a well-known distinction  belonging to the Philippian Church. It is quoted as Paul's by several of the early Church fathers (Irenaels, 4:18, § 4; Clem. Alex. Paedag. 1:6, § 52, and elsewhere; Tertullian. Adv. Mar 5:20; De Res. Carn. chapter 23). A quotation from it (Php 2:6) is found in the Epistle of the Churches of Lyons and Vienne, A.D. 177 (Eusebius, H.E. 5:2). The testimonies of later writers are innumerable. SEE CANON.

It is only in very recent times that any doubt has been suggested as to the genuineness of this epistle. Sclrader (Der Ap. Paulus, 5:233) first insinuated that the passage Php 3:1 to Php 4:9 is an interpolation; but he adduces no reason for this but the purely gratuitous one that the connection between Php 2:30 and Php 4:10 is disturbed bv this intervening section, and that by the excision of this the epistle becomes "more rounded off, and more a genuine occasional letter" — as if any sound critic would reject a passage from an ancient author because in hfis opinion the author's composition would be improved thereby! Baur goes farther than this, and would reject the whole epistle as a Gnostic compositions of a later age (Paulus, page 458 sq.). But when he comes to point out "the Gnostic ideas and expressions" by which the epistle is marked, they will be found to exist only in his own imagination, and can only by a perverse ingenuity be forced upon the words of the apostle. Thus, in the statement that Christ ἐν μορφῇ θεοῦ ὑπάρχων οὐχ ἁρπαγμὸν ἡγήσατο τὸ ειναι ἴσα θεῷ (Php 2:5-6), Baur finds an allusion to the Gnostic aeon Sophia, in which "existed the outgoing desire with all power to penetrate into the essence of the supreme Father." But not only is this to give the apostle's words a meaning which they do not bear (for however we translate ἁρπαγμὸν ἡγήσατο, it evidently expresses an act in the past, not an aim tor the future), but it is manifest that the entire drift of the passage is not to set forth any speculative doctrine, but to adduce a moral inference. This is so manifest that even Baur himself admits it, and by so doing overturns his own position; for it is only on the supposition that what the apostle refers to is a fact, and not a mere speculative fancy, that any moral conclusion can be drawn from it. Equally futile is the attempt to find Docetism in the use of the term μορφή — a term used by the apostle in reference to the divine nature — or of the terms ὁμοίωμα, σχῆμα, and εὑρεθῆναι, all of which occur elsewhere in Paul's writings, and are here used to denote simply that Jesus Christ presented himself to the view of men actually as one of themselves (Linemann, Pauli ad Phil. Ep. cont. Baurium defensa, Gott.  1847; Bruckner, Ep. ad Phil. Paulo auctori vindicata cont. Baur. Lips. 1848). Baur was followed by Schwegler (1846), who argued from the phraseology of the epistle and other internal marks that it is the work not of Paul, but of some Gnostic forger in the 2d century. He too has been answered by Linemann (1847), Brickner (1848), and Resch (1850). 'Even if his inference were a fair consequence from Baur's premises, it would still be neutralized by the strong evidence in favor of Pauline authorship, which Palev (Horae Paulinae, chapter 7) has drawn from the epistle as it stands. The arguments of the Tubingen school are briefly stated in Reuss (Gesch. d. N.T. § 130-133), and at greater length in Wiesinger's Commentary. Most persons who read them will be disposed to concur in the opinion of dean Alford (N.T. 3:27, ed. 1856), who regards them as an instance of the insanity of hypercriticism. The canonical authority and the authorship of the epistle may be considered as unshaken.

A question has been raised as to whether the extant Epistle to the Philippians is the only one addressed by Paul to that Church. What has given rise to this question is the expression used by the apostle (Php 3:1), τὰ αὐτὰ γράφειν ὑμῖν, κ.τ.λ., where the writing of the same things to them is supposed to refer to the identity of what he is now writing with what he had written in a previous letter. It has also been supposed that Polycarp knew of more than one epistle addressed by the apostle to the Philippians, from his using the plural (δς ἀπὼν ὑμῖν ἔγραψεν ἐπιστολάς) in reference to what he had written to them. To this, however, much weight cannot be attached, for there can be no doubt that the Greeks used ἐπιστολαί for a single letter, as the Latins used litera (see a multitude of examples in Stephans's Thesaurus, s.v.). That Polycarp knew of only one epistle of Paul to the Philippians has been supposed by some to be proved by the passage in the 11th chapter of his letter, preserved in the Latin version, where he says, "Ego autem nihil tale sensi in vobis vel audivi, in quibus laboravit beatlis Paulus qui estis in principio epistolae ejus," etc. But, as Meyver points out, "epistole" here is not the genitive singular, but the nominative plural; and the meaning is not "who are in the beginning of his epistle," which is hardly sense, but (with allusion to 2Co 3:1) "who are in the beginning [i.e., from the beginning of his preaching the Gospel among you — a common use of ἐν ἀρχῇ, which was the expression probably used by Polycarp] his epistle." It is going too far, however, to say that this passage has no bearing on this question; for if Meyer's construction be correct, it shows that Polycarp did use ἐπιστολαί  for a single epistle. Meyer, indeed, translates "who are his epistles;" but if the allusion is to 2Co 3:1, we must translate in the singular, the whole Church collectively being the epistle, and not each member an epistle. But though the testimony of Polycarp for a plurality of epistles may be set aside, it is less easy to set aside the testimony of the extant epistle itseli in the passage cited. To refer τὰ αὐτά to the preceding χαίρετε ἐν κυρίῳ seems somewhat difficult, for nowhere previously in this epistle has the apostle expressly enjoined on his readers χαίρειν ἐν κυρίῳ, and one does not see what on this hypothesis is the propriety of such expressions as ὀκνηρόν and ἀσφαλές; and to lay the stress on the γράφειν, as Wieseler proposes (Chronologie des Ap. Zeit. page 458), so as to make the apostle refer to some verbal message previously sent to the Philippians, the substance of which he was now about to put into writing, seems no less so; for not only does the epistle contain no allusion to any oral message, but in this case the writer would have said καὶ γράφειν.

A large number of critics follow Pelagius in the explanation, "eadem repetere que presens dixeram;" but it may be doubted if so important a clause may be legitimately dragged in to complete the apostle's meaning, without any authority from the context. Hence many have concluded that the apostle alludes to some written communication previously sent by him to the Philippians (so Hahnlein, Flatt, Meyer, Bleek, Schenkel, etc.). But, besides the lack of all evidence of such lost epistles in general, the assumption here must be pronounced ill a high degree doubtful and precarious. Hence we conclude that τὰ αὐτὰ refers to the χαίρειν, which is the pervading thought of the epistle (Php 1:4; Php 1:18; Php 2:17, etc.), and which seems to have been the more dwelt upon as the actual circumstances of the case might very naturally have suggested the contrary feeling (hence ὀκνηρόν). See Ellicott, ad loc. Ewald (Sendschreiben des Ap. Paulus, page 431) is of opinion that Paul sent several epistles to the Philippians; and he refers to the texts Php 2:12 and Php 3:18 as partly proving this. But some additional confirmation or explanation of this conjecture is requisite before it can be admitted as either probabre or necessary.

There is a break in the sense at the end of the second chapter of the epistle, which every careful reader must have observed. It is indeed quite natural that an epistle written amid exciting circumstances, personal dangers, and various distractions should bear in one place at least a mark of interruption. Le Moyne (1685) thought it was anciently divided into two parts. Heinrichs (1810), followed by Paulus (1817), has conjectured from this  abrupt recommencement that the two parts are two distinct epistles, of which the first, together with the conclusion of the epistle (4:21-23), was intended for public use in the Church, and the second exclusively for the apostle's special friends in Philippi. It is not easy to see what sufficient foundation exists for this theory, or what illustration of the meaning of the epistle could be derived from it. It has met with a distinct reply from Krause (1811 and 1818); and the integrity of the epistle has not been questioned by recent critics.

II. Time and Place of Writing. — The constant tradition that this epistle was written at Rome by Paul in his captivity was impugned first by Oeder (1732), who, disregarding the fact that the apostle was in prison (Php 1:7; Php 1:13-14) when he wrote, imagined that he was at Corinth (see Wolfs Cure Philologicae, 4:168, 270); and then by Paulus (1799), Schulz (1829), Bottger (1837), and Rilliet (1841), in whose opinion the epistle was written during the apostle's confinement at Csesarea (Act 24:23). But the references to the "palace" (praetorium, Act 1:13), and to "Caesar's household" (Act 4:22), seem to point to Rome rather than to Caesarea; and there is no reason whatever for supposing that the apostle felt in Ceesarea that extreme uncertainty of life connected with the approaching decision of his cause which he must have felt towards the end of his captivity at Rome, and which he expresses in this epistle (Php 1:19-20; Php 2:17; Php 3:10); and, further, the dissemination of the Gospel described in Php 1:12-18 is not even hinted at in Luke's account of the Caesarean captivity, but is described by him as taking place at Rome (comp. Act 24:23 with Act 28:30-31). Even Reuss (Gesch. d. N.T. 1860), who assigns to Caesarea three of Paul's epistles which are generally considered to have been written at Rome, is decided in his conviction that the Epistle to the Philippians was written at Rome.

Assuming then that the epistle was written at Rome during the imprisonment mentioned in the last chapter of the Acts, it may be shown from a single fact that it could not have been written long before the end of the two years. The distress of the Philippians on account of Epaphroditus's sickness was known at Rome when the epistle was written; this implies four journeys, separated by some indefinite intervals, to or from Philippi and Rome, between the commencement of Paul's captivity and the writing of the epistle. The Philippians were informed of his imprisonment, and sent Epaphroditus; they were informed of their messenger's sickness, and sent  their message of condolence. Further, the absence of Luke's name from the salutations to a Church where he was well known implies that he was absent from Rome when the epistle was written: so does Paul's declaration (Php 2:20) that no one who remained with him felt an equal interest with Timothy in the welfare of the Philippians. By comparing the mention of Luke in Col 4:14 and Phm 1:24 with the abrupt conclusion of his narrative in the Acts, we are led to the inference that he left Rome after those two epistles were written and before the end of the two years' captivity. Lastly, it is obvious from Php 1:20 that Pail. when he wrote, felt his position to be very critical, and we know that it became more precarious as the two years drew to a close. Assuming that Paul's acquittal and release took place in 58, we may date the Epistle to the Philippians early in that year.

III. Personal Circumstances of the Writer at the Time. —

1. Paul's connection with Philippi was of a peculiar character, which gave rise to the writing of this epistle. That city, important as a mart for the produce of the neighboring gold-mines, and as a Roman stronghold to check the rude Thracian mountaineers, was distinguished as the scene of the great battle fatal to Briutus and Cassiuls, B.C. 42. More than ninety years afterwards Paul entered its walls, accompanied by Silas, who had been with him since he started from Antioch, and by Timothy and Luke, whom he afterwards attached to himself; the former at Derbe. the latter quite recently at Troas. It may well be imagined that the patience of the zealous apostle had been tried by his mysterious repulse, first from Asia, then from Bithynia and Mysia, and that his expectations had been stirred up by the vision which hastened his departure with his new-found associate, Luke, from Troas. A swift passage brought him to the European shore at Neapolis, whence he took the road, about ten miles long, across the mountain ridge called Symbolum to Philippi (Act 16:12). There, at a greater distance from Jerusalem than any apostle had yet penetrated, the long-restrained energy of Paul was again employed in laying the foundation of a Christian Church. Seeking first the lost sheep of the house of Israel, he went on a Sabbath-dav with the few Jews who resided in Philippi to their small Proseucha on the bank of the river Gangites. The missionaries sat down and spoke to the assembled women. One of them, Lydia, not born of the seed of Abraham, but a proselyte, whose name and occupation, as well as her birth, connect her with Asia, gave heed unto Paul, and she and her household were baptized, perhaps on the same Sabbath-day. Her house  became the residence of the missionaries. Many days they resorted to the Proseucha, and the result of their short sojourn in Philippi was the conversion of many persons (Act 16:40), including at last their jailer and his household. Philippi was endeared to Paul, not only by the hospitality of Lydia, the deep sympathy of the converts. and the remarkable miracle which set a seal on his preaching, but also by the successful exercise of his missionary activity after a long suspense, and by the happy consequences of his undaunted endurance of ignominies which remained in his memory (Php 1:30) after a long interval. Leaving Timothy and Luke to watch over the infant Church, Paul and Silas went to Thessalonica (1Th 2:2), whither they were followed by the alms of the Philippians (Php 4:16), and thence southwards. Timothy, having probably carried out similar directions to those which were given to Titus (1:5) in Crete, soon rejoined Paul. We know not whether Luke remained at Philippi. The next six years of his life are a blank in our records. At the end of that period he is found again (Act 20:6) at Philippi.

After the lapse of five years, spent chiefly at Corinth and Ephesus, Paul, escaping from the incensed worshippers of the Ephesian Diana, passed through Macedonia, A.D. 54, on his way to Greece, accompanied by the Ephesians Tychicus and Trophimus, and probably visited Philippi for the second time, and was there joined by Timothy. His beloved Philippians, free, it seems, from the controversies which agitated other Christian churches, became still dearer to Paul on account of the solace which they afforded him when, emerging from a season of dejection (2Co 7:5), oppressed by weak bodily health, and anxious for the steadfastness of the churches which he had planted in Asia and Achaia, he wrote at Philippi his second Epistle to the Corinthians.

On returning from Greece, unable to take ship there on account of the Jewish plots against his life, he went through Macedonia, seeking a favorable port for embarking. After parting from his companions (Act 20:4), he again found a refuge among his faithful Philippians, where he spent some days at Easter, A.D. 55, with Luke, who accompanied him when he sailed from Neapolis.

Finally, in his Roman captivity (A.D. 57), their care of him revived again. They sent Epaphroditus, bearing their alms for the apostle's support, and ready also to tender his personal service (Php 2:25). He stayed  some time at Rome, and while employed as the organ of communication between the imprisoned apostle and the Christians, and inquirers in and about Rome, he fell dangerously ill. When he was sufficiently recovered, Paul sent him back to the Philippians, to whom he was very dear, and with him our epistle. SEE PHILIPPI.

2. The state of the Church at Rome should be considered before entering on the study of the Epistle to the Philippians. Something is to be learned of its condition about A.D. 55 from the Epistle to the Romans, and more about A.D. 58 from Acts 28. Possibly the Gospel was planted there by some who themselves received the seed on the day of Pentecost (Acts ii, 10). The converts were drawn chiefly from Gentile proselytes to Judaism, partly also from Jews who were such by birth, with possibly a few converts direct from heathenism. In A.D. 55 this Church was already eminent for its faith and obedience: it was exposed to the machinations of schismatical teachers; and it included two conflicting parties, the one insisting more or less on observing the Jewish law in addition to faith in Christ as necessary to salvation, the other repudiating outward observances even to the extent of depriving their weak brethren of such as to them might be really edifying. We cannot gather from the Acts whether the whole Church of Rome had then accepted the teaching of Paul as conveyed in his epistle to them. But it is certain that when he had been two years in Rome, his oral teaching was partly rejected by a party which perhaps may have been connected with the former of those above mentioned. Paul's presence in Rome, the freedom of speech allowed to him, and the personal freedom of his fellow-laborers were the means of infusing fresh missionary activity into the Church (Php 1:12-14). It was in the work of Christ that Epaphroditus was worn out (Php 2:30). Messages and letters passed between the apostle and distant churches; and doubtless churches near to Rome, and both members of the Church and inquirers into the new faith at Rome addressed themselves to the apostle, and to those who were known to be in constant personal communication with him. Thus in his bondage he was a cause of the advancement of the Gospel. From his prison, as from a centre, light streamed into Caesar's household and far beyond (Php 4:22; Php 1:12-19). SEE ROME.

IV. Efect of the Epistle. — We have no account of the reception of this epistle by the Philippians. Except doubtful traditions that Erastus was their first bishop, and that he with Lydia and Parmenas was martyred in their city, nothing is recorded of them for the next fortynine years. But about  A.D. 107 Philippi was visited by Ignatius, who was conducted through Neapolis and Philippi, and across Macedonia, on his way to martyrdom at Rome. His visit was speedily followed by the arrival of a letter from Polycarp of Smyrna, which accompanied, in compliance with a characteristic request of the warm-hearted Philippians, a copy of all the letters of Ignatius that were in the possession of the Church of Smvrna. It is interesting to compare the Philippians of A.D. 58, as drawn by Paul, with their successors in A.D. 107 as drawn by the disciple of John. Steadfastness in the faith, and a joyful sympathy with sufferers for Christ's sake, seem to have distinguished them at both periods (Php 1:5, and Polyc. Ephesians 1). The character of their religion was the same throughout, practical and emotional rather than speculative: in both epistles there are many practical suggestions, much interchange of feeling. and an absence of doctrinal discussion. The Old Testament is scarcely, if at all, quoted; as if the Philippian Christians had been gathered for the most part directly from the heathen. At each period false teachers were seeking, apparently in vain, an entrance into the Philippian Church, first Judaizing Christians, seemingly putting out of sight the resurrection and the judgment which afterwards the Gnosticizing Christians openly denied (Philippians 3, and Polyc. 6, 7). At both periods the same tendency to petty internal quarrels seems to prevail (Php 1:27; Php 2:14; Php 4:2; and Polyc. 2:4, 5:12). The student of ecclesiastical history will observe the faintly marked organization of bishops, deacons, and female coadjutors to which Paul refers (Php 1:1; Php 4:3), developed afterwards into broadly distinguished priests, deacons, widows, and virgins (Polyc. 4, 5, 6). Though the Macedonian churches in general were poor, at least as compared with commercial Corinth (2Co 8:2), yet their gold-mines probably exempted the Philippians from the common lot of their neighbors, and at first enabled them to be conspicuously liberal in alms-giving, and afterwards laid them open to strong warnings against the love of money (Php 4:15; 2Co 8:3; and Polyc. 4, 6, 11).

Now though we cannot trace the immediate effect of Paul's epistle on the Philippians, yet no one can doubt that it contributed to form the character of their Church, as it was in the time of Polycarp. It is evident from Polycarp's epistle that the Church, by the grace of God and the guidance of the apostle, had passed through those trials of which Paul warned it, and had not gone back from the high degree of Christian attainments which it reached under Paul's oral and written teaching (Polyc. 1, 3, 9, 11). If it had  made no great advance in knowledge, still unsound teachers were kept at a distance from its members. Their sympathy with martyrs and confessors glowed with as warm a flame as ever, whether it was claimed by Ignatius or by Paul. They maintained their ground with meek firmness among the heathen, and still held forth the light of an exemplary though not a perfect Christian life.

V. Scope and Contents of the Epistle. — Paul's aim in writing is plainly this: while acknowledging the alms of the Philippians and the personal services of their messenger, to give them some information respecting his own condition, and some advice respecting theirs. Perhaps the intensity of his feelings and the distraction of his prison prevented the following out his plan with undeviating closeness. For the preparations for the departure of Epaphroditus, and the thought that he would soon arrive among the warm- hearted Philippians, filled Paul with recollections of them, and revived his old feelings towards those fellow-heirs of his hope of glory who were so deep in his heart (Php 1:7) and so often in his prayers (Php 1:4).

Full of gratitude for this work of friendly remembrance and regard, Paul addressed to the Church in Philippi this epistle, in which, besides expressing his thanks for their kindness, he pours out a flood of eloquence and pathetic exhortation, suggested partly by his own circumstances, and partly by what he had learned of their state as a Church. That state appears to have been on the whole very prosperous, as there is much commendation of the Philippians in the epistle, and no censure is expressed in any part of it either of the Church as a whole, or of any individuals connected with it. At the same time the apostle deemed it necessary to put them on their guard against the evil influences to which they were exposed from Judaizing teachers and false professors of Christianity. These cautions he interposes between the exhortations suggested by his own state, and by the news he had received concerning the Philippians, with which his epistle commences and with which it closes. We may thus divide the epistle into three parts. In the first of these (Php 1:2), after the usual salutation and an outpouring of warm-hearted affection towards the Philippian Church (Php 1:1-11), the apostle refers to his own condition as a prisoner at Rome; and, lest they should be cast down at the thought of the unmerited indignities he had been called upon to suffer, he assures them that these had turned out rather to the furtherance of that great cause on which his heart was set, and for which he was willing to live  and labor, though, as respected his personal feelings, he would rather depart and be with Christ, which he deemed to be “far better" (Php 1:12-24). He then passes by an easy transition to a hortatory address to the Philippians, calling upon them to maintain steadfastly their profession, to cultivate humanity and brotherly love; to work out their own salvation with fear and trembling, and concluding by an appeal to their regard for his reputation as an apostle, which could not but be affected by their conduct, and a reference to his reason for sending to them Epaphroditus instead of Timothy, as he had originally designed (Php 1:25; Php 2:30). In part second he strenuously cautions them, as already observed, against Judaizing teachers, whom he stigmatizes as "dogs" (in reference, probably, to their impudent, snarling, and quarrelsome habits), "evil-workers," and "the concision;" by which latter term he means to intimate, as Theophylact remarks (ad loc.), that the circumcision in which the Jews so much gloried had now ceased to possess any spiritual significance, and was therefore no better than a useless mutilation of the person. On this theme he enlarges, making reference to his own standing as a Jew, and intimating that, if under the Christian dispensation Jewish descent and Jewish privileges were to go for anything, no one could have stronger claims on this ground than he; but at the same time declaring that however he had once valued these, he now counted them "all but loss for the excellency of the knowledge of Christ" (Php 3:1-12). A reference to his own sanctified ambition to advance in the service of Christ leads him to exhort the Philippians to a similar spirit; from this he passes to caution tjaem against unnecessary contention, and against those who walk disorderly, concluding by reminding them of the glorious hopes which, as Christians, they entertained (Php 3:13-21). In the third part we have a series of admonitions to individual members of the Church at Philippi (Php 4:1-3), followed by some general exhortations to cheerfulness, moderation, prayer, and good conduct (Php 4:4-9); after which come a series of allusions to the apostle's circumstances and feelings, his thanks to the Philippians for their seasonable aid, and his concluding benedictions and salutations (Php 4:10-23).

VI. Characteristic Features of the Epistle. — Strangely full of joy and thanksgiving amid adversity, like the apostle's midnight hymn from the depth of his Philippian dungeon, this epistle went forth from his prison at Rome. In most other epistles he writes with a sustained effort to instruct, or with sorrow, or with indignation; he is striving to supply imperfect, or to  correct erroneous teaching, to put down scandalous impurity, or to heal schism in the Church which he addresses. But in this epistle, though he knew the Philippians intimately, and was not blind to the faults and tendencies to fault of some of them, yet he mentions no evil so characteristic of the whole Church as to call for general censure on his part or amendment on theirs. Of all his epistles to churches, none has so little of an official character as this. He withholds his title of “apostle" in the inscription. We lose sight of his high authority, and of the subordinate position of the worshippers by the river-side; and we are admitted to see the free action of a heart glowing with inspired Christian love, and to hear the utterance of the highest friendship addressed to equal friends conscious of a connection which is not earthly and temporal, but in Christ, for eternity. Who that bears in mind the condition of Paul in his Roman prison can read unmoved of his continual pravers for his distant friends, his constant sense of their fellowship with him, his joyful remembrance of their past Christian course, his confidence in their future, his tender yearning after them all in Christ, his eagerness to communicate to them his own circumstances arid feelings, his carefulness to prepare them to repel any evil from within or from without which might dim the brightness of their spiritual graces? Love, at once tender and watchful — that love which "is of God" — is the key-note of this epistle; and in this epistle only we hear no undertone of any different feeling. Just enough, and no more, is shown of his own harassing trials to let us see how deep in his heart was the spring of that feeling, and how he was refreshed by its sweet and soothing flow.

VII. Commentaries. — The following are the exegetical helps specially on this entire epistle; a few of the most important are indicated by an asterisk (\*) prefixed: Vietorinus, In Ep. ad Ph. (in Mai, Script. Vet. III, 1:51; Pseudo-Hieronymus, Commentarii (in Opp. [Suppos.], 11:1011); Chrysostom, Homiliae (Gr. et Lat. in Opp. 11:208; also in Erasmi Opp. 8:319; in Engl. [including other epistles] in Lib. of Fathers, 14, Oxf. 1843, 8vo); Zwingli, Annotationes (Tigur. 1531, 4to; also in Opp. 4:504); Hoffmann, Commentarius (Basil. 1541,8vo); Brenz, Explicatio (Franc. 1548, 8vo; also in Opp. 7); Calvin, Commentarii (in Opp. often; separately in Engl. by Becket, Lond. 1584, fol.; by Johnston [includ. Colossians], Edinb. 1842, 12mo; by Pringle [includ. Colossians and Thessalonians], Edinb. 1851, 8vo); Major, Enarratio [includ. Colossians and Thessalonians] (Vitemb. 1554, 1561, 8vo); Ridley, Exposition (in  Richmond's Fathers, 2); Weller, Commentaries [includ. Thessalonians] (Norib. 1561, 8vo); Salbont, Commentarii [includ. other epistles] (Antw. 1561, 8vo; also in Opp. Colossians Agr. 1568, fol.); Musculus, Commentarius [includ. Colossians, Thessalonians, and 1 Timothy] (Basil. 1565, 1578, 1595, fol.); Aretius, Commentarii [includ. Colossians and Thessalonians] (Morg. 1580, 8vo); Olevian, Notae [includ. Colossians] (Genesis 1580, 8vo); Steuart (Roman Cath.), Commentarius (Ingolst. 1595, 4to); Zanchius, Commentarius [includ. Colossians and Thessalonians] (Neost. 1595, fol.; also in Opp. 6); Weinrich, Explicatio (Lips. 1615, 4to); Airay, Lectures (Lond. 1618, 4to); Battus, Commentarius (Rost. 1627, 4to); Velasquez (Rom. Cath.), Commentarii (Lugd. 1628-32; Antw. 1637, 1651; Ven. 1646, 2 volumes, fol.); Schotan, Commentaria (Franeck. 1637, 4to); Crell, Commentarius (in Opp. 1:501); Meelfuhr, Commentationes (Altorf, 1641, 4to); Cocceius, Commentarius (in Opp. 5); Daille, Exposition (2d ed. Genesis 1659-60, 2 volumes, 8vo; in English by Sherman, Lond. 1841, 8vo); Scheid, Disputationes (Argent. 1668, 4to); Breithaupt, Animadversiones (Hol. 1693, 1703, 4to); Hazevoet, Verklaaring (Leyd. 1718, 4to); Van Til, Verklaaring ([includ. Romans] Harlem, 1721. 4to; in Lat. [includ. 1 Corinthians, Ephesians, and Colossians] Amst. 1726, 4to); Busching, Introductio (Hal. 1746, 4to) ; Storr. Diss. exegetica (Tub. 1783, 4to; also in Opusc. 1:301-67); Am Ende, Annotationes (fasc. 1, 2, Torg. 1789-92; Viteb. 1798-1803, 8vo); Paulus, De tempore, etc. (Jen. 1799, 4to); Lang, Bearbeit. (Nuremb. and Alt. 1800, 8vo); Krause, An diversis hom. script., etc. (Regiom. 1811, 4to; also in Opusc. pages 1-22); Hoog, De Philip. conditione (L.B. 1825, 8vo); \*Rheinwald, Commentar (Berl. 1827, 8vo); Acaster, Lectures (Lond. 1827, 8vo); Rettig, Quaestiones (Giess. 1831, 8vo); Schinz, D. Christl. Gemeine zu Phil. (Zur. 1833, 8vo); Eastburn, Lectures (N.Y. 1833, 8vo); Passavant, Auslegung (Basle, 1834, 8vo); Baynes, Commentary (Lond. 1834, 12mo); Matthies, Erklad. (Greifsw. 1835, 8vo); \*Steiger, Exegese [includ. Colossians] (Par. 1837, 8vo); \*Van Hengel, Commentarius (L.B. 1838, 8vo); Holemann, Commentarii (Lips. 1839, 8vo) ; Anon., Erklar. (Hanov. 1839, 8vo); Neat, Discourses (Lond. 1841, 8vo); Rilliet, Commentaire (Genesis and Par. 1841, 8vo); Hall, Exposition (Lond. 1843, 8vo); Neander, Erlauf. (Berl. 1849, 8vo; in Engl. by Mrs. Conant, N.Y. 1851, 12mo); Robertson, Lectures (Lond. 1849, 12mo); B. Crusius, Commentar (Jen. 1849, 8vo); Kohler, Auslegung (Kiel, 1855, 8vo); Toller, Discourses (Lond. 1855, 12mo); \*Weiss, Auslegung (Berl. 1858, 8vo); \*Ellicott, Commentary [includ. Colossians and Philemon] (Lond. 1858,  8vo); Jatho, Erklar. (Hildesh. 1858, 8vo); \*Eadie, Commentary (Lond. 1858, 1861, 8vo); Shulte, Commentary (Lond. 1861, 8vo); Schenkel, Erlaut. [includ. Ephesians and Colossians] (Leipz. 1862, 8vo); Newland, Catena (Lond. 1862, 8vo); Vaughan, Lectures (2d ed. Lond. 1864, 8vo); Todd, Expositions (Lond. 1864, 8vo); \*Lightfoot, Commentary (Lond. 1868, 1870, 8vo); Johnstone, Lectures (Lond. 1875, 8vo). SEE EPISTLE.

## Philippine Islands[[@Headword:Philippine Islands]]

             situated in 50 30'-19° 42' N. lat., and 1170 14'-1260 4' E. long., in the great Indian Archipelago, to the north of Borneo and Celebes, are more than twelve hundred in number, and have an area of about 150,000 square miles. The population is over 6,000,000, three fourths of whom are subject to Spain. The remainder are governed, according to their own laws and customs, by independent native princes. Luzon, in the north, has an area of 51,300 square miles, and Mindlanao, or Magindanao, in the south, fully 25,000. The islands lying between Luzon and Mindanao are called the Bisayas, the largest of which are: Samar, area 13,020 square miles; Mindoro, 12,600; Panay, 11,340; Leyte, 10,080; Negros, 6300; Masbate, 4200; and Zebu, 2352. There are upwards of a thousand lesser islands of which little is known. To the south-west of the Bisayas lies the long, narrow island of Paragoa or Palawan, formed of a mountain-chain with low coast-lines, cut with numerous streams, and exceedingly fertile. The folests abound in ebony, logwood, gum-trees, and bamboos. To the north of Luzon lie the Batanen, Bashee, and Babuyan islands, the first two groups having about 8000 inhabitants, the last unpeopled. The Sooloo Islands form a long chain from Mindanao to Borneo, having the same mountainous and volcanic structure as the Philippine Islands, and all are probably fragments of a submerged continent. Many active volcanoes are scattered through the islands; Mayon, in Luzon, and Buhayan, in Mindanao, often causing great devastation. The mountain-chains run north and south, and never attain a greater elevation than 7000 feet. The islands have many rivers, the coasts are indented with deep bays, and there are many lakes in the interior. Earthquakes are frequent and destructive.

The soil is extremely fertile, except where extensive marshes occur. In Mindanao are numerous lakes, which expand during the rainy season into inland seas. Rain may be expected from May to December, and from June to November the land is flooded. Violent hurricanes are experienced in the north of Luzon and west coast of Mindanao. Especially during the changes of the monsoons, storms of wind, rain, thunder and lightning prevail. The weather is very fine, and  heat moderate, from December to May, when the temperature rapidly rises and becomes oppressive, except ibr a short time after a fall of rain. The fertility of the soil and the humid atmosphere produce a richness of vegetation which is nowhere surpassed. Blossoms and fruit hang together on the trees, and the cultivated fields yield a constant succession of crops. Immense forests spread over the Philippine Islands, clothing the mountains to their summits; ebony, iron-wood, cedar, sapanwood, gum-trees, etc., being laced together and garlanded by the bush-rope or palasan, which attains a length of several hundred feet. The variety of fruittrees is great, including the orange, citron, bread-fruit, mango, cocoa-nut, guava, tamarind, rose-apple, etc.; other important products of the vegetable kingdom being the banana, plantain, pine-apple, sugar-cane, cotton, tobacco, indigo, coffee, cocoa, cinnamon, vanilla, cassia, the areca-nut, ginger, pepper, etc., with rice, wheat, maize, and various other cereals. Gold is found in river-beds and detrital deposits, being used, in the form of dust, as the medium of exchange in Mindanao. Iron is plentiful, and fine coal-beds, from one to four feet thick, have been found. Copper has long been worked in Luzon. There are also limestone, a fine variegated marble, sulphur in unlimited quantity, quicksilver, vermilion, and saltpetre-the sulphur being found both native and in combination with copper, arsenic, and iron. Except the wild-cat, beasts of prey are unknown. There are oxen, buffaloes, sheep, goats, swine, harts, squirrels, and a great variety of monkeys. The jungles swarm with lizards, snakes, and other reptiles; the rivers and lakes with crocodiles. Huge spiders, tarantulas, white ants, mosquitoes, and locusts are plagues which form a set-off to the beautiful fireflies, the brilliant queen-beetle (Elater noctilucus), the melody of myriads of birds, the turtle-doves, pheasants, birds-of-paradise, and many lovely species of paroquets, with which the forests are alive. "Hives of wild bees hang from the branches, and alongside of them are the nests of humming-birds dangling in the wind." The caverns along the shores are frequented by the swallow, whose edible nest is esteemed by the Chinese a rich delicacy. Some of them are also tenanted by multitudes of bats of immense size. Buffaloes are used for tillage and draught; a small horse for riding. Fowls are plentiful, and incredible numbers of ducks are artificially hatched. Fish is in great abundance and variety. Mother-omfpearl, coral, amber, and tortoise-shell are important articles of commerce. The principal exports are sugar, tobacco, cigars, indigo, Manilla hemp, coffee, rice, dyewoods, hides, gold-dust, and beeswax.  Native Population. — The Tagals and Bisayans are the most numerous native races. They dwell in the cities and cultivated lowlands; 2,500,000 being converts to Roman Catholicism, and a considerable number, especially of the Bisayans, Mohammedan. The mountain districts are inhabited by a negro race, who, in features, stature, and savage mode of living, closely resemble the Alfoors of the interior of Papua, and are probably the aborigines driven back before the inroads of the Malays. A few of the negroes are Christian, but they are chiefly idolaters, or without any manifest form of religion, and roaming about in families, without fixed dwelling. The Mestizos form an influential part of the population; by their activity engrossing the greatest share of the trade. These are mostly of Chinese fathers and native mothers.

The leading mercantile houses are English and American. British and American merchants enjoy the largest share of the business, the exports to Great Britain being upwards of £1,500,000 sterling yearly, and the imports thence nearly of the same value. There are seven British houses established at Manilla, and one at Iloilo, in the populous and productive island of Panay, which is the centre of an increasing trade. The total exports and imports of the Philippine Islands have a value of about £6,000,000 yearly. The Chinese exercise various trades and callings, remaining only for a time, and never bringing their wives with them. The principal languages are the Tagalese and Bisayan. Rice, sweet potatoes, fish, flesh, and fruits form the food of the Tagals and Bisayans, who usually drink only water, though sometimes indulging in cocoa-wine. Tobacco is used by all. They are gentle, hospitable, fond of dancing and cock-fighting. Education is far behind; it is similar to what it was in Europe during the Middle Ages. It is entirely under the control of the Romish priesthood, who are governed by an archbishop (of Manilla), and the bishops of New Segovia, Nueva Caceres, and Zebu. Religious processions are the pride of the people, and are formed with great parade, thousands of persons carrying wax-candles, etc.

The Sooloo Islands have a population of 150,000; are governed by a sultan, whose capital is Sung, in 6° 1' N. lat., and 120° 55' 51" E. long., who also rules over the greatest part of Paragoa, the northern corner only being subject to Spain. Luzon has a population of 2,500,000, one fifth part being independent; the Bisaya Islands, 2,000,000, of whom three fourths are under Spanish rule. The population of Panay amounts to 750,000, and that of Zebu to 150,000. Of the numbers in Mindanao nothing is known; the  districts of Zamboanga, Misamis, and Caragan, with 100,000 inhabitants, being all that is subject to Spain. The greater part of the island is under the sultan of Mindanao, resident at Selanga, in 70 9' N. lat., and 1240 38' E. long., who, with his feudatory chiefs, can bring together an army of 100,000 men. He is on friendly terms with the Spaniards. Besides Manilla, there are very many large and important cities, especially in Luzon, Panay, and Zebu. The great centers of trade are Manilla, in Luzon, and Iloilo, in Panay. The Philippine Islands were discovered in 1521 by Magellan, who, after visiting Mindanao, sailed to Zebu, where, taking part with the king in a war, he was wounded, and died at Mactan April 26, 1521. Some years later the Spanish court sent an expedition under Villabos, who named the islands in honor of the prince of Asturias, afterwards Philip II. For some time the chief Spanish settlement was on Zebu; but in 1581 Manilla was built, and has since continued to be the seat of government. See Semper, Die Philippinen u. ihre Bewohner (Wurzb. 1869); and his Reisen inm Archipel der Philippinen (Leips. 1867-73, 8 volumes, 8vo); Earl, Papuans, chapter 7; Academy, August 15, 1873, page 311.

## Philippins[[@Headword:Philippins]]

             a small Russian sect, so called from the founder, Philip Pustoswiat, under whose leadership they emigrated from Russia to Livonia near the beginning of the 18th century, are a branch of the Raskolniks (q.v.). They call themselves Starowerski, or "Old-Faith Men," because they cling with the utmost tenacity to the old service-books, the old version of the Bible, and the old hymn and prayer books of the Russo-Greek Church, in the exact form in which those books stood before the revision which they underwent at the hands of the patriarch Nikon (q.v.) near the middle of the 17th century. There are two classes of the Raskolniks — one which recognizes popes (or priests); the other, which admits no priest or other clerical functionary. The Philippins are of the latter class; and they not only themselves refuse all priestly ministrations, but they regard all such ministrations — baptism, marriage, sacraments — as invalid: and they rebaptize all who join their sect from other Russian communities. All their own ministerial offices are discharged by the Starik, or parish elder, who for the time takes the title of pope, and is required to observe celibacy. But the preaching is permitted to any one who feels himself "called by the Spirit" to undertake it. Among the Philippins the spirit of fanaticism at times has run to the wildest excesses. They refuse oaths, and decline to enter military service; and it Was on this account and like incompatibilities that they were forced to emigrate, under the leadership of Philip Pustoswiat, "the saint of the Desert." They are now settled partly in Polish Lithuania, partly in East Prussia, where they have several small settlements with churches of their own rite. They are reported to be a peaceable and orderly race. Their principal pursuit is agriculture; and their thrifty and industrious habits have secured for them the good-will of the land- proprietors as well as of the government.

They are sometimes called Bruleurs, or Tueurs, from their tendency to suicide, which they consider meritorious, and which they accordingly court, sometimes burying themselves alive, sometimes starving themselves to death. Accusations of laxity of morals have been brought against them, of renouncing marriage, and living in spiritual brotherhood and sisterhood, the truth of which has never been clearly established; for when the empress Anne (A.D. 1730-1740) seat commissioners to inquire into the state of their monasteries, they shut themselves up, and burned themselves alive  within their own walls, rather than give any evidence on the subject. See Platon, Greek Church (see Index). (J.H.W.)

## Philippists[[@Headword:Philippists]]

             is the name of that sect or party among the Lutherans who were the followers of Philip Melancthon. He had strenuously opposed the Ubiquists, who arose in his time; and the dispute growing still hotter after his death, the University of Wittenberg, who espoused Melancthon's opinion, were called by the Flacians, who attacked it, Philippists. They were strongest in that university, the opposite party controlling the University of Jena. The Philippists were in the end accused of being Calvinists at heart. and were much persecuted by the ultra-Lutheran party. See the different works on the Rebrmnation (q.v.), and the long treatise in Herzog, Real- Encyklopadie, 11:537-546. SEE ADIAPHORISTIC CONTROVERSY; SEE MELANCTHON.

## Philipps, Dirk[[@Headword:Philipps, Dirk]]

             one of the most eminent co-laborers of Simon Menno (q.v.), was born in 1504 at Lenwarden, the capital of Friesland, of Romish parentage. He was carefully and piously reared, and had unusual educational facilities in his time. When the Anabaptists came to Friesland, Philipps, who was then a devoted Romanist, soon became interested in the new doctrines; and after his brother Ubbo, a common mechanic, had embraced the modern teachings and become a preacher, Dirk also found pleasure in them; forsook the Church of Rome, and was rebaptized. As a preacher of the new doctrines he was stationed at Appingadam (Groningen), and contented himself in that position until the Anabaptists advocated the extreme socialistic views. About the year 1534 or 1535 these two brothers came out boldly against the Munster ideas of the Anabaptists, and thus prepared the way for the revolution which Menno shortly after effected. After 1536 the brothers Philipps disappear, and are but little heard of. At the conference of the different Anabaptists held at Buckholt, in Westphalia, they do not seem to have been present. In 1543 we find them at Emden. After that we only meet Dirk now and then, but always in closest intimacy with Menno. Ubbo finally separated from both Dirk and Menno, and took a conciliatory position between the Protestants and Romanists. But Dirk remained true to Menno, and ever after is warmly commended by the great Dutch Reformer and founder of the Quakers of Holland. After the death of  Simon Menno, Dirk was more or less involved, and that unhappily, in the controversies which agitated the Dutch Anabaptists. In 1568 he was at Dantzic, but was so much sought after at home that the sixty-four-years- old man consented to return to Emden. He died there in 1568 or 1570. His many pamphleteering publications have been collected in his Enchiridion, or "Hand-book," among which there is an Apology or Defence of the Anabaptists; a treatise on Christian Marriage, etc. It is the universal testimony of Protestants and Romanists that Dirk Philipps was a very learned man, well versed in the classical languages, and a pulpit orator of the very highest order.

See Gent, Anfang u. Fortgang der Streitigkeiten unter den Taujgesinnten; Blaup. Ten Cate, Gesch. der Taufyesinnten. SEE MENNONITES, and the literature thereto appended. (J.H.W.)

## Philipps, Ubbo[[@Headword:Philipps, Ubbo]]

             SEE PHILIPPS, DIRK.

## Philippsohn, Moses[[@Headword:Philippsohn, Moses]]

             a noted Hebraist, was born May 9, 1775, in Sandersleben, a small town on the Wipper, and was destined for a rabbinate by his parents, who began to initiate him into Hebrew when he was scarcely four years of age. In 1787 he was sent to a rabbinic school at Halberstadt, where he was instructed in the Talmud and other branches of rabbinic literature. He then went to Brunswick, where he devoted himself to the study of the sciences generally, and in particular Hebrew philology, acquiring a most classical and charming style in Hebrew composition. In 1799, when only four-and- twenty, he was appointed master of the noted Jewish school at Dessau, where the celebrated historian Jost and the philosopher Mendelssohn, were educated. Here Philippsohn prosecuted more zealously than ever the study of Hebrew and the Hebrew Scriptures, and determined to continue, with the aid of his three colleagues, the great Bible work commenced by Mendelssohn (q.v.), selecting the minor prophets for their conjoint labor. Philippsohn undertook to translate and expound Hosea and Joel, being the two most difficult books of the twelve minor prophets; his colleague Wolf the translation and exposition of Obadiah, Micah, Habakkuk, and Zephaniah; his colleague Solomon undertook Haggai and Zechariah; while Neuman undertook Amos, Nahum, and Malachi; Jonah having already been published by Liwe (q.v.); and the whole was published under the title  מנחה טהורה, a Pure Offering, at Dessau, in 1805. Three years later Philippsohn published a Hebrew Grammar and Chrestomathy, entitled מודי לבני בינה, Friend of Students (Dessau. 1808; 2d improved ed. ibid. 1823); and a Hebrew Commentary on the Book of Daniel, with a translation by Wolf (ibid. 1808). He also wrote essays on various subjects connected with Hebrew, literature in the Hebrew periodical called המאס. The Gatherer, and died April 20, 1814. See Steinschneider, Cataloqus Libr. Hebr. in Bibliotheca Bodleiana, col. 2099, and the interesting biographical sketch by Dr. Ph. Philippson, in his Biographische Skizzen (Leips. 1864); Jost, Geschichte des Juden. und seiner Sekten (see Index in volume 3).

## Philippus Arabs[[@Headword:Philippus Arabs]]

             SEE PHILIP, EMPEROR.

## Philips (St.) And Jamess (St.) Day[[@Headword:Philips (St.) And Jamess (St.) Day]]

             a festival observed in memory of the apostles Philip and James the Less, on the 1st of May. In the Greek Church the festival of St. Philip is kept on the 14th of November.

## Philips, Edward, M.A[[@Headword:Philips, Edward, M.A]]

             an English divine, was born near the middle of the 16th century. He was entered a student in Broadgate's Hall, now Pembroke College, in 1574; became preacher at St. Saviour's. Southwark, London, and died about 1603. He was a Calvinist, and esteemed "a person zealous of the truth of God, earnest in his calling, faithful in his message, powerful in his speech, careful of his flock, peaceable and blameless in his life, and comfortable and constant in his death." His published sermons are entitled, Certaine Godly and Learned Sermons, Preached by that worthy Servant of Christ in St. Saviour's, in Southwark; and were taken by the pen of H. Yelverton, of Gray's Inn, Gentleman (Lond. 1607, 4to).

## Philips, Thomas[[@Headword:Philips, Thomas]]

             a Roman Catholic divine, was born of Protestant parentage at Ickford, in Buckinghamshire; received his education at St. Omer's, and there became a zealous Romanist. He entered into orders, and became a Jesuit, but quitted that society, and obtained a prebend in the collegiate church of Tongres, with a dispensation to reside in England. He was the author of The Study of Sacred Literature Stated and Considered (Lond. 1758, 8vo); and The Life of Cardinal Pole (Oxf. 1764-67, 2 volumes). He died at Liege in 1774. Philips was a man of eminent piety, and a writer of considerable ability.

## Philistia[[@Headword:Philistia]]

             (Heb. Pele'sheth, פְּלֶשֶׁת, signif. doubtful [see below]; Sept. ἀλλόφυλοι), the land of the Philistines, as it is usually styled in prose (Gen 21:32-33; Exo 13:17; 1Sa 27:1; 1Sa 27:7; 1Sa 29:11; 1Ki 4:21; 2Ki 8:2-3). This term is rendered in our version sometimes "Palestina," as in Exo 15:14, and Isa 14:29; Isa 14:31; and "Palestine" in Joe 3:4; but "Philistia" in Psa 60:8; Psa 87:4; and Psa 108:9; and "Philistines" in Psa 83:7. "Palestine" originally meant nothing but the district inhabited by the "Philistines," who are called by Josephus Παλαιστῖνοι, "Palaestines" (Ant. 5:1, 8). In fact the two words are the same, and the difference in their present form is but the result of gradual corruption. The form Philistia does not occur anywhere in the Sept. or Vulgate. In Exo 15:14 this word (Pelesheth) is used along with Canaan, and as distinct from it; in Joe 3:4 its "coasts" are referred to (for it was a littoral territory), and are coupled with Tyre and Sidon as having sold into slavery the children of Judah and Jerusalem, and carried off silver and gold from the Temple; and in Isa 14:29-31 it is told not to congratulate itself on the death of Ahaz, who had smitten it. In Psa 60:8; Psa 83:7; Psa 87:4; Psa 108:9, it is classed among countries hostile to Israel. The word therefore uniformly in Scripture denotes the territory of the Philistines — though it came at length to signify in common speech the entire country — the Holy Land. Philistia is probably the country vaguely referred to by Herodotus as Συρίη Παλαιστίνα — for he describes it as lying on the sea-coast (7:89).

The name is specially attached to Southern Syria by Strabo (16), Pomp. Mela (1:11), and Pliny (Hist. Nat. 5:12). The broader signification of the term arose by degrees. Josephus apparently uses it in both meanings (Ant. 1:6, 2. 4; 8:10, 3). Philo says of Palestine, ἡ τότε προσηγορεύετο Χαναναίων, and Jerome says, "Terra Judaea quae nunc appellatur Palaestina" (see Reland, Palcest. chapter 1, 7, 8). In the Talmud and the Arabic it likewise denotes the whole land of the Jews. SEE PALESTINE.  The name itself has given rise to various conjectures. Hitzig identifies the Philistines with Πελασγοί, and supposes the word, after the Sanscrit Valaksha, to denote the white races, as opposed to the Phoenician or dusky races (see Kenrick, Phean. pages 50, 52). Redslob makes it a transposition of the name of their country, שְׁפְלָה, Shephelah, the low country (A.V. "valley" or "plain"). Knobel, Gesenius, Movers, and Roth take it from the root פָּלִשׁ, "to emigrate" — of which Α᾿λλόφυλοι is supposed to be a translation. Furst substantially agrees with this etymology, from the same Heb. root, in the sense of breaking through, i.e., "wandering." Stark regards this Greek term as opposed to ὁ μόφυλος, "of the same race" (Gaza, page 67); and Von Lengerke looks upon it as a playful transposition of Φυλιστιείμ. Α᾿λλόφυλοι seems, in later Greek, to denote a foreign race living in a country among its natives. Thus Polybius gives the name to the forces of Hannibal located in Gaul and Italy (3:61). The Sept. has in this way given it to a race that lived in a country which God had conferred in promise on the Hebrew people. The same name is for a like reason given to the population of Galilee (1Ma 5:15).

Philistia proper was a long and somewhat broad strip of land lying on the sea-coast, west of the hills of Ephraim and Judah, and stretching generally from Egypt to Phoenicia. The northern portion of this territory, from Joppa nearly as far as Ashkelon, was allotted to Dan; and the southern portion, from Ashkelon to the wilderness of Tih, and extending east to Beersheba, was assigned to Judah. In short, it comprised the southern coast and plain of Canaan, along the Mediterranean, hence called " the sea of the Philistines" (Exo 23:31), from Ekron to the border of Egypt; though at certain times the Philistines had also in possession large portions of the interior (Psa 60:7; Psa 87:4; Psa 108:10; 1Sa 31:8; 1Ki 15:27; Psa 83:7). The land of the Philistines partakes of the general desolation common to it with Judaea and other neighboring states. According to Volney, except the immediate environs of a few villages, the whole country is a desert abandoned to the Bedawin Arabs who feed their flocks on it (Zep 2:4-7). SEE PHILISTINE.

## Philistim[[@Headword:Philistim]]

             (Gen 10:14). SEE PHILISTINE.

## Philistine[[@Headword:Philistine]]

             (Heb. Pelishti', פְּלַשְׁתַּי., gentile from פְּלֵשֵׁת, Philistia; Sept. ἀλλόφυλος, but sometimes Φυλιστιείμ for the plur., which is the usual form; A.V. once "Philistim," Gen 10:14; Josephus, Παλαίστινοι, Anf. 5:1, 18), a race of aboriginal Canaanites inhabiting the land of Philistia (q.v.). The following article combines the Scripture information with that from other sources.

I. Early History. —

1. The origin of the Philistines is nowhere expressly stated in the Bible; but since the prophets describe them as "the Philistines from Caphtor" (Amo 9:7), and “the remnant of the maritime district of Caphtor" (Jer 47:4), it is prima facie probable that they were the "Caphtorims which came out of Caphtor" who expelled the Avim from their territory and occupied it in their place (Deu 2:23), and that these again were the Caphtorim mentioned in the Mosaic genealogical table among the descendants of Mizraim (Gen 10:14). But in establishing this conclusion certain difficulties present themselves: in the first place, it is observable that in Gen 10:14 the Philistines are connected with the Casluhim rather than the Caphtorim. It has generally been assumed that the text has suffered a transposition, and that the parenthetical clause "out of whom came Philistim" ought to follow the words "and Caphtorim." This explanation is, however, inadmissible; for (1) there is no external evidence whatever of any variation in the text, either here or in the parallel passage in 1Ch 1:12; and (2) if the transposition were effected, the desired sense would -not be gained; for the words rendered in the A.V. "out of whom" (אֲשֶׁר מַשָּׁם) really mean "whence," and denote a local movement rather than a genealogical descent, so that, as applied to the Caphtorim, they would merely indicate a sojourn of the Philistines in their land, and not the identity of the two races. The clause seems to have an appropriate meaning in its present position: it looks like an interpolation into the original document with the view of explaining when and where the name Philistine was first applied to the people whose proper appellation was Caphtorim. It is an etymological as well as a historical memorandum; for it is based on the meaning of the name Philistine (from the root פָּלִשׁ=the Ethiopic falasa, "to migrate;" a term which is said to be still current in Abvssinia [Knobel. Vilkert. page  281], and which on the Egyptian monuments appears under the form of Pulost [Brugsch. Hist. d'Egypt. page 187]), viz. "emigrant," and is designed to account for the application of that name. But a second and more serious difficulty arises out of the language of the Philistines; for while the Caphtorim were Hamitic, the Philistine language is held to have been Shemitic. (Hitzig, in his Urgeschichte d. Phil., however, maintains that the language is Indo-European, with a view to prove the Philistines to be Pelasgi. He is, we believe, singular in his view.) It has hence been inferred that the Philistines were in reality a Shemitic race, and that they derived the title of Caphtorim simply from a residence in Caphtor (Ewald, 1:331; Movers, Phoniz. 3:258), and it has been noticed in confirmation of this that their land is termed Canaan (Zep 2:5). Blut this seems to be inconsistent with the express assertion of the Bible that they were Caphtorim (Deu 2:23), and not simply that they came from Caphtor; and the term Canaan is applied to their country, not ethnologically but etymologically, to describe the trading habits of the Philistines. The difficulty arising out of the question of language has been met by assuming either that the Caphtorim adopted the language of the conquered Avim (a not unusual circumstance where the conquered form the bulk of the population), or that they diverged from the Hamitic stock at a period when the distinctive features of Hamitism and Shemitism were yet in embryo. (See below.) A third objection to their Egyptian origin is raised from the application of the term "uncircumcised" to them (1Sa 17:26; 2Sa 1:20), whereas the Egyptians were circumcised (Herod. 2:36). But this objection is answered bv Jer 9:25-26, where the same term is in some sense applied to the Egyptians, however it may be reconciled with the statement of Herodotus. SEE CAPHTOR

There is additional evidence to the above that the Philistines belonged to the Shemitic family. The names of their cities and their proper names are of Shemitic origin. In their intercourse with the Israelites there are many intimations that the two used a common language. How is this, if they were immigrants in Palestine? This difficulty is removed by supposing that originally they were in Palestine, being a part of the great Shemitic family, went westward, under pressure from the wave of population which came down from the higher country to the sea-coast, but afterwards returned eastward, back from Crete to Palestine; so that in Amo 9:7 it is to be understood that God brought them up to Palestine, as he brought the Israelites out of Egypt-back to their home. This view the passage  undoubtedly admits; but we cannot agree with Movers in holding that it gives direct evidence in its favor, though his general position is probably correct, that the Philistines first quitted the mainland for the neighboring islands of the Mediterranean sea, and then, after a time, returned to their original home (Movers, pages 19, 29, 35). Greek writers, however, give evidence of a wide diffusion of the Shemitic race over the islands of the Mediterranean.

Thucydides says (1:8) that most of the islands were inhabited by Carians and Phoenicians. Of Crete, Herodotus (1:173) declares that barbarians had, before Minos, formed the population ofthe island. There is evidence in Homer to the same effect (Od. 9:174; comp. Strabo, page 475). Many proofs offer themselves that, before the spread of the Hellenes. these islands were inhabited by Shemitic races. The worship observed in them at this time shows a Shemitic origin. The Shemitics gave place to the Hellenics-a change which dates from the time of Minos, who drove them out of the islands, giving the dominion to his son. The expelled population settled on the Asiatic coast. This evidence, derived from heathen sources, gives a representation which agrees with the scriptural account of the origin, the westerly wandering, and eastward return of the Philistines. But chronology creates a difficulty. Minos probably lived about the year B.C. 1300. According to the O.T. the Philistines were found in Palestine at an earlier period. In Gen 20:2; Gen 26:1, we find a Philistine king of Gerar. But this king (and others) may have been so termed, not because he was of Philistine blood, but because he dwelt in the land which was afterwards called Philistia. There are other considerations which seem to show that Philistines did not occupy this country in the days of Abraham (consult Bertheau, page 196). It is, however, certain that the Philistines existed in Palestine in the time of Moses'as a brave and warlike people (Exo 13:17) — a fact which places them on the Asiatic continent long before Minos. This difficulty does not appear considerable to us. There may have been a return eastwards before the time of Minos, as well as one in his time; or he may have merely put the finishing stroke to a return commenced, from some cause or other — war, over-population, etc. — at a much earlier period. The information found in the Bible is easily understood on the showing that in the earliest ages tribes of the Shemitic race spread themselves over the West, and, becoming inhabitants of the islands, gave themselves to navigation. To these tribes the Philistines appear to have belonged, who, for what reason we know not, left Crete, and settled on the coast of Palestine.

2. The next question therefore that arises relates to the early movements of the Philistines. It has been very generally assumed of late years that Caphtor represents Crete, and that the Philistines migrated from that island, either directly or through Egypt, into Palestine. This hypothesis presupposes the Shemitic origin of the Philistines; for we believe that there are no traces of Hamitic settlements in Crete, and consequently the Biblical statement that Caphtorim was descended from Mizraim forms an a priori objection to the view. Moreover, the name Caphtor can only be identified with the Egyptian Cotptos. But the Cretan origin of the Philistines has been deduced, not so much from the name Caphtor, as from that of the Cherethites. This name in its Hebrew form (כְּרֵתַי) bears a close resemblance to Crete, and is rendered Cretans in the Sept. A further link between the two terms has apparently been discovered in the term כָּרַי, kari, which is applied to the royal guard (2Ki 11:4; 2Ki 11:19), and which sounds like Carians. The latter of these arguments assumes that the C herethites of David's guard were identical with the Cherethites of the Philistine plain, which appears in the highest degree improbable. See CHERETHITE

With regard to the former argument, the mere coincidence of the names cannot pass for much without some corroborative testimony. The Bible furnishes none, for the name oci curs but thrice (1Sa 30:4; Eze 25:16; Zep 2:5), and apparently applies to the occupants of the southern district; the testimony of the Sept. is invalidated by the fact that it is based upon the mere sound of the word (see Zep 2:6, where keroth is also rendered Crete); and, lastly, we have to account for the introduction of the classical name of the island side by side with the Hebrew term Caphtor. A certain amount of testimony is indeed adduced in favor of a connection between Crete and Philistia; but, with the exception of the vague rumor, recorded but not adopted by Tacitus (Hist. 5:3), the evidence is confined to the town of Gaza, and even in this case is not wholly satisfactory. The town, according to Stephanus Byzantinus (s.v. Γάζα), was termed Minoa, as having been founded by Minos, and this tradition may be traced back to, and was perhaps founded on, an inscription on the coins of that city, containing the letters ΜΕΙΝΩ; but these coins are of no higher date than the 1st century B.C., and belong to a period when Gaza had attained a decided Greek character (Josephus, War, 2:6, 3). Again, the worship of the god Mama, and its identity with the Cretan Jove, are frequently mentioned by early writers (Movers, Phoniz.  1:662); but the name is Phoenician, being the maran," lord," of 1Co 16:22, and it seems more probable that Gaza and Crete derived the worship from a common source, Phoenicia. Without therefore asserting that migrations may not have taken place from Crete to Philistia, we hold that the evidence adduced to prove that they did is not altogether sufficient. What is remarkable, and as if two distinct and unallied peoples bore the same appellation, on a tablet of Rameses III at Medinet HabA is sculptured a naval victory over the Sharutana, perhaps the Cherethites of Crete; while another nation of the same name, perhaps the Cherethites of the mainland, form a portion of the Egyptian army. We find also the name Pulusata in close connection with this Sharutana. SEE CRETE

On the other hand, it has been held by Ewald (1:330) and others that the Cherethites and Pelethites (2Sa 20:23) were Cherethites and Philistines. The objections to this view are:

(1) that it is highly improbable that David would select his officers from the hereditary foes of his country, particularly so immediately after he had enforced their submission;

(2) that there appears no reason why an undue prominence should have been given to the Cherethites by placing that name first, and altering Philistines into Pelethites, so as to produce a paronomasia;

(3) that the names subsequently applied to the same body (2Ki 11:19) are appellatives; and (4) that the terms admit of a probable explanation from Hebrew roots. SEE PELETHITE.

3. A still more important point to be decided in connection with the early history of the Philistines is the time when they settled in the land of Canaan. If we were to restrict ourselves to the statements of the Bible, we should conclude that this took place before the time of Abraham; for they are noticed in his day as a pastoral tribe in the neighborhood of Gerar (Gen 21:32; Gen 21:34; Gen 26:1; Gen 26:8); and this position accords well with the statement in Deu 2:23 that the Avim dwelt in Hazerim, i.e., in nomad encampments; for Gerar lay in the south country, which was just adapted to such a life. At the time of the exodus they were still in the same neighborhood, but grown sufficiently powerful to inspire the Israelites with fear (Exo 13:17; Exo 15:14). When the Israelites arrived, they were in  full possession of the Shephelah from the "river of Egypt" (el-Arish) in the south to Ekron in the north (Jos 15:4; Jos 15:47), and had formed a confederacy of five powerful cities-Gaza, Ashdod, Ashkelon, Gath, and Ekron (Jos 13:3). At what period these cities were originally founded we know not, but there are good grounds for believing that they were of Canaanitish origin, and had previously been occupied by the Avim. The name Gath is certainly Canaanitish; so most probably are Gaza, Ashdod, and Ekron. Ashkelon is doubtful; and the terminations both of this and Ekron may be Philistine. Gaza is mentioned as early as in Gen 10:19 as a city of the Canaanites; and this as well as Ashdod and Ekron was in Joshua's time the asylum of the Canaanitish Anakim (Jos 11:22). The interval that elapsed between Abraham and the exodus seems sufficient to allow for the alteration that took place in the position of the Philistines, and their transformation from a pastoral tribe to a settled and powerful nation. But such a view has not met with acceptance among modern critics, partly because it leaves the migrations of the Philistines wholly unconnected with any known historical event, and partly because it does not serve to explain the great increase of their power in the time of the Judges. To meet these two requirements a double migration on the part of the Philistines, or of the two branches of that nation, has been suggested.

Knobel, for instance, regards the Philistines proper as a branch of the same stock as that to which the Hvksos belonged, and he discovers the name Philistine i;l the opprobrious name Philition or Philitis, bestowed on the Shepherd kings (Herod. 2:128); their first entrance into Canaan from the Casluhim would thus be subsequent to the patriarchal age, and coincident with the expulsion of the Hyksos. The Cherethites he identifies with the Caphtorim who displaced the Avim; and these he regards as Cretans, who did not enter Canaan before the period of the Judges. The former part of his theory is inconsistent with the notices of the Philistines in the book of Genesis; these, therefore, he regards as additions of a later date (Volkert. page 218 sq.). The view adopted by Movers is, that the Philistines were carried westward from Palestine into Lower Egypt by the stream of the Hyksos movement at a period subsequent to Abraham; from Egypt they passed to Crete, and returned to Palestine in the early period of the Judges (Phoniz. 3:258). This is inconsistent with the notices in Joshua. Ewald, in the second edition of his Geschichte, propounds the hypothesis of a double immigration from Crete, the first of which took place in the ante-patriarchal period, as a consequence either of the Canaanitish settlement or of the Hyksos movement, the second in the time of the  Judges (Gesch. 1:329-331). We cannot regard the above views in any other light than as speculations, built up on very slight data, and unsatisfactory, inasmuch as they fail to reconcile the statements of Scripture. For they all imply

(1) that the notice of the Caphtorim in Gen 10:14 applies to an entirely distinct tribe from the Philistines, as Ewald (1:331, note) himself allows;

(2) that either the notices in Genesis 20:26:or those in Jos 15:45-47, or perchance both, are interpolations; and

(3) that the notice in Deu 2:23, which certainly bears marks of high antiquity, belongs to a late date, and refers solely to the Cherethites.

But, beyond these inconsistencies, there are two points which appear to militate against the theory of the second immigration in the time of the Judges:

(1) that the national title of the nation always remained Philistine, whereas, according to these theories, it was the Cretan or Cherethite element which led to the great development of power in the time of the Judges; and

(2) that it remains to be shown why a seafaring race like the Cretans, coming direct from Caphtor in their ships (as Knobel, page 224, understands "Caphtorim from Caphtor" to imply), would seek to occupy the quarters of a nomad race living in encampments, in the wilderness region of the south.

We hesitate, therefore, to endorse any of the proffered explanations, and, while we allow that the Biblical statements are remarkable for their fragmentary and parenthetical nature, we are not prepared to fill up the gaps. If those statements cannot be received as they stand, it is questionable whether any amount of criticism will supply the connecting links. One point can, we think, be satisfactorily shown, viz. that the hypothesis of a second immigration is not needed in order to account for the growth of the Philistine power. Their geographical position and their relations to neighboring nations will account for it. Between the times of Abraham and Joshua the Philistines had changed their quarters, and had advanced northwards into the Shephelah or plain of Philistia. This plain has  been in all ages remarkable for the extreme richness of its soil; its fields of standing corn, its vineyards and olive-yards, are incidentally mentioned in Scripture (Jdg 15:5); and in time of famine the land of the Philistines was the hope of Palestine (2Ki 8:2). We should, however, fail to form a just idea of its capacities from the scanty notices in the Bible. The crops which it yielded were alone sufficient to insure national wealth. It was also adapted to the growth of military power; for while the plain itself permitted the use of war-chariots, which were the chief arm of offence, the occasional elevations which rise out of it offered secure sites for towns and strongholds. It was, moreover, a commercial country; from its position it must have been at all times the great thoroughfare between Phoenicia and Syria in the north, and Egypt and Arabia in the south. Ashdod and Gaza were the keys of Egypt, and commanded the transit trade; and the stores of frankincense and myrrh which Alexander captured in the latter place prove it to have been a depot of Arabian produce (Plutarch, Alex. cap. 25). We have evidence in the Bible that the Philistines traded in slaves with Edom and Southern Arabia (Amo 1:6; Joe 3:3; Joe 3:5), and their commercial character is indicated by the application of the name Canaan to their land (Zep 2:5). They probably possessed a navy; for they had ports attached to Gaza and Ashkelon; the Sept. speaks of their ships in its version of Isa 11:14, and they are represented as attacking the Egyptians out of ships. The Philistines had at an early period attained proficiency in the arts of peace; they were skilful as smiths (1Sa 13:20), as armorers (17, 5, 6), and as builders, if we may judge from the prolonged sieges which several of their towns sustained. Their images and the golden mice and emerods (6:11) imply an acquaintance with the founder's and goldsmith's arts. Their wealth was abundant (Jdg 16:5; Jdg 16:18), and they appear in all respects to have been a prosperous people.

4. Subsequent Extension. — Possessed of such elements of power, the Philistines had attained in the time of the Judges an important position among Eastern nations. Their history is, indeed, almost a blank; yet the few particulars preserved to us are suggestive. About B.C. 1209 we find them engaged in successful war with the Sidonians, the effect of which was so serious to the latter power that it involved the transference of the capital of Phoenicia to a more secure position on the island of Tyre (Justin. 18:3). About the same period, or a little after, they were engaged in a naval war with Rameses III of Egypt, in conjunction with other Mediterranean  nations; in these wars they were unsuccessfil (Brugsch, Hist. d'Egypte, pages 185, 187), but the notice of them proves their importance, and we cannot therefore be surprised that they were able to extend their authority over the Israelites, devoid as these were of internal union, and harassed by external foes. With regard to their tactics and the objects that they had in view in their attacks on the Israelites, we may form a fair idea from the scattered notices in the books of Judges and Samuel. The warfare was of a guerilla character, and consisted of a series of raids into the enemy's country.

Sometimes these extended only just over the border, with the view of plundering the threshing-floors of the agricultural produce (1Sa 23:1); but more generally they penetrated into the heart of the country and seized a commanding position on the edge of the Jordan valley, whence they could secure themselves against a combination of the trans- and cis-Jordanic divisions of the Israelites, or prevent a return of the fugitives who had hurried across the river on the alarm of their approach. Thus at one time we find them crossing the central district of Benjamin and posting themselves on Michmash (1Sa 13:16), at another time following the coast-road to the plain of Esdraelon and reaching the edge of the Jordan valley by Jezreel (1Sa 29:11). From such posts as their headquarters they sent out detached bands to plunder the surrounding country (1Sa 13:17), and, having obtained all they could, they established some military mark (VI., A.V. "garrison," but perhaps meaning only a column, as in Gen 19:26) as a token of their supremacy (1Sa 10:5; 1Sa 13:3), and retreated to their own country. This system of incursions kept the Israelites in a state of perpetual disquietude: all commerce was suspended, from the insecurity of the roads (Jdg 5:6); and at the approach of the foe the people either betook themselves to the natural hiding-places of the country, or fled across the Jordan (1Sa 13:6-7). By degrees the ascendency became complete, and a virtual disarmament of the population was effected by the suppression of the smiths (1Sa 13:19). The profits of the Philistines were not confined to the goods and chattels they carried off with them.

They seized the persons of the Israelites and sold them for slaves; the earliest notice of this occurs in 1Sa 14:21, where, according to the probably correct reading (נְצַיב, and not עֲבָדַים) followed by the Sept., we find that there were numerous slaves in the camp at Michmash: at a later period the prophets inveigh against them for their traffic in human flesh (Joe 3:6; Amo 1:6): at a still later period we hear that "the merchants of the country" followed the army of Gorgias into Judaea for the purpose of  buying the children of Israel for slaves (1Ma 3:41), and that these merchants were Philistines is a fair inference from the subsequent notice that Nicanor sold the captive Jews to the "cities upon the sea-coast" (2Ma 8:11). There can be little doubt, too, that tribute was exacted from the Israelites, but the notices of it are confined to passages of questionable authority, such as the rendering of 1Sa 13:21 in the Sept., which represents the Philistines as making a charge of three shekels a tool for sharpening them; and again the expression "Metheg-ammah" in 2Sa 8:1, which is rendered in the Vulg.frenum tributi, and by Symmachus τὴν ἐξουσίαν τοῦ φόρου (the true text may have been הִמַּדָּה, instead of הָאִמַּה). In each of the passages quoted the versions presuppose a text which yields a better sense than the existing one.

II. Connection of the Philistines with Israelitish History. — Here we recur to the Biblical narrative.

1. Under Joshua and the Judges. — The territory of the Philistines, having been once occupied by the Canaanites, formed a portion of the Promised Land, and was assigned to the tribe of Judah (Jos 15:2; Jos 15:12; Jos 15:45; Jos 15:47). No part, however, of it was conquered in the lifetime of Joshua (Jos 13:2), and even after his death no permanent conquest was effected (Jdg 3:3), though, on the authority of a somewhat doubtful passage, we are informed that the three cities of Gaza, Ashkelon, and Ekron were taken (Jdg 1:18). The Philistines, at all events, soon recovered these, and commenced an aggressive policy against the Israelites, by which they gained a complete ascendency over them. We are ulable to say at what intervals their incursions took place, as nothing is recorded of them in the early period of the Judges. But they must have been frequent, inasmuch as the national spirit of the Israelites was so entirely broken that they even reprobated any attempt at deliverance (Jdg 15:12). Individual heroes were raised up from time to time whose achievements might well kindle patriotism, such as Shamgar the son of Anath (Jdg 3:31), and still more Samson (Judges 13-16); but neither of these men succeeded in permanently throwing off the yoke. Of the former only a single daring feat is recorded, the effect of which appears, from Jdg 5:6-7, to have been very shortlived. The true series of deliverances commenced with the latter, of whom it was predicted that " he shall begin to deliver" (Jdg 13:5), and were carried on by Samuel, Saul, and David. A brief notice occurs in Jdg 10:7 of invasions by the Philistines and Ammonites,  followed by particulars which apply exclusively to the latter people. It has hence been supposed that the brief reference to the Philistines is in anticipation of Samson's history.

The history of Samson furnishes us with some idea of the relations which existed between the two nations. As a "borderer" of the tribe of Dan, he was thrown into frequent contact with the Philistines, whose supremacy was so established that no bar appears to have been placed to free intercourse with their country. His early life was spent on the verge of the Shephelah between Zorah and Eshtaol, but when his actions had aroused. the active hostility of the Philistines he withdrew into the central district, and found a secure post on the rock of Etam, to the south-west of Bethlehem. Thither the Philistines followed him without opposition from the inhabitants. His achievements belong to his personal history: it is clear that they were the isolated acts of an individual, and altogether unconnected with any national movement; for the revenge of the Philistines was throughout directed against Samson personally. Under Eli there was- an organized but unsuccessful resistance to the encroachments of the Philistines, who had penetrated into the central district and were met at Aphek (1Sa 4:1). The production of the ark on this occasion demonstrates the greatness of the emergency, and its loss marked the lowest depth of Israel's degradation.

The next action took place under Samuel's leadership, and the tide of success turned in Israel's favor: the Philistines had again penetrated into the mountainous country near Jerusalem; at Mizpeh they met the cowed host of the Israelites, who, encouraged by the signs of divine favor, and availing themselves of the panic produced by a thunderstorm, inflicted on them a total defeat. For the first time the Israelites erected their pillar or stele at Eben-ezer as the token of victory. The resuits were the recovery of the border-towns and their territories "from Ekron even unto Gath," i.e., in the northern district. The success of Israel may be partly ascribed to their peaceful relations at this time with the Amorites (1Sa 7:9-14).

2. Under the Hebrew Monarchy. — The Israelites now attributed their past weakness to their want of unity, and they desired a king, with the special object of leading them against the foe (1Sa 8:20). It is a significant fact that Saul first felt inspiration in the presence of a pillar (A.V. "garrison") erected by the Philistines in commemoration of a victory (1Sa 10:5; 1Sa 10:10). As soon as he was prepared to throw off the yoke he  occupied with his army a position at Michmash, commanding the defiles leading to the Jordan valley, and his heroic general Jonathan gave the signal for a rising by overthrowing the pillar which the Philistines had placed there. The challenge was accepted; the Philistines invaded the central district with an immense force (a copyist's clerical exaggeration, SEE NUMBERI ), and, having dislodged Saul from Michmash, occupied it themselves, and sent forth predatory bands into the surrounding country. The Israelites shortly after took up a position on the other side of the ravine at Geba, and availing themselves of the confusion consequent upon Jonathan's daring feat, inflicted a tremendous slaughter upon the enemy (chapter 13, 14). No attempt was made by the Philistines to regain their supremacy for about twenty-five years, and the scene of the next contest shows the altered strength of the two parties: it was no longer in the central country, but in a ravine leading down to the Philistine plain, the valley of Elah, the position of which is about fourteen miles south-west of Jerusalem; on this occasion the prowess of young David secured success to Israel, and the foe was pursued to the gates of Gath and Ekron (chapter 17).

The power of the Philistines was, however, still intact on their own territory, as is proved by the flight of David to the court of Achish (1Sa 21:10-15), and his subsequent abode at Ziklag (chapter 27), where he was secured from the attacks of Saul. The border warfare was continued; captures and reprisals, such as are described as occurring at Keilah (1Sa 23:1-5), being probably frequent. The scene of the next conflict was far to the north, in the valley of Esdraelon, whither the Philistines may have made a plundering incursion similar to that of the Midianites in the days of Gideon. The battle on this occasion proved disastrous to the Israelites: Saul himself perished, and the Philistines penetrated across the Jordan, and occupied the forsaken cities (1Sa 31:1-7). The dissensions which followed the death of Saul were naturally favorable to the Philistines; and no sooner were these brought to a close by the appointment of David to be king over the united tribes than the Philistines attempted to counterbalance the advantage by an attack on the person of the king; they therefore penetrated into the valley of Rephaim, south-west of Jerusalem, and even pushed forward an advanced post as far as Bethlehem (1Ch 11:16). David twice attacked them at the former spot, and on each occasion with signal success, in the first case capturing their images, in the second pursuing them “from Geba until thou come to Gazer" (2Sa 5:17-25; 1Ch 14:8-16). About seven years after the defeat at Rephaim, David, who had now  consolidated his power, attacked them on their own soil, and took Gath, with its dependencies (1Ch 18:1), and thus (according to one interpretation of the obscure expression "Metheg-ammah" in 2Sa 8:1) "he took the arm-bridle out of the hand of the Philistines" (Bertheau, Comm. on 1 Chronicles), or (according to another) "he took the bridle of the metropolis out of the hand of the Philistines" (Gesenius, Thesaur. page 113) — meaning in either case that their ascendency was utterly broken. This indeed was the case; for the minor engagements in David's lifetime probably all took place within the borders of Philistia; Gob, which is given as the scene of the second and third combats, being probably identical with Gath, where the fourth took place (2Sa 21:15-22; comp. the Sept., some of the copies of which read Γέθ instead of Γόβ).

The whole of Philistia was included in Solomon's empire, the extent of which is described as being "from the river unto the land of the Philistines, unto the border of Egypt" (1Ki 4:21; 2Ch 9:26), and again, "from Tiphsah unto Gaza" (1Ki 4:24; A.V. "Azzah"). The several towns probably remained under their former governors, as in the case of Gath (1Ki 2:39), and the sovereignty of Solomon was acknowledged by the payment of tribute (1Ki 4:21). There are indications, however, that his hold on the Philistine country was by no means established; for we find him securing the passes that led up from the plain to the central district by the fortification of Gezer and Bethhoron (1Ki 9:17), while no mention is made either of Gaza or Ashdod, which fully commanded the coastroad. Indeed the expedition of Pharaoh against Gezer, which stood at the head of the Philistine plain, and which was quite independent of Solomon until the time of his marriage with Pharaoh's daughter, would lead to the inference that Egyptian influence was paramount in Philistia at this period (1Ki 9:16).

Under the later Jewish kings these signs of aggression on the part of the Philistines increase. The division of the empire at Solomon's death was favorable to the Philistine cause: Rehoboam secured himself against them by fortifying Gath and other cities bordering on the plain (2Ch 11:8): the Israelitish monarchs were either not so prudent or not so powerful, for they allowed the Philistines to get hold of Gibbethon, commanding one of the defiles leading up from the plain of Sharon to Samaria, the recovery of which involved them in a protracted struggle in the reigns of Nadab and Zimri (1Ki 15:27; 1Ki 16:1). Judah meanwhile had lost the tribute; for it is recorded, as an occurrence that marked  Jehoshaphat's success, that "some of the Philistines brought presents" (2Ch 17:11). But this subjection was of brief duration: in the reign of his son Jehoram they avenged themselves by invading Judah in conjunction with the Arabians, and sacking the royal palace (2Ch 21:16-17). The increasing weakness of the Jewish monarchy under the attacks of Hazael led to the recovery of Gath, which had been captured by that monarch in his advance on Jerusalem from the western plain in the reign of Jehoash (2Ki 12:17), and was probably occupied by the Philistines after his departure as an advanced post against Judah: at all events it was in their hands in the time of Uzziah, who dismantled (2Ch 26:6) and probably destroyed it; for it is adduced by Amos as an example of divine vengeance (Amo 6:2), and then disappears from history. Uzziah at the same time dismantled Jabneh (Jamnia), in the northern part of the plain, and Ashdod, and further erected forts in different parts of the country to intimidate the inhabitants (2Ch 26:6). The prophecies of Joel and Amos prove that these measures were provoked by the aggressions of the Philistines, who appear to have formed leagues both with the Edomites and Phoenicians, and had reduced many of the Jews to slavery (Joe 3:4-6; Amo 1:6-10). How far the means adopted by Uzziah were effectual we are not informed; but we have reason to suppose that the Philistines were kept in subjection until the time of Ahaz, when, relying upon the difficulties produced by the Syrian invasions, they attacked the border-cities in the Shephelah, and "the south" of Judah (2Ch 18:18).

From this time the notices of the Philistines are largely involved in the movements of the great powers surrounding Palestine. Isaiah's declarations (Isa 14:29-32) throw light upon these subsequent events: from them we learn that the Assyrians, whom Ahaz summoned to his aid, proved themselves to be the "cockatrice that should come out of the serpent's (Judah's) root," by ravaging the Philistine plain. A few years later the Philistines, in conjunction with the Syrians and Assyrians ("the adversaries of Rezin"), and perhaps as the subject — allies of the latter, carried on a series of attacks on the kingdom of Israel (Isa 9:11-12). Hezekiah's reign inaugurated a new policy, in which the Philistines were deeply interested: that monarch formed an alliance, with the Egyptians, as a counterpoise to the Assyrians, and the possession of Philistia became henceforth the turning-point of the struggle between the two great empires of the East. Hezekiah, in the early part of his reign, re-established his  authority over the whole of it, "even unto Gaza" (2Ki 18:8). This movement was evidently connected with his rebellion against the king of Assyria, and was undertaken in conjunction with the Egyptians; for we find the latter people shortly after in possession of the five Philistine cities, to which alone are we able to refer the prediction in Isa 19:18, when coupled with the fact that both Gaza and Ashkelon are termed Egyptian cities in the annals of Sargon (Bunsen, Egypt; 4:603). The Assyrians under Tartan, the general of Sargon, made an expedition against Egypt, and took Ashdod, as the key of that country (Isa 20:1; Isa 20:4-5). Under Sennacherib Philistia was again the scene of important operations: in his first campaign against Egypt Ashkelon was taken and its dependencies were plundered; Ashdod, Ekron, and Gaza submitted, and received as a reward a portion of Hezekiah's territory (Rawlinson, Herod. 1:477): in his second campaign (on the view that the two were different) other towns on the verge of the plain, such as Libnah and Lachish, were also taken (2Ki 18:14; 2Ki 19:8). The Assyrian supremacy, though shaken by the failure of this latter expedition, was restored by Esar-haddon, who claims to have conquered Egypt (Rawlinson, 1:481); and it seems probable that the Assyrians retained their hold on Ashdod until its capture, after a long siege, by the Egyptian monarch Psammetichus (Herod. 2:157), the effect of which was to reduce the population of that important place to a mere "remnant" (Jer 25:20). It was about this time, and possibly while Psammetichus was engaged in the siege of Ashdod, that Philistia was traversed by a vast Scythian horde on their way to Egypt: they were, however, diverted from their purpose by the king, and retraced their steps, plundering on their retreat the rich temple of Venus at Ashkelon (Herod. 1:105). The description of Zephaniah (Zep 2:4-7), who was contemporary with this event, may well apply to this terrible scourge, though more generally referred to a Chaldaean invasion. The Egyptian ascendency was not as yet re-established, for we find the next king, Necho, compelled to besiege Gaza (if the Cadytis of Herodotus, 2:159) on his return from the battle of MIegiddo. After the death of Necho. the contest was renewed between the Egyptians and the Chaldaeans under Nebuchadnezzar, and the result was specially disastrous to the Philistines: Gaza was again taken by the former, and the population of the whole plain was reduced to a mere "remnant" by the invading armies (Jeremiah 47). The "old hatred" that the Philistines bore to the Jews was exhibited in acts of hostility at the time of the Babylonian captivity (Eze 25:15-17); but on the return this was somewhat abated, for some of the Jews married  Philistine women, to the great scandal of their rulers (Neh 13:23-24).

3. Post-exilian History. — From this time the history of Philistia is absorbed in the struggles of the neighboring kingdoms. In B.C. 332, Alexander the Great traversed it on his way to Egypt, and captured Gaza, then held by the Persians under Betis, after a two month's siege. In 312 the armies of Demetrius Poliorcetes and Ptolemy fought in the neighborhood of Gaza. In 198 Antiochus the Great, in his war against Ptolemy Epiphanes, invaded Philistia and took Gaza. In 166 the Philistines joined the Syrian army under Gorgias in its attack on Judaea (1Ma 3:41). In 148 the adherents of the rival kings Demetrius II and Alexander Balas, under Apollonius and Jonathan respectively, contended in the Philistine plain: Jonathan took Ashdod, triumphantly entered Ashkelon, and received Ekron as his reward (1Ma 10:69-89). A few years later Jonathan again descended into the plain in the interests of Antiochus VI, and captured Gaza (1Ma 11:60-62). No further notice of the country occurs until the capture of Gaza in 97 by the Jewish king Alexander Jannseus, in his contest with Lathyrus (Joseph. Ant. 13:13, 3; War, 1:4, 2). In 63 Pompey annexed Philistia to the province of Syria (Ant. 14:4, 4), with the exception of Gaza, which was assigned to Herod (15:7, 3), together with Jamnia, Ashdod, and Ashkelon, as appears from 17:11, 5. The last three fell to Salome after Herod's death, but Gaza was re-annexed to Syria (17:11, 4, 5). The latest notices of the Philistines as a nation, under their title of ἀλλόφυλοι, occur in 1 Maccabees 3-5. The extension of the name from the district occupied by them to the whole country, under the familiar form of PALESTINE, has already been noticed under that head.

III. Usages, etc. — With regard to the institutions of the Philistines our information is very scanty. Their military tactics have been noticed above. The country in which they settled is remarkably productive (2Ki 8:2). Thomson exclaims on entering it, "Beautiful but monotonous-wheat, wheat, a very ocean of wheat" (Land and Book, 2:32 sq.). The country, he adds, greatly resembles some of the prairies in Western America. "Isaac sowed in that land, and received in the same year a hundredfold" (Gen 26:12). Not only was agriculture most remunerative, but Philistia was the highway for caravans between Egypt and the north, and commerce must have added to its wealth. Harbors were attached to Gaza and Ashkelon, and a lucrative navigation may have been carried on. The  greatness of the cities was mainly owing to commerce, for the coast of Palestine was in the earliest ages exclusively in possession of the traffic which was carried on between Europe and Asia. Besides a great transit trade, they had internal sources of wealth, being given to agriculture (Jdg 15:5). In the time of Saul they were evidently superior in the arts of life to the Israelites; for we read (1Sa 13:20) that the latter were indebted to the former for the utensils of ordinary life.

The five chief cities had, as early as the days of Joshua, constituted themselves into a confederacy, restricted, however, in all probability, to matters of offence and defence. Each was under the government of a prince whose official title was seren, סֶרֶן (Jos 13:3; Jdg 3:3, etc.), and occasionally sar, שִׂר (1Sa 18:30; 1Sa 29:6). Gaza may be regarded as having exercised a hegemony over the others, for in the list of the towns it is mentioned the first (Jos 13:3; Amo 1:7-8), except where there is an especial ground for giving prominence to another, as in the case of Ashdod (1Sa 6:17). Ekron always stands last, while Ashdod,Ashkelon, and Gath interchange places. Each town possessed its own territory, as instanced in the case of Gath (1Ch 18:1), Ashdod (1Sa 5:6), and others, and each possessed its dependent towns or "daughters" (Jos 15:45-47; 1Ch 18:1; 2Sa 1:20; Eze 16:27; Eze 16:57), and its villages (Joshua 10). In later times Gaza had a senate of five hundred (Joseph. Ant. 13:13, 3).

The Philistines appear to have been deeply imbued with superstition: they carried their idols with them on their campaigns (2Sa 5:21), and proclaimed their victories in their presence (1Sa 31:9). They also carried about their persons charms of some kind that had been presented before the idols (2Ma 12:40). The gods whom they chiefly worshipped were Dagon, who possessed temples both at Gaza (Jdg 16:23) and at Ashdod (1Sa 5:3-5; 1Ch 10:10; 1Ma 10:83); Ashtoreth, whose temple at Ashkelon was far-famed (1Sa 31:10; Herod. 1:105); Baal-zebub, whose fane at Ekron was consulted by Ahaziah (2Ki 1:2-6); and Derceto, who was honored at Ashkelon (Diod. Sic. 2:4), though unnoticed in the Bible. Priests and diviners (1Sa 6:2) were attached to the various seats of worship; and the Philistine magicians were in repute (Isa 2:6).

The special authorities for the history of the Philistines are Stark, Gaza und die philistiiische Kiiste (Jena, 1852); Knobel, Volkertafel der Genesis  (Giess. 1850); Movers, Phonizien (Bonn, 1841); Hitzig, Urgesch. und Mythologie der Philistaer (Leips. 1845); and Kneucker, in Schenkel's Bibel-Lex. s.v. Philistaer. See also Jour. Sac. Lit. July 1852, page 323 sq.; January 1856, page 299 sq.; Frisch, De Origine, diis et terra Palaestinorum (Tubing. 1696); Wolf, Apparatus Philistceorumz bellicorum (Viteb. 1711); Hannecker, Die Philistaer (Eichstadt, 1872).

## Phillipps, George[[@Headword:Phillipps, George]]

             a Congregational minister, was born at Rondham, in the county of Norfolk, England, near the opening of the 17th century. Having given early indications of a remarkably vigorous mind, a strong love of knowledge, and a deep sense of religion, he was sent to the University of Cambridge, where he received his education, and distinguished himself as a scholar. Theology was his favorite study; and, while yet a young man, he had made himself familiar with the most celebrated of the fathers of the Christian Church. Not long after his ordination he began to entertain scruples with regard to certain requirements of the Established Church. This dissatisfaction became so strong that at last he determined to emigrate to this country with a company of Puritans, among whom was John Winthrop. He arrived at Salem in 1630. Having founded with a number of others the settlement of Watertown, Massachusetts, Phillipps became the first pastor of the Church, and as such he continued his labors till near the time of his death, which occurred July 1, 1644. Phillipps possessed no small degree of intellectual acumen, and was an able controversial writer. He was a man of great independence of mind, and adhered with unyielding tenacity to his conscientious convictions. ie seems to have been in advance of nearly all his contemporaries in regard to the principles of strict Congregationalism; insomuch that his views were, for a time, regarded as novel and extreme. His ministry was marked by great diligence and fervor, and attended with rich blessings. His publications are, Reply to the Confutation of some Grounds of Infant Baptism; as also Concerning the Form of a Church, put forth against me by one Thomas Lamb (Lond. 1645, 4to). See Mather, Magnalia, 3:82-84, 162; Winthrop, Journal; Sprague, Annals of the Amer. Pulpit, 1:15-17. (J.H.W.)

## Phillips, Georg[[@Headword:Phillips, Georg]]

             a German professor of canon law, was born January 6, 1804, at Konigsberg, Prussia. He studied at Gottingen, and commenced his academical career at Berlin, where he joined the Roman Catholic Church.  In 1833 he went to Munich, in 1849 to Innsbruck, in 1851 to Vienna, and died Sept. 6, 1872. His main works are, Das Kirchenrecht (Ratisbon, 1845-72, 7 volumes): — Lehrbuch des Kirchenrechts (2d ed. 1871): Deutsche Reichs- und Rechtsyeschichte (4th ed. 1859, 2 volumes): — Vermischte Schrifenz (Vienna, 1856-60, 3 volumes). See Zuchold, Bibl. Theol. 2:995; Lichtenbegeer, Encyclop. des Sciences Religieuses, s.v. (B.P.)

## Phillips, James, D.D[[@Headword:Phillips, James, D.D]]

             an eminent Presbyterian divine, was born at Newendon, Essex County, England, April 22, 1792. His father was a minister of the Established  Church of England, and attached to the Evangelical party in that Church. His early education was acquired mostly while he was engaged in private study and teaching in the service of the English navy. His tastes and habits seem to have been fixed early, and to the impressions which he there received, and the scenes he witnessed at the great military and naval stations, may be traced many of his later habits and interests. He came to America in 1818, and engaged in the business of teaching at Harlem, N.Y., where he soon had a flourishing school. There were at that time in New York and the neighborhood a number of American and British mathematicians who had organized a mathematical club, of which he became a member. To the mathematical journals published at that time he was a regular contributor, or at least to two of them — the Mathenmatical Repository and Nash's Diary. In 1826 he was elected to the vacant mathematical chair in the University of North Carolina, and entered upon the duties of his professorship in July of the same year. In this position he continued to labor for forty-one years, devoting himself with unremitting care and attention to his duties. The amount of work he went through with is amazing. He projected a complete course of mathematical works, and published in 1828 a work on conic sections, which was afterwards adopted as a text-book in Columbia College, New York. He prepared also treatises on algebra, geometry, trigonometry, differential and integral calculus, and natural philosophy, besides making for his own use translations of many of the French mathematicians-which works, however, he never made any attempt to publish. He also joined the other members of the faculty in contributing his quota to the Harbinger, a newspaper published at Chapel Hill, in 1832, under the direction of Dr. Caldwell.

Up to the time of his coming to North Carolina, and for many years after, he seems to have devoted himself exclusively to scientific studies. Although he had been for years a consistent member of the Church, yet now he began to experience a change, which he regarded as the true beginning of his Christian life. Henceforth he ceased to be the mere teacher of science; he added to his othei duties the diligent study of theology and unwearied activity in all Christian duties, and in September, 1833, was licensed by the Presbytery of Orange, at New Hope, and in April, 1835, was ordained to the full work of the ministry. He was never installed as pastor, but he preached as a supply for some time at Pittsboro', and afterwards, for the greater part of his ministerial life, at New Hope Church. He was in the full discharge of his professional duties when he died suddenly March 14, 1867. Dr. Phillips was a man of remarkable literary, theological, and professional attainments.  He was an inexorable mathematician, but well and thoroughly read in all departments. Many books in his library had this simple comment, "Perlegi." His chief religious reading was among the old Nonconformist divines; his favorite authors were the old English classics; the book that was oftenest in his hand was the Bible. He was a great preacher; his sermons were complete structures; there was nothing oratorical about him-it was the pure "weight of metal." As a man he was uncompromisingly conscientious, remarkably modest, free from all arrogance and presumption, and yet most genial as a companion and friend. See Wilson, Presb. Hist. Almanac, 1868, page 349. (J.L.S.)

## Phillips, John, LL.D[[@Headword:Phillips, John, LL.D]]

             an American philanthropist of some note, was born in Andover, Massachusetts, December 27, 1719; was educated at Harvard College (class of 1735); and having preached for some time, at length engaged in mercantile pursuits, and was for several years a member of the Council of New Hampshire. In 1778 he and his brother, Samuel Phillips, of Andover, founded and liberally endowed the academy in that town, which was incorporated in 1780. In 1789 he further gave to this institution $20,000. The academy called Phillips Exeter Academy, of which he was the sole founder, was incorporated in 1781, with a fund which was eventually increased to $134,000. He endowed a professorship in Dartmouth College, and he contributed liberally to Princeton College. He died in April 1795, bequeathing to his academy two thirds of all his estate, and one third of 'the residue to the seminary at Andover, particularly for the benefit of pious youth.

## Phillips, Morgan[[@Headword:Phillips, Morgan]]

             sometimes called Phillip Morgan, a Roman Catholic divine, was born probably during the latter part of the 15th century. He received his education at Oxford, graduating in the class of 1537. He was made principal of St. Mary's Hall in 1546, and was one of the founders of the English College at Douay, where he died in 1570. His powers as a disputant were so great that he was called "Morgan the Sophister." and he was one of the three selected to dispute with Peter Martyr on the Eucharist, and published on that occasion Disputatio de Sacramento Eucharistiae in Univ. Oxon. habita contra D. Peter Martyr, 13 Mai, 1549. He also published A Treatise showing the Regiment of Women is  conformable to the Law of God and Nature (Liege, 1571, 8vo), written in answer to John Knox's work, The First Blast of the Trumpet, etc. See Wood, Athen. Oxon.; Dodd, Ch. Hist. volume 3; Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Auth. s.v.

## Phillips, Richard[[@Headword:Phillips, Richard]]

             an English Wesleyan preacher, was born in 1777. In early life he was brought to Christ through Methodist influence, and, feeling called of God to the work of the ministry, entered the itinerant ranks in 1804, and continued in the active labors of the ministry until 1844, when debility constrained him to accept an assistant, and to preach only occasionally. “Blessed with a good understanding and a retentive memory, patient and prudent, enjoying the life of God in his soul, and warmly attached to the doctrines and discipline of Methodism, he preached those doctrines uad administered that discipline to the profit of the Wesleyan body." See Wesleyan Magazine, 1846, page 916.

## Phillips, Samuel (1)[[@Headword:Phillips, Samuel (1)]]

             a Congregational minister, was born February 17, 1690 (O.S.), at Salem, Massachusetts. He graduated at Harvard College in 1708, and was ordained, October 17, 1711, pastor of the South Parish, Andover, where he remained until his death, June 5, 1771. Samuel Phillips was a devoted orthodox preacher, and not only refused to be affected by the heretical tendencies of his times, but combated all Arian influences, and became a most decided opponent of the Unitarians. " As a preacher, he was highly respectable, was zealous, and endeavored not only to indoctrinate his people in sentiments which he deemed correct and important, but to lead them to the practice of all Christian duties." He published, Elegy upon the Death of Nicholas Noyes and George Curwen (1718): — A Word in Season, or Duty of a People to take the Oath of Allegiance to a Glorious God (1727): — Advice to a Child (1729): — The History of the Savior (1738): — The Orthodox Christian, or a Child well Instructed (1738): — A Minister's A ddress to his People (1739): — A Sermon on Living Water to be hadfor Asking (1750): — A Sermon on the Sinner's Refusal to Come to Christ (1753): — A Sermon on the Necessity of God's Drawing in Order to Men's Coming unto Christ (1753): — Seasonable Advice to a Neighbor, in a Dialogue (1761): — Address to Young People, in a  Dialogue (1763); and several occasional sermons. See Sprague, Annals, 1:273.

## Phillips, Samuel (2), LL.D[[@Headword:Phillips, Samuel (2), LL.D]]

             an American philanthropist, noted for his service to the state, deserves a place here for the interest which he took in educational matters. He was born at Andover in 1751, and graduated at Harvard College in 1771. He was a member of the Provincial Congress in 1775, and of the House of Representatives till the year 1780, when he assisted in framing the constitution of Massachusetts. On its adoption he was elected a member of the Senate, and was its president from 1785 to 1802. Being appointed justice of the Court of Common Pleas for Essex in 1781, he held his office till 1797, when his declining health induced his resignation. He was commissioner of the state in Scharp's insurrection, and in 1801 was chosen lieutenant-governor. He died February 10, 1802. Although so greatly honored with public eminence, he remained a faithful son of the Church of Christ, and was not only regular in his own observances, but ministered frequently to those unable to go to church. He appeared to be continually governed by love to the Supreme Being, and by the desire of imitating his benevolence and doing good. Phillips's deep views of evangelical doctrine and duty, of human depravity and mediatorial mercy, formed his heart to humility, condescension, and kindness, and led him continually to depend on the grace of God through the atonement of his Son. He was one of the projectors of the academy at Andover, and was much concerned in establishing that, as well as the academy at Exeter, which were founded by his father and uncle. To these institutions he was a distinguished benefactor. He was also a founder of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences of Boston. At his death he left to the town of Andover $5000, the income to be applied to the cause of education. After his death his widow, Phoebe Phillips, and his son, John Phillips, of Andover, evinced the same attachment to the interests of learning and religion, by uniting with Samuei Abbot, and three others of a most liberal and benevolent spirit, in founding the theological seminary at Andover, which was opened in September, 1808. See Allen, Dict. of Amer. Biog. s.v.; Brown, Rel. Cyclop. s.v.; Drake, Dict. of Amer. Biog. s.v.

## Phillips, Thomas[[@Headword:Phillips, Thomas]]

             an English Roman Catholic priest, was born in Buckinghamshire in 1708. He received his education at St. Omer's College, and became a most zealous worker in the Church. He obtained a prebend in the collegiate church of Tongres, and resided for many years in the family of the earl of Shrewsbury. Towards the end of his life he retired to the English college at Liege, where he died in 1774. He published, The Study of Sacred Literature fully Stated and Considered (Lond. 1756, 8vo; 2d ed. 1758; 3d ed. 1765):— Philemon (1761, 8vo). This autobiographical pamphlet was privately printed, and suppressed: — The History of the Life of Reginald Pole (Oxford, 1764-1767, 2 parts in 1 volume, 4to; Lond. 1767, 2 volumes, 8vo). This work elicited six answers, by Richard Lillard, T. Ridley, T. Neve, E, Stone, B. Pye, and J. Jones (see Chalmers, Biog. Dict. 26:460-461), and Phillips responded in an appendix to the Life (1767, 4to); see also end of his 3d ed. of Study of Sacred Literature:— Reasons for the Repeal of the Law against the Papists: — Translation in Metre of the Hymn Lauda Sion Salvatorem: — Censura Commentariorum Cornelii a Lapide, in Latin, on a single sheet. He also addressed some poetry to his sister Elizabeth, abbess of the Benedictine nuns at Ghent. See Cole's MS. Athen. in the British Museum; European Magazine, for September 1796; Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Auth. s.v.

## Phillips, William (1)[[@Headword:Phillips, William (1)]]

             a Christian philanthropist, was born in Boston April 10, 1750. Owing to feeble health, he was prevented from receiving many educational advantages. He entered upon mercantile pursuits with his father, from whom he received a large fortune at his death. In 1772 he made a profession of religion; in: 1794 he was made a deacon of Old South Church, Boston, where he officiated until his death, May 26, 1817. He was highly respected by the community at large, and was influential in all the affairs of State and Church. He was at one time the lieutenant-governor of his native state. He was also actively engaged in philanthropic labors, and was at his death president of the Massachusetts Bible Society. His charities were very extensive, and during a series of years amounted to from $8000 to $11,000. He bequeathed $15,000 to Phillips Academy; $10,000 to the theological institution at Andover; to the Society for Propagating the Gospel among the Indians, the Massachusetts Bible Society, the Foreign Mission Board, the Congregational Society, the Educational Society, and  the Massachusetts General Hospital, each $5000; to the Medical Dispensary $3000; to the Female Asylum, and the Asylum for Boys, each $2000.

## Phillips, William (2)[[@Headword:Phillips, William (2)]]

             a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born in Jessamine County, Kentucky, May 7, 1797. Even as a youth he exhibited talents of a superior order. He received a carefiul and pious training, but he did not as a young man make any outward profession of religion; and after entering political life, and while engaged for several years as a successful teacher, he became even less considerate of his higher and immortal interests, and sought refuge from the accusations, of conscience in the dark and cheerless regions of infidelity. His early impressions of religious truth were, however, strong and abiding, and he was finally converted, and deeply impressed with the idea that he was called of God to enter the Christian ministry. December 27, 1828, he was licensed as a local preacher. In the fall of 1831 he was received into the Kentucky Conference. He was appointed consecutively to the Winchester Circuit, Lexington Circuit, and Newport and Covington stations. He was also assistant editor of the Western Christian Advocate, serving for one year by appointment of the Book Committee, and then by vote of the General Conference of 1836. Among his numerous contributions to that journal was a series of articles on the peculiar tenets of Alexander Campbell, which excited very considerable attention. These were republished, by request of the Ohio Conference, after Mr. Phillips's death, which occurred June 22, 1836, only a few weeks after his election by the General Conference.

## Phillips, William Wirt, D.D[[@Headword:Phillips, William Wirt, D.D]]

             a Presbyterian divine, was born in Montgomery County, N.Y., September 23, 1796. He graduated at Union College, Schenectady, N.Y., in 1812; completed a three years' course in the Associate Reformed Theological Seminary, New York, and afterwards spent a year in the theological seminary at New Brunswick, N.J., under the instruction of Reverend Dr. Livingston; was licensed by the New Brunswick Classis of the Reformed Dutch Church, and in April 1818, was ordained and installed pastor of Pearl Street Presbyterian Church, New York City. From this church he was called to the First Presbyterian Church, New York. The congregation having disposed of their building and ground in Wall Street, in May, 1844,  the corner-stone of the building on Fifth Avenue, near Twelfth Street, was laid in the following autumn, and soon after completed. Dr. Phillips was their beloved pastor for a period of nearly forty years; he was actively engaged in the discharge of his ministerial duties until about four weeks before his death, which occurred March 20, 1865. Dr. Phillips was a man of the utmost simplicity of character; a sound and able preacher of the Gospel, whose aim in the pulpit was to hold forth the Word of Life in all its purity, and to impress it with solemnity upon the hearts of all his hearers. He was moderator of the General Assembly which met at Pittsburgh in 1835, and for many years previous to his death he was the presiding officer of the Board of Foreign Missions. He was also president of the Board of Publication; a trustee of Princeton College and Seminary; a director of the Sailors' Snug Harbor, and several other benevolent institutions. See Wilson, Presb. Hist. Almanac, 1866, page 160; Congreg. Quar. 1859, page 133. (J.L. S.)

## Phillips, Zebulon[[@Headword:Phillips, Zebulon]]

             a Methodist Episcopal minister, was born at Amsterdam, N.Y., in 1808. He joined the Troy Conference in 1834, and served as pastor until 1848, when he became presiding elder of the Troy district. During this period he was also a member of the book committee, and in 1852 was appointed assistant agent of the Methodist Book Concern in New York city. In 1856 he became agent of the Troy University, and in 1860 entered into business. He died February 8, 1885. See Minutes of Annual Conferences (Spring), 1886, page 100.

## Philo[[@Headword:Philo]]

             (surnamed in Latin JUDAEUS, i.e., the Jew; in Hebrew, פַּילוֹן הִיְּהוּדַיin Greek, Φίλων [ὁ] Ι᾿ουδαῖος), the greatest of ancient Jewish philosophers, flourished in the 1st century of the Christian sera. We give a somewhat lengthy exposition of his philosophic and religious opinions.

Life. — Philo was a native and throughout life a resident of Alexandria. The precise time of his birth is unknown, but he represents himself as of advanced age about A.D. 40, when he was sent as chief of an embassy from the Jews of Alexandria to the emperor Caligula, for the purpose of pleading their cause against Apion, who charged them with refusing to pay due honors to Caesar (Josephus, Ant. 18:8, 1; comp. De Legat. ad Caium, 28). He was probably about sixty years old; if so, he was born about B.C. 20, and was contemporary with all the important events of the New Testament. He went again to Rome in the reign of Claudius, but after this nothing is known with certainty of his whereabouts. Philo had a brother employed in the affairs of government at Alexandria, named Alexander  Lysimachus, who is supposed to be the Alexander mentioned in Act 4:6 as a man "of the kindred of the highpriest." That Philo was a member of the sacerdotal family is asserted by Josephus (Ant. 18:8, 1), and also by Eusebius, Jerome, and others, and his own writings indirectly testify that such was the fact. There is also reason to believe that he belonged to the sect of the Pharisees. Philo was eminent for his learning and eloquence. To the attainments usually secured by Jews of his social condition (Eusebius, Prep. Evang. 8:13) he added an extensive knowledge of the Greek philosophy, especially the Platonic, for the acquisition of which the most favorable opportunities would occur in Alexandria, at that time the very metropolis of the learned world and the home of revived Hellenism. He has been represented by Scaliger and Cudworth as ignorant of Jewish literature and customs, but Fabricius and Mangey have clearly shown that such a view is entirely groundless. The supposition of his ignorance of Hebrew must have arisen from the fact that the Jews of Alexandria at that time were so little acquainted with the original of the Old-Test. Scriptures that they had to be supplied with the Sept. and other Greek versions. But even Geiger, who says that Philo had but a schoolboy knowledge of the Hebrew language, concedes that when the tranlslation of the Bible was undertaken for the Alexandrian Jews, "they had not yet been altogether estranged from the Hebrewv languagc;" but that they were no longer so much at home and versed in it that they could have fully mastered the Book which was to offer them the bread and water of life; it was the Grecian language that must bring it home to them" (page 146; comp. also page 148). As absurd as is this charge of Philo's ignorance of Hebrew is the charge that Philo's Greek is unclassical, and this because he was a Jew. As well might we say of the Jewish literati of Germany that their style is Jewish-German, and not the pure tongue of Lessing and Gervinus. Philo's Greek was of course not that of Plato, nor the pure Attic of Demosthenes. No one at Alexandria wrote so purely, but Philo wrote as did his contemporaries, and as wrote the best of them. In his treatise De Congressu, 14. Philo refers himself to his own attainments in grammar, philosophy, geometry, music, and poetry; and his accomplished character was thus gracefully attested by his wife, who, when once asked why she alone of all her sex did not wear any golden ornaments, replied: "The virtue of a husband is a sufficient ornament for his wife" (Fragments, ed. Richter, 6:236).

The circumstance that Philo was contemporary with New-Test. events, coupled with his high intelligence and interest in sacred learning, as well as  with the fact that he once visited Jerusalem “to offer up prayers and sacrifices in the Temple" (although only one such visit is referred to by him [Richter's ed. of Firagments, 6:200], his piety and devotion probably led to occasional repetitions of this pilgrimage, which were less likely to be mentioned because of his modesty and reserve in personal matters), led ancient writers to connect Philo intimately with Christianity. Photius (Bibl. Cod. 15) makes him a friend of the apostle Peter; as do also Eusebius (Hist. Ecc 2:17), Jerome (Catal. Scriptor. Eccles.), and Suidas. Photius goes so far as to say that Philo was admitted into the Christian Church, from which he afterwards fell. But while we have no direct means of testing the truth of such statements, they certainly do not bear the evidence on their face. A man of such decided characteristics as Philo could no more have remained quiet after conversion than did Saul of Tarsus, and, because we have no utterances from him as a Christian, we have reason to reject the story as fabulous from first to last. Besides, Philo's own extant writings do not give the slightest reference to any such important step, and this fact tells even more strongly, if possible, against the report.

His Theology and Philosophy. — In the article NEOPLATONISM SEE NEOPLATONISM (q.v.) it has been shown that this eclectic philosophy, though it developed in the 3d century after Christ, is not only to be regarded in its origin as coeval with Christianity, but must acknowledge as its father and founder Philo the Jew (see Kingsley, Alexandria and her Schools, page 79). Alexandria, from its very foundation by Alexander the Great in B.C. 332, had sought to establish Greek civilization within its borders, and to produce an intellect that might be the rival of Athens in her proudest day. Mind was the secret of Greek power, and for that the great conqueror would work in this African city, which he designed to be the point of union of two, or, rather, of three worlds. For in this place, named after himself, Europe, Asia, and Africa were to meet and to hold communion. Under the Ptolemies this desire was strengthened still more, and yet the outcome of all the Ptolemaean appliances was of little or no account if we except the great collection of MSS. and art treasures. The wisest men. though gathered from the most learned centres of the world, failed to produce anything that was really worth preserving. In physics they did little. In art nothing. In metaphysics less than nothing. Says Kingsley, "You must not suppose that the philosophers whom the Ptolemies collected (as they would any other marketable article) by liberal offers of pay and patronage, were such men as the old Seven Sages of Greece, or as  Socrates, Plato, and Aristotle. In these three last indeed, Greek thought reached not merely its greatest height, but the edge of a precipice, down which it rolled headlong after their decease. . . . When the Romans destroyed Greece, God was just and merciful. The eagles were gathered together only because the carrion needed to be removed from the face of God's earth. And at the time of which I now speak the signs of approaching death were fearfully apparent. Hapless and hopeless enough were the clique of men out of whom the first two Ptolemies hoped to form a school of philosophy; men certainly clever enough, and amusing withal, who might give the kings of Egypt many a shrewd lesson in kingcraft and the crafts of this world, and the art of profiting by the folly of fools and the selfishness of the selfish; or who might amuse them, in default of fighting- cocks, by puns and repartees, and battles of logic; 'how one thing cannot be predicated of another,' or 'how the wise man is not only to overcome every misfortune, but not even to feel it,' and other such weighty questions, which in those days hid that deep unbelief in any truth whatsoever which was spreading fast over the minds of men . . . during those frightful centuries which immediately preceded the Christian aera, when was fast approaching that dark chaos of unbelief and unrighteousness which Saul of Tarsus so analyzes and describes in the first chapter of his Epistle to the Romans; when the old light was lost, the old faiths extinct, the old reverence for the laws of family and national life destroyed, yea, even the natural instincts themselves perverted; that chaos whose darkness Juvenal and Petronius and Tacitus have proved in their fearful pages not to have been exaggerated by the more compassionate though more righteous Jew" (pages 55-63).

Fortunately for the Macedonians, another Eastern nation had closely intermingled with them, and from this mixture of two races came that superior product which gave to Alexandrian thought not only a new impulse, but a superior life. When Hellenism was transferred to Alexandria, the Grecian spirit, as we have seen, was in an exhausted and faded condition. But together with Hellenism had come Judaism also. True, the latter was not sought for and imported at the bidding of the mighty conqueror of three worlds, but he had suffered the Jews to find a home in Alexandria, and thus Judaism found its establishment then and there. The Ptolemies also pursued the same conciliatory policy; and Judaism gained strength and developed so much at Alexandria that it became a center of  Jewish thought and learning for several centuries, and its rabbins were called "the light of Israel."

Now it is to be expected that whenever two spiritual powers meet, such as Hellenism and Judaism, such as Grecian culture and Jewish religion — when two such spiritual world-reforming powers come into conflict with each other — that conflict must necessarily result in new formations; something new will always grow out of it, be it by their antagonism or by their spiritual interpenetration; new creations will be evolved, either bearing the character of both, or pre-eminently that of one of them, yet impregnated, in a certain measure, by that of the other. The conflict between Hellenism and Judaism was principally a spiritual struggle, and its result a radical change in the thought and belief of both Jew and Macedonian, which led to the formation of what came to be known as Neo-Platonism, a philosophy of syncretism, whose elements are partly Oriental (Alexandrian-Jewish in particular) and partly Hellenic; but whose form is strictly Hellenic, and whose peculiarity of doctrine is that it is distinguished from Plato's own by the principle of revelation contained in the new philosophy.

The great representative of this syncretism, which also reappeared afterwards in manifold shapes in Gnosticism, is our spirited and prolific theologian, Philo of Alexandria. He held to the divine character of the Old Test., had very strict views of inspiration, and thought that the Mosaic law and the Temple worship were destined to be perpetual. He ascribed to the Jews a mission for all nations, boasted of their cosmopolitism, and called them priests and prophets, who offered sacrifice and invoked the blessing of God for all mankind. With him the expounding of the books of the Old Test. is synonymous with the philosophy of his nation; but in his own exposition he allegorically introduces into those documents philosophical ideas, partly derived from the natural internal development of Jewish notions, and partly obtained from Hellenic philosophy, and thus the theology of Philo has been aptly called a blending of Platonism and Judaism.

The allegorical method of interpreting the sacred Scriptures, which had long prevailed among the more cultivated of the Alexandrian Jews, was adopted by Philo without restriction. His principle that the prophets were only involuntary instruments of the Spirit which spoke through them was favorable to the freest use of this mode of exegesis. He pronounced those  who would merely tolerate a literal interpretation of the Scriptures as low, unworthy, and superstitious; and while he was thus led astray frequently to the introduction of foreign heathen elements into the store of divine revelation, and to the refusal of all elements which, like the anthropomorphisms for instance, seemed offensive to the culture of the time, Philo, like Origen (q.v.) in later times, far from rejecting the literal sense in every case, often, especially in the case of historical events in the Old Test., assumed both this and the allegorical sense as equally true. But Philo, besides this, regarded as higher that conception of Scripture which penetrated beneath the shell of the letter to what he thought to be the kernel of philosophical truth; beneath the anthropomorphic and anthropopathic representations of God, to that idealistic view of God which, in fact, divests him in the end of all concrete attributes. In this way, in spite of his opposition to Hellenic mysteries, Philo set up a radical distinction of initiated and uninitiated, a mode of interpretation which leads very easily to the contempt of the letter, and thus to an unhistorical, abstractly spiritualistic tendency. SEE INTERPRETATION.

As a devoted, believing Jew, Philo accepted Judaism as a truth requiring no proof. But in him, as probably in others of the Alexandro-Jewish school of philosophers before him, the desire was awakened to blend the Jewish inheritance with the newly acquired Grecian knowledge; to heighten the truths of Judaism by the addition of Hellenic culture; to reconcile both treasures with each other, so that each should make the lustre of the other shine the more clearly and brightly. Directly antagonistic as they were to each other, a compromise must needs be effected between them. Judaism is the fruit of self-evidence, inner experience of a vivid conviction, for which no proof is required. Hellenism, on the contrary, proceeded from investigation, from human research, starting from the physical, to reach, by combination and analysis, the higher idea. These are two processes not only diverging in their progress, but even in their whole conception, and these two directly antagonistic views clashed against each other. But there was also in Hellenism a tendency which, although grown from the Grecian spirit, nevertheless endeavored to conceive, by a certain prophetic flight of poesy, the higher, thence to descend to the lower, and thus to make the former descend into lower degrees. It desired likewise directly to conceive the divine,, the ideal, by intuition, by higher perception. With such a bold flight Plato conceived the everlasting Good, the everlasting Beautiful, whence individual ideals evolve themselves, which as archetypes — we are not told whether they have a distinct existence, or must be regarded as mere fictions  of the spirit — are expressed in real objects, perfect in themselves, while the several visible objects represent them in a limited degree. This was a system which especially suited the philosophizing Jews; it afforded them a bridge between the purely spiritual and the physical objects. How does the Highest Spirit, the eternally Perfect One, enter into the finite world? He creates ideals from himself, says Plato. He introspects himself, and thus.perfection is produced; but this perfection impresses itself upon more subordinate existences, and thus it descends from immediate causes to intermediate causes, until the real objects spring into existence, and creation becomes manifest to us; God, the eternal existence, the eternally perfect, is the highest cause, but the eternally Pure One does not immediately come into contact with the impure — only by means of manifold emanations and concatenations, the earthly grows into existence. Such views afforded the philosophic Jews a happy means of preserving the theory of the infallibility and inconceivableness of God, and yet of accepting the different figurative expressions concerning God in the Bible, because they could refer to the subordinate beings. Hellenism of that time, stiff and sober as it was, was unfit to conceive naive, poetical imageries, and to admit poetical expression without fearing that thereby the sublimity of thought might be violated. The latter was tenaciously adhered to, and whenever it expressed entities too directly, it had to yield to forced interpretations. To such also the Bible was frequently subjected. Narratives and commands were forcibly driven from their natural simplicity into artificial philosophemes, in the belief that their value would thus be enhanced. The figurative expressions and events in connection with God were referred to such subordinate spirits as had evolved themselves from God. In the writings of Philo that intermediate agency is comprised in the Logos.

As with Plato and the elder Greeks, so with Philo, theology was the ultimate object of all metaphysical science. But there arose a puzzle in the mind of the Jewish philosopher, as in reality it had already arisen in the minds of Socrates and Plato. How could he reconcile the idea of that absolute and eternal one Being, that Zeus, Father of gods and men, self- perfect, selfcontained, without change or motion, in whom, as a Jew, he believed even more firmly than the Platonists, with the Daemon of Socrates, the divine teacher whom both Plato and Solomon confessed? Or how, again, could he reconcile the idea of him with the creative and providential energy, working in space and time, working in matter, and  apparently affected and limited, if not baffled, by the imperfection of the matter which he moulded? Philo offered a solution in that idea of a Logos, or Word of God, divinity articulate, speaking and acting in time and space, and therefore by successive acts, and so doing in time and space the will of the timeless and spaceless Father, the abysmal and eternal Being, of whom he was the perfect likeness. In calling this person the Logos, and making him the source of all human reason, and knowledge of eternal laws, he only translated from Hebrew into Greek the name which he found in his sacred books, "The Word of God." Of God himself, Philo teaches that he is incorporeal, invisible, and cognizable only through the reason; that he is the most universal of beings, the Being to whom alone being, as such, truly pertains; that he is more excellent than virtue, than science, or even than the good per se and the beautiful per se. He is one and simple, imperishable and eternal; his existence is absolute and separate from the world; the world is his work.

Thus while Philo contends that God is to be worshipped as a personal being, he yet conceives him at the same time as the most general of existences: τὸ γενικώτατόν ἐστιν ὁ θεός (Legis Alleg. 2). God is the only truly existent being, τὸ ὄν (De Somn. 1:655, ed. Mang.). But Philo, similarly to the Neo-Platonists of a later epoch, advances upon the Platonic doctrine by representing God as exalted not only above all human knowledge and virtue-as Plato had done-but as above the idea of the Good — κρείττων τε ἡ ἀρετή, καὶ κρείτ των ἡ ἐπιστήμη, καὶ κρείττων ἡ αὐτὸ τἀγαθὸν καὶ αὐτὸ τὸ καλόν (De Mundi Officio, 1:2, ed. Mang.) with which Plato identifies him-and by teaching that we do not arrive at the absolute by scientific demonstration (λόγων ἀποδείξει), but by an intermediate subjective certainty (ἐναργείᾷ, De post Caini, 48, page 258, ed. Mang.). Still a certain kind of knowledge of God, which, however, is only second in rank, results from the aesthetic and teleological view of the world, as founded on the Socratic principle that "no work of skill makes itself" (οὐδὲν τῶν τεχνικῶν ἔργων ἀπαυτοματίζεται). God is one and simple: ὁ θεὸς μόνος ἐστὶ καὶ ἕν, οὐ σύγκριμα, φύσις ἁπλῆ...τέτακται οῦν ὁ θεὸς κατὰ τὸ ž ν καὶ τὴν μονάδα, μᾶλλον δὲ καὶ ἡ μονὰς κατὰ τὸν ἕνα θεόν (Legis Alleg. 2:1, 66 sq. ed. Mang.). God is the only free nature (η μόνη ἐλευθέρα φύσις, De Somn. 2), full of himself and sufficient to himself (αὐτὸ ἑαυτοῦ πλῆρες καὶ ἑαυτῷ ἱκανόν, De Nom. Mutat. 1:582); everything finite is involved in necessity. God is not in contact with matter; if he were he would be defiled. He who holds the world itself to be God the Lord has fallen into error and sacrilege. In his essence God is incomprehensible; we can only  know that he is, not what he is. All names which are intended to express the separate attributes of God are appropriate only in a figurative sense. since God is in truth an unqualified and pure being. Notwithstanding the pantheistically sounding neuters which Plato applies to God, Philo ascribes to him the purest blessedness: "He is without grief or fear, not subject to evils, unyielding, painless, never wearied, filled with unmixed happiness" (De Cherubim, 1:154).

God is everywhere by his power (τὰς δυνάμεις αὑτοῦ διὰ γῆς καὶ ὕδατος, ἀέρος τε καὶ οὐρανοῦ τείνας), but. in no place with his essence, since space and place were first given to the material world by him (De Linguarum Conf. 1:425). Speaking figuratively, Philo describes God as enthroned on the outermost border of the heavens, in an extramundane place (τόπος μετακόσμιος), as in a sacred citadel (Genes. 28, 15; De Vit. Mos. 2:164, etc.). God is the place of the world, for it is he that contains and encompasses all things (De Somniis, 1). In creating the world, God employed as instruments incorporeal potencies or ideas, since he could not come in contact with polluting matter (ἐξ ἐκείνης ῾τῆς οὐσίας πάντ᾿ ἐγέννησεν ὁ θεός, οὐκ ἐφαπτόμενος αὐτος· οὐ γὰρ ην θἐμις ἀπειρης καὶ πεφυρμένης ὕλης ψαύειν τὸν ἴδμονα καὶ μακάριον· ἀλλὰ ταῖς ἀσωμάτοις δυνάμεσιν, ων ἔτυμον ὄνομα αἱ ἰδέαι κατεχρήσατο πρὸς τὸ γένος ἔκαστον τὴν ἁρμόττουσσαν λαβεῖν μορφήν, De Sacrificantibus, 2:261). These potencies surround God as ministering spirits, just as a monarch is surrounded by the members of his court. The highest of the divine potencies, the creative (ποιητική), bears also, according to Philo, in Scripture the name of God (θεός); the second or ruling (βασιλική) potency is called the Lord (κύριος) (De Vita Mosis, 2:150, et al.). These are followed by the foreseeing potency, the law-giving, and many others. They are all conceived by Philo, not only in the nature of divine qualities, but also as relatively independent, personal beings, who can appear to men, and who have favored some of them with their most intimate intercourse (De Vita Abrah. 2:17 sq.).

From all that has been said of the Philonic doctrine of the Logos, it is clearly apparent that Philo recognized it as the highest of all the divine forces; and yet many of his descriptions of it were in no essential like those of the apostle John, but rather belonged to Jewish ideas which he found already existing. The distinction of a concealed God and a revelation of him was connected with the Old-Test. idea of theophany. But by tracing back all theophanies to the one principle of revelation lying at their basis,  and by making it their objective, the idea of the Logos was attained. The apocryphal book of The Wisdom of Solomon had already interposed wisdom between God and the world as the reflection of the eternal light; the fountain of all knowledge, virtue, and skill; the moulder of all things; the medium of all the Old-Test. revelations (chapters 7-10). This idea Philo also conceived, but he.modified it according as the Platonic influence was more or less strongly felt. Says Neander, — "In proportion as he occupied the standpoint which divested the Divine Being of human qualities, or that which favored anthropomorphism, the ideal or the symbolical, might not the λόγος appear as a power of God or as a hypostatic being?" Philo describes the λόγος, therefore, as the first-born before all existence, the πρωτόγονος υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ, as the perfect reflection of God, as the ἀρχάγγελος among the angels, as the original power of the divine powers. Alluding to the νοητὸν παράδειγμα of Plato, he describes him as the world-constructing reason; he compares the world to the ζῶον of Plato, and the λόγος to the soul of the world; he calls him God's vicegerent in the world (ὕπαρχος); he gives him the office of mediator between God and the universe, since the connection of phenomena with God is effected through the reason revealed in the world. Hence he is the high-priest of the world, the advocate (παράκητος) for the defects of men with God, and generally the revealer of the divine nature to the universe.

The Logos is the archetype of the reason, which is formed not after the Absolute himself, the ῎Ον, but after the Logos. He, as the revelation of the Absolute in the reason, is the image of God, after which man, according to Genesis, was created. In this connection he calls the Logos the ideal man; and alluding to a Jewish mystical idea, the original man. In the Logos is the unity of the collected revelations of the Divine Being which is individualized in man. In general, everything is traced back to the distinction between the Divine Being as he is in himself and his revelation in the Logos, or the ειναι and the λέγεσθαι. The revelation of God in creation — in all positive revelation — in the communication of separate ideas by peculiar dogmas — all this forms part of the knowledge of the revealed God in the phenomenal world, and of the symbolical knowledge from the standpoint of the υἱοὶ τοῦ λόγου, over which the standpoint of the υἱοὶ τοῦ ῎Οντος is raised. But this Logos by Philo is only a sort of intermediate being between God, who is in his nature hidden, simple. without attributes, and the eternal, shapeless, chaotic matter (the Platonic ὕλη). It is the reflection, the first-born Son of God; the second God; the sum of the ideas,  which are the original types of all existence; the ideal world itself (κόσμος νοητός); the medium through which the actual, sensible world (κόσμος αἰσθητός) is created and upheld; the interpreter and revealer of God; the archangel, who destroyed Sodom and Gomorrah, spoke to Jacob and to Moses in the burning bush, and led the people of Israel through the wilderness; the high-priest (ἀρχιερεύς), and advocate (παράκλητος), who pleads the cause of sinful humanity before God, and procures for it the pardon of its guilt. We see an apparent affinity of this view with the christology of St. Paul and St. John, and thus it probably came to exert no small influence with the early Church fathers in the evolution of their doctrine of the Logos.

But at the same time we must not overlook the very essential difference. Philo's doctrine would not itself suggest the application of the idea of the Logos to any historical appearance whatever; for the revelation of the Logos refers not exclusively to any single fact, but to everything relating to the revelation of God in nature and history. If, according to John's Gospel, the appearance of the Logos is the highest and only medium of communication with God, then communion with the Logos in Philo's sense can only be a subordinate standpoint; for not even the highest man immediately apprehends the Absolute. Yet out of this religious idealism a preparation and a medium might be formed for Christian realism, when what was here taken in a merely ideal sense showed itself as realized in humanity. Christianity refers the Logos to the perfect revelation of God in human nature, to the one revelation in Christ; and substitutes for the immediate apprehension of the Absolute the historically founded communion with God revealed in Christ. The symbolical meaning of Philo's Paraclete was elevated by the reference to the historical Christ as the only high-priest. Thus the Alexandrian ideas formed a bridge to Christianity. But we cannot regard the doctrine of a union of the Logos with humanity, in all the forms under which it appeared, as a reflection in the first place of Christianity, but must doubtless presuppose a tendency of this kind before the Christian aera. A yearning of the spirit goes before great events — an unconscious longing for that which is to come. This must especially have been the case in that greatest revolution which the religious development of humanity experienced. It was preceded by an unconscious feeling of a revelation of the spiritual world to humanity — a longing which hastened to meet the new communications from God. It was not difficult for those who regarded the Logos as the medium of revelation, by which God made himself cognizable to pious souls, and, on the other hand, who held the Messiah to be the highest of God's messengers, to suppose a particular  connection between him and the Logos. But, after all, this Jewish idea of the Logos is quite eclipsed by the Christian idea of the Messiah: with the Jews it is simply the hope of their miraculous restoration from all parts of the world to Palestine, through the agency of a superhuman appearance (/OgLc); and even this supernatural phenomenon has no legitimate place in Philo's system; it means nothing.

But again, his dualistic and idealistic view of the world absolutely excludes an incarnation, which is the central truth' of Christianity (comp. Dorner, Person of Christ). His Christ, if he needed any. could have been at best but a gnostic, docetistic, fantastic Christ; his redemption, but ideal and intellectual. He attained only an artificial harmony between God and the world, between Judaism and heathenism; which hovered, like a "spectral illusion," an "evanescent fata morgana," on the horizon of dawning Christianity. Says Schaff, "It is a question not vet entirely settled whether Philo's Logos was a personal hypostasis or merely a personification, a divine attribute. While Gfrorer, GrossmannDahne, Lucke, Ritter, and Semisch maintain the former view, Dorner (Entwicklungsgeschichte der Lehre von der Person Christi, 2d ed. 1:23 sq.) has latterly attempted to re-establish the other. To me, Philo himself seems to vibrate between the two views; and this obscurity accounts for the difference among so, distinguished scholars on this point" (Hist. of the Apostolic Church, page 180). The eternal atonement, which Philo imagined already made and eternally being made by his ideal Logos, could be effected only by a creative act of the condescending love of God; and it is a remarkable instance of divine wisdom in history that this redeeming act was really performed about the same time that the greatest Jewish philosopher and theologian of his age was dreaming of and announcing to the world a ghostlike shadow of it.

Of his other philosophic speculations we have space only to refer to some of his ethical views. With him knowledge and virtue are gifts of God, to be obtained only by self-abnegation on the part of man. A life of contemplation is superior to one of practical, political occupation. In other words, the business of man is to follow and imitate God (De Caritate, 2:404, et pass.). The soul must strive to become the dwelling-place of God, his holy temple, and so to become strong, whereas it was before weak, and wise, whereas before it was foolish (De Somn. 1:23). The highest blessedness is to abide in God (πέρας εὐδαιμονίας τὸ ἀκλινῶς καὶ ἀῤῥεπῶς ἐν μόνῳ στῆναι). The various minor sciences serve as a preparatory training for the knowledge of God. Of the philosophical  disciplines, logic and physics are of little worth. The highest step in philosophy is the intuition of God, to which the sage attains through divine illumination when, completely renouncing himself and leaving behind his finite self-consciousness, he resigns himself unresistingly to the divine influence.

It remains for us to notice the use that has been made of Philo's writings within the domain of New-Test. interpretation. There are some Christian exegetists who in their rationalistic tendency have gone so far as to account for the character and style of some of the NewTest. Scriptures by referring their origin to Philo's writings. (We here quote largely from Kitto's Biblical Cyclopcedia.) Mr. Grinfield. in his Hellenistic Greek Testament, and the accompanying Scholia, has derived many of his notes from the works of Philo; in the application, however, of such illustrations, it must be borne in mind that Philo's style was hardly a natural one; it is very elaborate, and avoids Alexandrian provincialisms, and on that account often fails to elucidate the simple diction of the New Test., even where there is similarity in the subject-matter (comp. Carpzovii Exer. Sacr. in Ep. ad Hebr. page 140). But recent critics of the rationalistic school are not content with finding in Philo such illustration of the New Test. as might be expected to occur in a contemporary, and in some respects kindred, Greek writer; they go so far as to assert that some of the prominent doctrines of the sacred writers are little else than accommodations from the opinions of Philo, mediate or immediate. Thus Grossmann (Quaest. Philon. sub init.) does not scruple to say that Christianity is the product of the allegories of the Jewish synagogue and of Philo. Other writers, more measured in their terms, trace isolated truths to a like source. For instance, the well-disposed Ernesti (Institutes), and after him Luicke, who says, "It is impossible to mistake as to the immediate historical connection of John's doctrine of the Logos with the Alexandrian in its more perfect form, as it occurs in Philo." Similarly, Strauss, De Wette, and others; while others again apply the like criticism to St. Paul. Among these we must especially notice Gfrorer, whose work, Philo und die judisch-alexandrinische Theologie, has been made accessible to English readers, in an abridged form. by Prof. Jowett, in his dissertation St. Paul and Philo, contained in his commentary on St. Paul's Epp. 1:363-417.

No criticism, however, is to be tolerated by the believer in Revelation which does not start from the principle that the characteristic truths of Christianity are self-evolved, i.e., (to use Dorner's words) "have not emerged from without Christianity, but wholly from  within it" (Person of Christ [Clark], volume 1, Introduction, page 45). Instead of making Philo, in any sense, a fountain-head of Christian doctrine, it would be more correct to regard him as the unconscious source of antichristian opinion — unconscious, we say, for with all his knowledge and skill in style, Philo possessed not those energetic qualities which characterize founders of schools of opinion. To say nothing of Philo's influence upon the theosophizing fathers of the Church, Clement of Alexandria and Origen, who borrowed largely from their Jewish predecessor and fellow-citizen, some of the salient heresies of the early centuries had almost their spring in the Philonian writings (for the affinity of the opposite opinions of Arius and Sabellius to certain opinions of Philo, see Mosheim's Notes on Cudworth cited below); while that pagan philosophy, the Neo-Platonism of Alexandria, which derived much of its strength and obtained its ultimate defeat from the Christianity which it both aped and hated, is mainly traceable to our Philo. For a popular but sufficiently exact statement of (1) Philo's relation to Neo-Platonism, and (2) of the antagonism of this Neo-Platonism to Christianity, the reader is referred to Lewes's Hist. of Philosophy, pages 260-278. Although we cannot therefore allow that the inspired volume of the Christian religion owes in its origin anything to Philo, we do not deny to his writings a certain utility in the interpretation of the New Test. SEE PHILOSOPHY, GREEK.

Besides the explanation of words and phrases above referred to (a service which is the more valuable because of Philo's profound acquaintance with the Septuagint version, in which the writers of the New Test. show themselves to have been well versed also), the works of Philo sometimes contribute interesting elucidation of scriptural facts and statements. We may instance his delineation of the character of Pontius Pilate (De Legat. ad Caium, 38, Richter, 6:134; Bohn, 4:164). This well- drawn sketch of such a man, from the masterly hand of a contemporary, throws considerable light on more than one point, such as the relations of Herod and Pilate, which are but lightly touched in the Gospels (comp. Hale's Analysis, 3:216-218). As a second instance, may we not regard the remarkable passage of St. Paul as receiving light from Philo's view of the twofold creation, first of the heavenly (οὐράνιος) or ideal man, and then of the earthly (γήϊνος) man? (Comp. 1Co 15:46-47, with Philo, De Allegor. Legis, 1:12, 13 [Richter, 1:68; Bohn, 1:601, and De Mundi Opific. page 46 [Richter, 1:43; Bohn, 1:39]; and see Stanley on Corinthians, 1:331.) But then such illustration is rather an example of how Philo is corrected by St. Paul, than of how St. Paul borrowed from Philo.  Respecting the allegorical method of interpreting the Old Test., of which the apostle is alleged to have derived the idea from our author, it should be remembered that St. Paul, guided by the Divine Spirit, who had indited the ancient Scriptures, was directed to apply Old-Test. facts to New-Test. doctrines, as correlative portions of one great scheme of providential dispensation; whereas Philo's adaptations of te same facts were only the product of an arbitrary and extremely fanciful imagination; so that in the case of the former we have an authoritative and sure method of interpreting ancient events without ever impairing their historical and original truth, whereas the latter affords us nothing besides the conjectures of a mind of great vivacity indeed, but often capricious and inconsistent, which always postpones the truth of history to its allegorical sense, and oftentimes wholly reduces it to a simple myth. Readers of Philo are well aware of the extravagance and weakness of many of his allegories; of these some are inoffensive, no doubt, and some others are even neat and interesting, but none carry with them the simple dignity and expressiveness of the allegorical types of the New Test. St. Paul and Philo, it is well known, have both treated the history of Hagar and Sarah allegorically (comp. Gal 4:22-31 with Philo, De Congressu, pages 1-5 [Richter, 3:71-76; Bohn, 2:157-162]; and see Lightfoot, Epist. to Gal. pages 189-191; and Howson's Hagar and Arabia, pages 20, 36, 37); but although we have here one of the best specimens of Philo's favorite method, how infinitely does it fall short of St. Paul's! To say nothing of authority, it fails in terseness and point, and all the features of proper allegory. The reader will at once perceive this who examines both.

Literature. — For an account of Philo's philosophical and theological system in general, the reader is referred to Mosheim's notes on Cudworth, p. 640-649 [transl. by Harrison, 2:320-333], where Philo's influence on Patristic divinity and early heresy, especially the Sabellian, is clearly traced; to Ritter, Hist. of Phil. [transl. by Morrison], 4:407-478; and to Dollinger, The Gentile and the Jew [transl. by Darnell], 2:398-408; Neander, Hist. of Christ. Dogmas, 11:135 sq.; id. Ch. Hist. page 58 sq.; Ueberweg. Hist. of Philos. 1:222 sq.; Schaff, Hist. of the Apost. Ch. page 176 sq.; Tennemann, Hist. of Phil. page 170 sq.; Fabricius, Dis. de Platonismo Philonis (Leips. 1693, 4to); id. Sylloge Dissertat. (Hamb. 1738, 4to); Stahl, Attempt at a Systematic Statement of the Doctrines of Philo of Alexandria, in the Allgem. Bibl. der Bibl. Literatur of Eichhorn, tom. 4. fasc. 5; Schreiter, Ideas of Philo respecting the Immortality of the Soul, the Resurrection,  and Future Retribution, in the Analecten of Keil and Tzchirner, volume 1, section 2; see also volume 3, section 2; Scheffer, Quaestiones, part 1, 2, 1829-31; Grossmann, Quaestiones Philoniance, part 1, De theologies Philonis fontibus et auctoritate (1829); Gfrorer, Philo und die Alexandrinische Theosophie (1831, 1835, 2 volumes); Dahne, Geschichtliche Darstellung der judisch-alexandrinischen Religionsphilosophie (1831), part 1; id. in the Theol. Studien und Kritiken, 1833, page 984; Bucher, Philonische Studien (1848); Creuzer, Kritik der Schriften des Juden Philon, in Theol. Studien und Kritiken, January 1832. Philo's opinions about the divine Logos have been warmly discussed. The ancients, as we have seen, were fond of identifying them with Christian doctrine; Mangey, in the middle of the last century, accompanied his splendid edition of Philo's works (2 volumes, fol.) with a dissertation, in which he made our author attribute, in the Christian sense, a distinct personality to the Logos; bishop Bull had stated a similar opinion (Def. Fid. Nic. [transl. by the Reverend Peter Holmes for the Anglo. Cath. Lib.], 1:31-33); and, more recently, Bryant (Sentiments of Philo Jud. concerning the λόγος); and, very lately, Pye Smith (Messiah, 1:573-600).

But the conclusions of these writers, however learnedly asserted, have been abundantly refuted in many works; the chief of which are Carpzovii Disput. de λόγῳ Philonis, non Johannis, adversus Mangey (1749); Csesar Morgan's Investigation of the Trinity of Plato and of Philo Jud.; Burton's Banmpton Lectures, note 93, pages 550-560; and Dorner's Person of Christ [Clarke], 1:22-41. (See also the able articles of professors H.B. Smith and Moses Stuart, in the Bibliotheca Sacra, 6:156-185, and 7:696- 732.) An interesting review of Philo's writings and their relation to Judaism, from the Jewish point of view, occurs in Jost's Geschichte des Judenthums, 1:379-393 (the chapter is designated Die Gnosis im Judenthume); Gratz, Gesch. der. Juden, 3:298 sq.; Schultz, Die judische Religionsphilosophie in Gelzer's Prot. Monatsblatt, volume 24, No. 4 (October 1864); Clemens, Die Therapeuten (Konigsb. 1809); Georgius, Ueber die neuesten Gegensatze in Aufassung der Alexandrin. Religionsphilosophie in Illgen's Zeitschr. f. hist. Theol. (1839), Nos. 3 and 4; Keferstein, Philo's Lehre v.d. Mittelwesen (Leips. 1846); Wolff, Die Philonische Philosophie (ibid. 1849; 2d ed. Gothenb. 1858); Frankel, Zur Ethik des Philo, in Monatschrift f. Gesch. u. Wissensch. d. Judenthums, July 1867; Delaney, Philon d'Alexandrie (Paris, 1867).  We ought not to close this article without noticing the old opinion which made Philo the author of the beautiful Book of Wisdom in the Apocrypha. This opinion, which was at one time very prevalent, has not stood its ground before recent critical examination. For the literature of the question we can only refer our readers to Prof. C.L.W. Grimm's Das Buch der Weisheit, Einleitung, section 6, where the authorities on both sides are given. Corn. a Lapide, in Librum Sapientiae, also discusses Philo's claims to the distinguished honor which tradition had conferred on him, but decides against him [new edition by Vives. 8:264].

Besides Mangey's edition of Philo, above referred to, we mention Turnebus's edition (Paris, 1552, fol.), emended by Hoeschelius (Colon. Allobrog. 1613; Paris, 1640; Francof. 1691); Pfeiffer's edition, incomplete (Erlangen, 1785-92, 5 volumes, 8vo), and the convenient edition by Richter (Leips. 1828-30, 8 volumes, 12mo). This last contains not only a reprint of Mangey, in the first six volumes, but two supplementary volumes of Philo's writings, discovered by Angelo Mai in a Florentine MS., and by Bapt. Aucher in an Armenian version, and translated by him into Latin. What an edition of Philo ought to be to deserve the approbation of the critical student has been pointed out by different German theologians, most recently by Creuzer, in Theol. Studien u. Kritiken, 1832, pages 1-43. A popular and cheap edition was published at Leipsic (1851-53); also Philonea, ed. Tischendorf (Leips. 1868). A fuller account of these editions, with a list of the various versions of Philo's writings, which have been made from time to time into Latin, Hebrew, German, French, Italian, Spanish, and English, is contained in Fiirst's Bibl. Jud. Furst adds a catalogue of all the leading works in which Philo and his writings have been treated. To his list of versions we must here add the useful one published by Mr. Bohn, in four vols. of his Eccl. Library, by Mr. Yonge.

For a complete, and withal succinct examination of the entire field of Philo's opinions, we refer to Herzog's Real-Encyklop. 11:578-603. Shorter and more accessible, but inevitably imperfect, notices occur in Smith's Dict. of Gr. and Rom. Biog. and Mythol. 3:309 sq.; Schaff's Apostolic Church [Clarke], pages 211-214; Horne's Introduction [by Eyre], pages 277, 278; [by Davidson], pages 363-365; Davidson's Hermeneutics [Clarke, 1843], pages 63-65; Fairbairn's Hermeneut. Man. page 47. A temperate review of Jowett's Dissertation on Philo and St. Paul may be found, written by Dr. J.B. Lightfoot, in the Journal of Philology, 3:119-121; and for sound views respecting Philo's doctrine of the λόγος, as bearing upon the  writings of the New Test., see Neander's Planting of the Christian Church [Bohn], 2:13-15; Westcott's Introduction, pages 138-143, and Tholuck's St. John [Clarke], pages 62-67. The interest of Jews in the writings of their philosophic countryman is curiously exhibited in the Hebrew version of certain of them. These are enumerated by Furst, Bibl. Judaica, 2:90. As. de' Rossi, one of the translators, has revived Philo's synonym Jedidiah, by which he was anciently designated in Rabbinical literature (see Bartolocci, ut sup., and Steinschneider's Bodl. Catal. s.v. Philon).

## Philo Carpathius[[@Headword:Philo Carpathius]]

             (from Carpathus, an island north-east of Crete), or, rather, CARPASIUS (from Carpasia, a town in the north of Cyprus), an Eastern ecclesiastic, flourished about the opening of the 5th century. His birthplace is unknown, but he derived this cognomen from his having been ordained bishop of Carpasia by Epiphanius, the well-known bishop of Constantia. According to the statements of Joannes and Polybius, bishop of Rhinoscuri, in their life of Epiphanius (Vita Epiphan. chapter 49), Philo, at that time a deacon, was sent, along with some others, by the sister of the emperors Arcadius and Honorius, to bring Epiphanius to Rome, that through his prayers and the laying on of hands she might be saved from a dangerous disease under which she was laboring. Pleased with Philo, Epiphanius not only ordained him bishop of Carpasia, but gave him charge of his own diocese during his absence. This was about the beginning of the 5th century (Cave, Hist. Litt. page 240, ed. Genev.). Philo Carpasius is principally known from his commentary on the Canticles, which he treats allegorically. A Latin translation, or, rather, paraphrase of this commentary, with ill-assorted interpolations from the commentary of Gregorius I, by Salutatus, was published (Paris, 1537, and reprinted in the Biblioth. Pat. Lugdun. volume 5). Fragments of Philo's commentary are inserted in that on the Canticles, which is falsely ascribed to Eusebius, edited by Meursius (Lugd. Batav. 1617). In these he is simply named Philo, without the surname. Bandurius, a Benedictine monk, promised in 1705 a genuine edition, which he never fulfilled. Al edition, however, was published from a Vatican MS. in 1750, under the name of Epiphanius, and edited by Fogginius. The most important edition, however, is that of Giacomellus (Rome, 1772), from two MSS. This has the original Greek, a Latin translation, with notes, and is accompanied by the entire Greek text of the Canticles, principally from the Alexandrian recension. This is reprinted in Galland, N. Bibl. PP. 9:713:  Ernesti (Neueste Theolog. Bibl. volume 3, part 6), in a review of this edition, of which he thinks highly, is of opinion that the commentary, as we now have it, is but an abridgment of the original. Besides this commentary, Philo wrote on various parts both of the Old and New Test., fragments of which are contained in the various Catence. See Suidas, s.v.; Cave, l.c.; Fabricius, Bibl. Graec. 7:398, 611; 8:645; 10:479; Smith, Dict. of Gr. and Rom. Biog. s.v.; Herzog, Real-Encyklopadie, s.v.

## Philo Of Larissa[[@Headword:Philo Of Larissa]]

             an academic philosopher of Athens, flourished in the century preceding the Christian sera. He quitted the Greek capital on the success of the army of Mithridates, and went to Rome, where he had Cicero for a disciple. He gained renown by his services to philosophic science. He furnished a more complete and systematic division of the different branches of philosophy, and was more methodic in his terms. He is also often spoken of as the founder of the third academy. See Tennemann, Manual of Hist. of Philosophy; Ueberweg, Hist. of Philosophy (see Index in volume 2).

## Philo Of Tarsus[[@Headword:Philo Of Tarsus]]

             a deacon. He was a companion of Ignatius of Antioch, and accompanied the martyr from the East to Rome, A.D. 107. He is twice mentioned in the epistles of Ignatius (Ad Philadelph. c. 11; Ad Smynaeos, c. 13). He is supposed to have written, along with Rheus Agathopus, the Martyrium Ignatii, for which SEE IGNATIUS. See Cave, Hist. Litt. page 28 (ed. Geneva, 1720).

## Philo Senior[[@Headword:Philo Senior]]

             Josephus (Apion, 1:23), when enumerating the heathen writers who had treated of Jewish history, mentions together Demetrius Phalerens. Philo, and Eupolemon. Philo he calls the elder (πρεσβύτερος), probably to distinguish him from Philo Judaeus, and he cannot mean Herennius Philo, who lived after his time. Clemens Alexandrinus (Stromat. 1:146) also couples together the names of Philo the elder and Demetrius, stating that their lists of Jewish kings differed. Hence Vossius thinks that both authors refer to the same person (De Hist. Graec. page 486, ed. Westermann). In this Jonsius agrees with him, while he notices the error of Josephus, in giving Demetrius the surname of Phalereus (De Script. Hist. Php 3:4, page 17). As Huetius (Demonstrat. Evangel. page 62) was of opinion that the apocryphal Book of Wisdom was written by this Philo, he was necessitated to consider him as a Hellenistic Jew, who, unskilled in the original Hebrew, had it translated, and then expanded it, in language peculiar to his class (ibid. pages 62, 246, etc.). Fabricius thinks that the Philo mentioned by Josephus may have been a Gentile, and that a Philo different from either Philo Judaeus or senior was the author of the Book of Wisdom. Eusebius (Prcep. Evangel. 9:20, 24) quotes fifteen obscure hexameters from Philo, without giving hint of who he is, and merely citing them as from Alexander Polyhistor.These evidently form part of a history of the Jews in verse, and were written either by a Jew, in the character of a  heathen, as Fabricius hints is possible, or by a heathen acquainted with the Jewish Scriptures. This is, in all probability, the work referred to by Josephus and Clemens Alexandrinus. Of course the author must have lived before the time of Alexander Polyhistor, who came to Rome B.C. 83. It is doubtful whether he is the same as the geographer of the same name.

## Philo The Dialectician[[@Headword:Philo The Dialectician]]

             SEE PHILO THE MEGARIAN.

## Philo The Megarian, Or Dialectician[[@Headword:Philo The Megarian, Or Dialectician]]

             was a disciple of Diodorus Cronus, and a friend of Zeno, though older than the latter, if the reading in Diogenes Laertius (7:16) is correct. In his Menexenus he mentioned the five daughters of his teacher (Clem. Alex. Strom. 4:528, ed. Potter), and disputed with him respecting the idea of the possible, and the criteria of the truth of hypothetical propositions. With reference to the first point, Philo approximated to Aristotle, as he recognised that not only what is, or will be, is possible (as Diodorus maintained), but also what is in itself conformable to the particular purpose of the object in question, as of chaff to burn (κατὰ ψιλὴν λεγόμενον ἐπιτηδειότητα; Alex. Aphrod. Nat. Qual. 1:14; comp. on the whole question Harris, in Upton's Arriani Dissertat. Epict. 2:19, ap. Schweighiuser, 2:515, etc.). Diodorus had allowed the validity of hypothetical propositions only when the antecedent clause could never lead to an untrue conclusion, whereas Philo regarded those only as false which with a correct antecedent had an incorrect conclusion (Sext. Empir. Adv. Math. 8:113, etc.; Hypotyp. 2:110; comp. Cicero, Acad. 2:47; De Fato, 6).  Both accordingly had sought for criteria for correct sequence in the members of hypothetical propositions, and each of them in a manner corresponding to what he maintained respecting the idea of the possible. Chrysippus attacked the assumption of each of them.

The Philo who is spoken of as an Athenian and a disciple of Pyrrhon, though ridiculed by Timon as a sophist, can hardly be different from Philo the dialectician (Diog. Laert. 9:67, 69). Jerome (Jov. 1) speaks of Philo the dialectician and the author of the Menexenus as the instructor of Carneades, in contradiction to chronology, perhaps in order to indicate the sceptical direction of his doctrines.

## Philo The Monk[[@Headword:Philo The Monk]]

             An ascetic treatise, bearing the name of Philo Monachus, whom Cave (Hist. Litt. page 176) deems to be much later than the other ecclesiastical writers of the same name, is preserved in the library of Vienna (Cod. Theol. 325, No. 15). It is entitled Contra Pulchritudinem Feuminarum.

## Philo The Pythagorean[[@Headword:Philo The Pythagorean]]

             Clemens Alexandrinus (Strom. 1:305) and Sozomen (1:12) mention Philo ὁ Πεθαγόρειος. It is probable from their language that they both mean by the person so designated PHILO JUDEUS. Jonsius (ibid. 3, c. 4, page 17) is strongly of opinion that Philo the elder and this Philo mentioned by Clemens are the same. Fabricius, who once held this opinion, was led to change his views (Bibl. 1:862), and tacitly assumes (4:738) that Sozomen indicates Philo Judaeus by this epithet.

## Philo The Rhetorician And Philosopher[[@Headword:Philo The Rhetorician And Philosopher]]

             Cave, Giacomellus, and Ernesti are of opinion that this is no other than Philo Carpathius (q.v.). His aera agrees with this, for the philosopher is quoted by Athanasius Sinaita, who flourished about A.D. 561. We need not be startled at the term philosopher as applied to an ecclesiastic. This was not uncommon. Michael Psellus was termed the prince of philosophers, and Nicetas was surnamed, in the same way as Philo, ῥήτωρ καὶ φιλόσοφος. Besides, Polybius, in the life of Epiphanius, expressly calls Philo of Carpathia κληρικόν ἀπὸ ῥητόρων, which Tillemont and others erroneously understand to mean a man who has changed from the profession of the law to that of the Church. Cave shows that the ῥήτωρ  held an office in the Church itself, somewhat analogous to our professorship of ecclesiastical history. Our only knowledge of Philo, under this name, whether it be Philo Carpathius or not, is from an inedited work of Anastasius Sinaita, preserved in the library of Vienna and the Bodleian. Glycas (Annal. page 283, etc.), it is true, quotes as if from Philo, but he has only borrowed verbatim, and without acknowledgment, from Anastasius. The work of Anastasius referred to is entitled by Cave Demonstratio Historica de Magna et Angelica summi Sacerdotis Dignitate. Philo's work therein quoted is styled a Church history, but, if we may judge from the only specimen of it we have, we need, hardly regret its loss. It consists of a tale regarding a monk, that, being excommunicated by his bishop, and having afterwards suffered martyrdom, he was brought in his coffin to the church, but could not rest till the bishop, warned in a dream, had formally absolved him. See Cave, Hist. Litt. page 176 (ed. Geneva, 1720); Fabricius, Bibl. Graec. 7:420.

## Philolaus[[@Headword:Philolaus]]

             a Pythagorean philosopher, was born at Crotona, or Tarentum, towards the close of the 5th century B.C. Aresas, a probable disciple of Pythagoras, was his master; so that we receive the Pythagorean doctrine from Philolaus, only as it appeared to the third generation, and an account of it is therefore more properly in place in a general examination of the philosophy of Pythagoras (q.v.). It has been repeated once and again that Philolaus divined the true theory of the universe, and was the virtual predecessor of Copernicus. Nothing can be more false. In his scheme indeed, not the earth, but fire, is placed in the centre of the unit verse; that fire, however, is not the sun, which, on the contrary, he makes revolve around the central πῦρ. The scheme, in so far as it can be understood, is altogether fantastic, based on no observation or comparison of phenomena, but on vague and now unintelligible metaphysical considerations. The only predecessor of Copernicus in antiquity was Aristarchus of Samos, whose remarkable conjectures appeared first in the editio princeps of Archimedes-published after Copernicus wrote. Of Philolaus's three works, written in the Doric dialect, only fragments now remain. See Bockh, Leben, nebst den Bruchstiicken seiner Werke (Berl. 1819); Smith, Diet. of Gr. and Rom. Biog. and Mythol. s.v.; Ueberweg, Hist. of Philos. (see Index in volume 2); Butler, Hist. of Ancient Philos. volume 2. (J.H.W.)

## Philologus[[@Headword:Philologus]]

             (φιλόλογος ,fond of talk), one of the Christians at Rome to whom Paul sent his salutations (Rom 16:15). A.D. 55. Origen conjectures that he was the head of a Christian household which included the other persons named with him. Dorotheus makes him one of the seventy disciples, and alleges that he was placed by the apostle Andrew as bishop of Sinope, in Pontus (see Epiphanins, Mon. page 68, ed. Dressel). Pseudo-Hippolytus (De LXX Apostolis) substantially repeats the same improbable tradition. His name is found in the Columbarium "of the freedmen of Livia Augusta" at Rome; which shows that there was a Philologus connected with the imperial household at the time when it included many Julias. The name Philologus was a common one at Rome (Lewin, Life and Epistles of St. Paul, 2:71).

## Philology, Comparative[[@Headword:Philology, Comparative]]

             The importance which this subject has assumed in modern science as a key to the history of national origin justifies its admission and brief discussion here, with special reference to the two Biblical tongues.

The ethnographical. table contained in the tenth chapter of Genesis has derived no little corroboration and illustration from the researches of modern philology. It has thus been clearly established that all the languages which have furnished a polished literature are reducible to two great families, corresponding, with a few sporadic variations, to the lineage of the two older sons of Noah respectively, namely, Shem and Japheth. The former of these, which is in fact usually designated as the Shemitic, is emphatically Oriental, and embraces the Hebrew and Arabic, with their cognates, the Samaritan, the eastern and western Aramaean, or Chaldee and Syriac, and the Ethiopic. The latter, which is conveniently styled the Indo-Germanic group, includes the Sanscrit, with its sister the Zend, and their offshoots, the Greek, the Latin, the Gallic, the Saxon — in a word, the stock of the Occidental or European languages. The analogies and coincidences subsisting between the members of the Shemitic family have been pretty fully exhibited by Castell, Gesenius, and First in their lexicons, and by Ewald and Nordheimer in their grammars; while the relationship existing among the Indo-Germanic group has been extensively traced by Bopp in his Comparative Granmar, by Pott in his Etymologische Forschungen, and by Benfey in his Wurzel-Lexicon. Other philologists,  among whom De Sacy, Bournouf, Max Muller, and Renan may be especially mentioned, have somewhat extended the range of these comparisons, and occasional resemblances have been pointed out in particular forms between the Shemitic and Indo-Germanic branches; but no systematic collation of these latter coincidences, so far as we are aware, has been instituted, unless we accept such fanciful attempts as those of Parkhurst, who derives most of the Greek primitives from Hebrew roots! Yet notwithstanding the confusion at Babel and many a later linguistic misadventure, the common Noachian parentage ought to be capable of vindication by some distinct traces, at least of analogy if not of identity, in early forms of speech existing among both these great branches of the human family as represented by their written records. We propose in this article briefly to exhibit a few of these resemblances which have presented themselves in our own ilvestigations as arguing a common origin, although a remote one, between the Shemitic and the Indo-Germanic tongues; the most of them are certainly too striking to have been accidental. Lest we should venture beyond our own or our readers' depth, and make our pages bristle with an unnecessary display of foreign characters, we shall confine our illustrations to the Hebrew, on the one hand, and to the Greek. Latin, French, German, and English, on the other, as sufficient representatives of the two linlgual families which we are comparing.

I. Identity of Roots. — The following is a table, compiled from notes made in the course of our own reading, of such Hebrew roots as recur among the European dialects so strikingly similar in tolrn auin significanlce as to leave little doubt in most cases of their original identity. We have carefully excluded all those that betray evidences of later or artificial introduction from one language to the other, such as commercial, mechanical, or scientific terms, mere technicals, obvious onomatopoetics, names of animals, plants, minerals, official titles, etc., and we have selected words representing families as far divergent as possible, rather than those exhibiting the most striking resemblance. It will be interesting to observe how a root has sometimes slipped out of one or more of the cognate dialects, in the line of descent, and reappears in another representative; a few only are found in all the columns. In some of them again the signification or form has become disguised in one or another of the affiliated languages, but becomes clear again in a later representative. We have restored the digamma wherever it was necessary in order to bring out  the relationship in the Greek roots. Those marked with an asterisk are Chaldee. A few out of their proper column are included in brackets.

This list is sufficiently copious, after deducting those which further researches may show to be merely fortuitous, to prove a more than accidental agreement in words of frequent use. Many of the roots are evidently related to each other, and most of them are found in sevral kindred forms. Among these the selection has here been made not so much for the purpose of exhibiting the most palpable similarity, as to include the greatest variety of distinct etymons in each line of descent. We have not room to express the numerous cognates and derivatives of each, to trace the connection of their meanings with the common or generic import, nor to note the various orthographical changes that they have undergone. If the reader will take the trouble to investigate these points at his leisure, as he may readily do with the help of good lexicons of the respective languages, he will soon satisfy himself how widely these radices have ramified and how intimately they are connected. A comparison with their Arabic and Sanscrit parallels would still further verify the foregoing results.

II. Monosyllabic Roots. — It is well settled that the so-called weak radicals in Hebrew verbs, technically denominated Pe-Aleph, Pe-Nun, Pe- Yod, Lamed-He, etc., which drop away in the course of inflection, were not in reality originally triliteral at all, but that these letters were oily added in those forms in which they appear for the sake of uniformity with regular verbs. But these constitute in the aggregate a very large part, we apprehend a decided majority, of all the verbs most frequently employed in the language. Besides these, there is another very large class of roots of kindred or analogous signification with each other, and having two radicals in common. All these, as Gesenius has ingeniously shown in his Lexicon, are likewise to be regarded as essentially identical, the idea clinging in the two letters possessed by them in common. Thus we have reduced nearly the other moiety of Hebrew verbs, and these it must be remembered are the ground or stock of the entire vocabulary, to biliterals. The presumption is not an unwarrantable one that all the roots might etymologically be similarly retrenched. The few quadriliterals that occur are unceremoniously treated in this manner, being regarded as formed from ordinary roots by reduplication or interpolation.  Now it is a remarkable coincidence that the ultimate theme of the primitive Greek verb has been ascertained, in like manner, by modern philologists to be a monosyllable, consisting of two consonants vocalized, in precise conformity with the Hebrew system of vowel points, by a single mutable vowel. Thus the basis of such protracted forms even as λανθάνω, μανθάνω, διδάσχω, becomes λαθ, μαθ, δαχ. Indeed, Noah Webster has applied the same principle to all the roots of English words; and in his Dictionary (we speak of the quarto edition, originally published at New Haven in two volumes) he has indicated them as "class Dg, No. 28," etc., although he seems never to have published the key or list of this classification.

III. Primitive Tenses. — In nothing perhaps does the disparity between the Greek and the Hebrew verb strike the student at first more obviously than the multiplicity and variety of tense-forms in the former, compared with the meagre and vague array of tenses in the latter. A little further examination, however, shows that by means of the various so-called conjugations (Niphal, Hiphil, etc.) the Hebrews managed to extend their paradigm to pretty considerable dimensions. Here the Heb. Piel and other dageshed conjugations evidently correspond with the reduplication of the Greek perfect and pluperfect tenses, while the prefixed syllable of Hiphil, etc., affords a clew to the device of the simple augment in Greek. These, however, are comparatively unimportant, although interesting analogies.

The root of the Hebrew verb is found in its least disguised form in the praeter Kal. The future is but a modification of this, as is especially evident from the facility with which it resumes the preterit import with "vav conversive." The past is naturally the first and most frequent tense in use, because it is historical. In all these respects the prseter answers to the Greek second aorist. The augment of this tense was a secondary or subsequent invention, and, accordingly, Homer habitually disregards it. The "Attic reduplication" (for example, ἤγαγον) had a still later origin. The second aorist gives the root in its simplest if not purest form. It is further remarkable that none but primitive verbs have this tense, and no Greek verbs are primitive but those which exhibit a monosyllabic root as found in the stem of the second aorist. We invite the attention of scholars especially to these last enunciated principles. They show that this tense was originally the ground-form of the verb.  No tense in Greek exhibits greater modifications of the root than the present. This argues that the tense itself was of comparatively late date. Accordingly the derivative verbs most usually have it, although defective in many other parts and the variety of forms under which it appears occasions most of the so-called irregularities set down in tables of Greek verbs. Now the Hebrew has properly no present tense. Present time can only be expressed by means of the participle, with the substantive verb (regularly understood) like our "periphrastic present" ("I am doing," etc.). True to the analogy which we have indicated, the junior members of the Hebraistic family, especially the Chaldee and Syriac, have constructed a present tense out of the participle by annexing the inflective terminations appropriate to the different numbers and persons. This process illustrates the formation of

IV. Verb Inflections. — In Greek, as in Hebrew, the personal endings are obviously but fragments of the personal pronouns, appended to the verbal root or tensestem. This is so generally recognized to be the fact with respect to both these languages that we need dwell upon it only for the purpose of explaining, by its means, some of the peculiarities of the Greek verbs in — μι. This termination, which reappears in the optative of other verbs, was doubtless the original and proper sign of the first person, rather than the ending in — ω. The former is the basis of the oblique cases of the pronoun of the first person, μέ, me; as the latter is the last, but nonradical, syllable of the nominative, ἐγώ, I. It is in keeping with this that the verbs in — μι are some of the oldest in the language, for example, the substantive verb, εἰμί. The passive terminal — μαι is doubtless but a modification of the same. Now the principle or fact to which we wish to call particular attention in this connection is this: Every primitive "pure" verb in Greek is a verb in — μι. By this rule the student may always know them, as there are no others, except the few factitious verbs in — υμι, and very rare exceptions like ῥέω, τίω, πίνω, which are attributable to disguises of the true root. Let it now be further noted, in confirmation of what we have stated above concerning the Greek primal tense, that verbs in — μι have substantially the same inflection as the second aorist, and they have only those tenses with which these inflections are compatible. Neither of these last-named principles, it is true, is carried out with exactness, for the aorists passive of other verbs seem to have usurped these active terminations; but we are persuaded they are in general the real clew to the defectiveness and peculiar inflection of the forms in μι. We therefore look upon the verbs in question as interesting links in the descent from the older Hebrew type.

V. Declensional Endings. — In the absence of any real declensions whatever in the Hebrew, or any proper cases — unless the "construct state" be entitled to be regarded as a genitive — there is little ground of comparison with the copious series of modifications of the Greek noun and adjective. Yet Webster has noted the resemblance of the plural יםand Chaldee יןto the English oxen (archaic housen, etc.). The ν "ephelcustic" has its analogue in the "paragogic" ן, and is strikingly generalized in the "nunnation" of the Arabic.

VI. Vowel Changes. — To the learner the Hebrew language seems very complicated in this respect; but the whole process of vocalization is wrought out under the following simple law: that "without the tone, a long vowel cannot stand in a closed syllable, nor a short vowel in an open syllable." From this results practically the alternative of a long vowel or an additional consonant (or dagesh forte) in every unaccented syllable. In the Greek the following fundamental principle prevails: that a long vowel (or diphthong) indicates the omission of a consonant, except where it represents two short vowels; and this latter is tantamount to the other, for there is one letter less. Thus the systems of syllabication in both languages essentially coincide in this: that length in the vowel is equivalent to another consonant. We might take room to exemplify these rules, but the modern scholar will readily see their truth. In none of the later cognate languages is this principle regarded with much uniformity, although from the nature of the vocal organs themselves, it follows, even in so arbitrary a tongue (or rather so historical a spelling) as the Engllsh, that a vowel is naturally long when it ends the syllable, and short when a consonant closes the sound. But in the Greek and Hebrew the law we have propounded is consistently carried out in a complete system of euphonic changes which lie at the very threshold of either language.

Accordingly, in exactness of phonetic representation these two languages have no rival, not even in the German, Italian, or Spanish. Though the original sounds are now somewhat uncertain, yet it is evident (unless we take the degenerate modern Greek, and the discrepant modern Rabbinical pronunciations as perfect guides) that each letter and vowel in both had its own peculiar power. The two alphabets, we know, were identical in origin; for if we distrust the story of the importation of the Phoenician characters by Cadmus into Greece, we have but to compare the names, order, and forms of the written signs (reversing them, as the two languages were read  in opposite directions), in order to satisfy ourselves that they are essentially the same. Even the unappreciable אhas its equivalent in the spiritus lenis (as the עmay be visually represented by the spiritus asper), and the old digamma (Γαῦ) reappears in the consonantal ו. Perhaps the reason why v initial always has the rough breathing is owing to its affinity to both these last named. SEE ALPHABET.

We trust we have said enough to illustrate our proposition that these two lingual families, and especially their two chiefly interesting representatives — which, widely variant as they are in age, culture, flexibility, and genius, yet by a remarkable Providence have been brought together in the only revelation written for man — have no ordinary or casual points of resemblance. We would be glad to see the subject extended by some competent hand, especially by a comparison of the venerable and rich Sanscrit and Arabic. SEE SHEMITIC LANGUAGES.

## Philometor[[@Headword:Philometor]]

             (Φιλομήτωρ, mother-loving), the surname of Ptolemaeus VI of Egypt (2Ma 4:21). SEE PTOLEMY.

## Philon[[@Headword:Philon]]

             SEE PHILO.

## Philopatris[[@Headword:Philopatris]]

             is the name of a dialogue found among the writings of Lucian (q.v.). It is quoted in Church history as a contribution to the heathen satires against Christianity. It is a frivolous derision of the character and doctrines of the Christians in the form of a dialogue between Critias, a professed heathen, and Triephon, an Epicurean, personating a Christian. It represents the Christians as disaffected to the government, dangerous to civil society, and delighting in public calamities. It calls St. Paul a half-bald, long-nosed Galilmean, who travelled through the air to the third heaven (2Co 12:1-4). It combats the Church doctrine of the Trinity, and of the procession of the Spirit from the Father, though not by argument, but only by ridicule. Not its intrinsic value, but its historic references, make it a valuable production. The authenticity of the work has been called in question by Gessner, in his De aetate et auctore dialogi Lucianei, qui Philop. inscribitur (Jen. 1714; Leips. 1730; Getting. 1741; et in tom. 9, ed.  Bip.), who ascribes to it a post-Nicaean age. Of like opinion are Neander (Church Hist. 2:90) and Tzschirner (Fall des Heidenthums, page 312). Niebuhr (Kleine histor. u. philolog. Schriften, 2:73) dates it from the reign of Nicephorus Phocas (963-969), but this date is generally regarded as too recent. Compare Bernhardy, Berl. Jahrb. 1832, 2:131; Ehrmaln, in Stein's Studien der evangel. Geistlichkeit Wiirtembergs, 1839, page 47; Schmid, De Philopatride Lucianeo dialogo nova dissert. (Leips. 1830); Wetzlar, De cetate, vita scriptisque Luciani Samos (Marb. 1834) ; Schaff, Ch. Hist. 2:79. (J.H.W.)

## Philoponists[[@Headword:Philoponists]]

             a sect of Tritheists in the 6th cenrtury, named after a famous Alexandrian grammarian. Nature and hypostasis, he affirmed, were identical unity not being something real, but only a generic term, according to the Aristotelian logic. SEE PHILOPONUS.

## Philoponus, Joannes[[@Headword:Philoponus, Joannes]]

             (Ι᾿ωάννης ὁ Φιλόπονος), or JOANNES GRAMMATICUS (ὁ Γραμματικός), an Alexandrian theologian and philosopher of great renown, but which he little deserved on account of his extreme dulness and want of good-sense, was called Φιλόπονος because he was one of the most laborious and studious men of his age. He lived in the 7th century of our aera; one of his writings, Physica, is dated May 10, 617. He calls himself γραμματικός, undoubtedly because he taught grammar in his native town, Alexandria, and would in earlier times have been called rhetor. He was a disciple of the philosopher Ammonius. Although his celebrity is more based upon the number of his varied productions and the estimation in which they were held by his contemporaries than upon the intrinsic value of those works, he is yet so strangely connected with one of the most important events of his time (though only through subsequent tradition) that his name is sure to be handed down to future generations. We refer to the capture of Alexandria by Amru in A.D. 039, and the pretended conflagration of the famous Alexandrian library. It is in the first instance said that Philoponus adopted the Mohammedan religion on the city being taken by Amru, whence he may justly be called the last of the pure Alexandrian grammarians. Upon this, so the story goes, he requested Amru to grant him the possession of the celebrated library of Alexandria. Having informed the absent caliph Omar of the philosopher's wishes, Amru  received for answer that if the books were in conformity with the Koran, they were useless, and if they did not agree with it, they were to be condemned, and ought in both cases to be destroyed. Thus the library was burned. But we now know that this story is most likely only an invention of Abulfaraj, the great Arabic writer of the 13th century, who was, however, a Christian, and who, at any rate, was the first that ever mentioned such a thing as the burning of the Alexandrian library. We consequently dismiss the matter, referring the reader to the 51st chapter of Gibbon's Decline and Fall. It is extremely doubtful that Philoponus became a Mohamomedan. His favorite authors were Plato and Aristotle, whence his tendency to heresy; and he was one of the first and principal promoters of the sect of the Tritheists, which was condemned by the Council of Constantinople of 681. Starting with Monophysite principles, taking φύσις in a concrete instead of an abstract sense, and identifying it with ὑπόστασις, Philoponus distinguished in God three individuals, and so became involved in Tritheism.

This view he sought to justify by the Aristotelian categories of genus, species, and individuum. His followers were called Philoponiaci and Tritheistse. Philoponus, it may be remarked, was not the first promulgator of this error; but (as appears from Assem. Bibl. Orient. 2:327; comp. Hefele, 2:555) the Monophysite John Ascusnages, who ascribed to Christ only one nature, but to each person in the Godhead a separate nature, and on this account was banished by the emperor and excommunicated by the patriarch of Constantinople. The time of the death of Philoponus is not known. The following is a list of his works: Τῶν εἰς τὴν Μωυσέως κοσμογονίαν ἐξηγητικῶν λόγοι ζ᾿ ', Commentarii in Mosaicam Cosmogoniam, lib. 8, dedicated to Sergius, patriarch of Constantinople, who held that see from 610 to 639, and perhaps 641. Edit. Greece et Latine by Balthasar Corderius (Vienna, 1630, 4to). The editor was deficient in scholarship, and Lambecius promised a better edition, which, however, never appeared. Photius (Biblioth. cod. 75) compares the Cosmogonia with its author, and forms no good opinion of either: — Disputatio de Paschale, "ad calcem Cosmogoniae," by the same editor: — Κατὰ Πρόκλου περὶ ἀϊδιότητος κόσμου λύσεις, λόγοι Ιή, Adversus Procli de AEternitate Mundi Argumenta XVIII Solutiones, commonly called De AEternitate Mundi. The end is mutilated. Edit.: the text by Victor Trincavellus (Venice, 1535, fol.); Latin versions, by Joannes Mahotius (Lyons, 1557, fol.), and by Casparus Marcellus (Venice, 1551, fol.): — De quinque Dialectis Graecae Lingues Liber. Edit. Greece, together with the writings of some other grammarians, and the Thesaurus  of Varinus Camertes (Venice, 1476, fol.; 1504, fol.; ad calcem Lexici Graeco Latini, Venice, 1524, fol.; another, ibid. 1524, fol.; Basle, 1532, fol.; Paris, 1521, fol.): — Συναγωγὴ τῶν πρὸς διάφρρον σημασίαν διαφόρως τονουμενων λέξεων, Collectio Vocum quae pro diversa significatione Accentum diversum accipiunt, in alphabetical order. It has often been published at the end of Greek dictionaries. The only separate edition is by Erasmus Schmid (Wittenb. 1615, 8vo), under the title of Cyrilli, vel, ut alii volunt, Joanni Philoponi Opusculum utilissimum de Differentiis Vocum Graecarum, quod Tonum, Spiritum, Genus, etc., to which is added the editor's Dissertatio de Pronunciatione Graeca Antiqua. Schmid appended to the dictionary of Philoponus about five times as much of his own, but he separated his additions from the text:Coummentarii in Aristotelem, viz.

(1) In Analytica Priora. Edit.: the text, Venice, 1536, fol.; Latin versions, by Gulielmus Dorotheus (Venice, 1541, fol.), Lucillus Philaltheus (ibid. 1544, 1548, 1553, 1555, fol.), Alexander Justinianus (ibid. 1560, fol.).

(2) In Analytica Posteriora. Edit.: Venice, 1504, fol., together with Anonymi Grseci Commentarii on the same work (ibid. 1534, fol.), revised and with additions, together with Eustratii, episcopi Nicaeani (who lived about 1117) Commentarii on the same work. A Greek edition of 1534 is said to exist. Latin versions by Andreas Grateolus (Venice, 1542, fol.; Paris, 1543, fol.) and by Martianus Rota (Venice, 1559, 1568, fol.).

(3) In quatuor priores Libros Physicorum. Edit.: the text, cum Praefatione Victoris Trincavelli ad Casparum Contarenum Cardinalem (Venice, 1535, fol.); Latin version, by Gulielmus Dorotheus (ibid. 1539 and 1541, fol.); a better one by Baptista Rasarius (ibid. 1558,1569, 1581, fol.). Philoponus speaks of his Scholia to the sixth book, whence we may infer that he commented upon the last four books also.

(4) In Librum unicum Meteorum. The text ad calcem Olympiodori In Meteora (Venice, 1551, fol.); Latine, by Joannes Baptistus Camotius (ibid. 1551. 1567, fol.).

(5) In Libros III de Anima. Edit. Greece, cum Trincavelli Epistola ad Nicolaum Rudolphum Cardinalem (Venice, 1553, fol.); Latine, by Gentianus Hervetus (Lyons, 1544, 1548; Venice, 1554, 1568) and by Mattheus h Bove (Venice, 1544, 1581), all in folio.

(6) In Libros V De Generatione et Interitu. Graece, cum Praefatione Asalani (Venice, 1527, fol.), together with Alexander Aphrodiseus's Meteorologia.

(7) In Libros V De Generatione Animalium, probably by Philoponus. Edit. Greece cum Petri Corcyraei Epistola Graeca ad Andream Mattheeum Aquavivam (Venice, 1526, fol.): Latine, by the same, ibid. eodem anno. Black letter.

(8) In Libros XIV Metaphysicorum. Latine by Franciscus Patricius (Ferrara, 1583, fol.). The text was never published. Philoponus wrote many other works, some of which are lost. and others have never been published. Fabricius gives an "Index Scriptorum in Philop. De Mundi AEternitate memoratorum," and an "Index Scriptorum in universis Philoponi ad Aristotelem Commentariis memoratorum," both of great length. See Fabricius, Bibl. Graec. 10:639. etc.; Cave, Hist. Litt. volume 1; Smith, Dict. of Class. Biograph. s.v.; Schaff, Church History, 3:674, 767: Illgenfeld, Patristik, page 288; Ueberweg, History of Philosophy, 1:255, 259, 347-9, 402; Alzog, Kirchengeschichte, 1:313; Stillingfleet, Works, volume 1; Gieseler, Ecclesiastical History (see Index); Hagenbach, History of Doctrines; Cudworth, Intellectual System of the Universe (see Index).

## Philosarcas[[@Headword:Philosarcas]]

             (Gr. φιλέω, to love, and σάρξ, flesh), a term of reproach used by the Origenists in reference to the orthodox as believers in the resurrection of the body.

## Philosopher[[@Headword:Philosopher]]

             (φιλόσοφος). Of the Greek sects of philosophers existing in the time of the apostles, the Stoics and Epicureans are mentioned in Act 17:18, some of whom disputed with Paul at Athens. In Col 2:8 a warning is given against philosophy itself, as a departure from the knowledge of Christ; and it has been noticed that Paul, who had been a Pharisee, acted in this respect in harmony with the sect in which he had been educated (Grossmann, De Pharisaismo Judceor. Alex. 1:8). At least the rabbins set the divine law above all human wisdom; yet they do not appear to have given the name of philosophy to their expositions of the law (see Josephus, Revelation 2; Revelation 4; 1 Maccabees 1, 5). Paul is speaking.in the passage alluded to oftheosophic speculations, which had found an entrance among  Christians (5:16 sq.), and on which Rheinwald (De pseudo doctor. Colos. Bonn, 1834), Neander (Gesch. d. Pflanz. 1:438 sq.), and others have made investigations (see, in brief. De Wette, Br. a. d. Kolos. page 1 sq.). It is plain from Paul's letters that he denied all worth to human wisdom and philosophy in comparison with that eternal salvation which is only to be obtained through the divine revelation in the Gospel; but it is not necessary to suppose that he was a despiser of sober philosophic investigation, either on the ground of his pharisaic training or of his apostolic principles. For monographs, see Volbeding, Index Programmatuum, page 89 sq. SEE PHILOSOPHY.

## Philosophists[[@Headword:Philosophists]]

             a name given to a class of French writers who entered into a combination to overturn the religion of Jesus, and eradicate from the human heart every religious sentiment. The man more particularly to whom this idea first occurred was Voltaire, who, being weary (as he said himself) of hearing people repeat that twelve men were sufficient to establish Christianity, resolved to prove that one might be sufficient to overturn it. Full of this project, he swore, before the year 1730, to dedicate his life to its accomplishment; and for some time he flattered himself that he should enjoy alone the glory of destroying the Christian religion. He found, however, that associates would be necessary; and, from the numerous tribe of his admirers and disciples, he chose D'Alembert and Diderot as the most proper persons to cooperate with him in his designs. But Voltaire was not satisfied with their aid alone. He contrived to embark in the same cause Frederick II, king of Prussia. This royal adept was one of the most zealous of Voltaire's coadjutors, till he discovered that the philosophists were waging war with the throne as well as with the altar. This, indeed, was not originally Voltaire's intention. He was vain; he loved to be caressed by the great; and, in one word, he was from natural disposition an aristocrat, and an admirer of royalty. But when he found that almost every sovereign but Frederick disapproved of his impious projects because they perceived the issue, he determined to oppose all the governments on earth rather than forfeit the glory, with which he had flattered himself, of vanquishing Christ and his apostles in the field of controversy. He now set himself, with D'Alembert and Diderot, to excite universal discontent with the established order of things. For this purpose they formed secret societies, assumed new names, and employed an enigmatical language. Thus Frederick was  called Luc; D'Alembert, Protagoras. and sometimes Bertrand; Voltaire, Raton; and Diderot, Platon, or its anagram, Tonpla; while the general term for the conspirators was Cacoucc. In their secret meetings they professed to celebrate the mysteries of Mythra; and their great object, as they professed to one another, was to confound the wretch, meaning Jesus Christ. Hence their secret watchword was Ecrasez l'Infame, "Crush the Wretch." If we look into some of the books expressly written for general circulation, we shall there find the following doctrines; some of them standing alone in all their naked horrors, others surrounded by sophistry and meretricious ornaments, to entice the mind into their net before it perceives their nature: "The Universal Cause, that God of the philosophers, of the Jews, and of the Christians, is but a chimera and a phantom.

The phenomena of nature only prove the existence of God to a few prepossessed men: so far from bespeaking a God, they are but the necessary effects of matter prodigiously diversified. It is more reasonable to admit, with Manes, a twofold God, than the God of Christianity. We cannot know whether a God really exists, or whether there is the smallest difference between good and evil, or vice and virtue. Nothing can be more absurd than to believe the soul a spiritual being. The immortality of the soul, so far from stimulating man to the practice of virtue, is nothing but a barbarous, desperate, fatal tenet, and contrary to all legislation. All ideas of justice and injustice, of virtue and vice, of glory and infamy, are purely arbitrary, and dependent on custom. Conscience and remorse are nothing but the foresight of those physical penalties to which crimes expose us. The man who is above the law can commit without remorse the dishonest act that may serve his purpose. The fear of God, so far from being the beginning of wisdom, should be the beginning of folly. The command to love one's parents is more the work of education than of nature. Modesty is only an invention of refined voluptuousness. The law which condemns married people to live together becomes barbarous and cruel on the day they cease to love one another." These extracts from the secret correspondence and the public writings of these men will suffice to show us the nature and tendency of the dreadful system they had formed. The philosophists were diligently employed in attempting to propagate their sentiments. Their grand Encyclopcedia was converted into an engine to serve this purpose. SEE ENCYCLOPEDISTS.

Voltaire proposed to establish a colony of philosophists at Cleves, who, protected by the king of Prussia, might publish their opinions without dread or danger; and Frederick was disposed to take them under his protection, till he  discovered that their opinions were anarchical as well as impious, when he threw them off, and even wrote against them. They contrived, however, to engage the ministers of the court of France in their favor, by pretending to have nothing in view but the enlargement of science, in works which spoke, indeed, respectfully of revelation, while every discovery which they brought forward was meant to undermine its very foundation. When the throne was to be attacked, and even when barefaced atheism was to be promulgated, a number of impious and licentious pamphlets were dispersed (for some time none knew how) from a secret society formed at the Hotel d'Holbach, at Paris, of which Voltaire was elected honorary and perpetual president. To conceal their design, which was the diffusion of their infidel sentiments, they called themselves Encyclopedists. SEE HOLBACH.

The books, however, thatwere issued from this club were calculated to impair and overturn religion, morals, and government; and these, indeed, spreading over all Europe, imperceptibly took possession of public opinion. As soon as the sale was sufficient to pay the expenses, inferior editions were printed and given away, or sold at a very low price; circulating libraries of them were formed, and reading societies instituted. While they constantly disowned these productions before the world, they contrived to give them a false celebrity through their confidential agents and correspondents, who were not themselves always trusted with the entire secret. By degrees they got possession of most of the reviews and periodical publications; established a general intercourse, by means of hawkers and pedlers, with the distant provinces, and instituted an office to supply all schools with teachers; and thus did they acquire unprecedented dominion over every species of literature, over the minds of all ranks of people, and over the education of youth, without giving any alarm to the world. The lovers of wit and polite literature were caught by Voltaire; the men of science were perverted, and children corrupted in the first rudiments of learning, by D'Alembert and Diderot; stronger appetites were fed by the secret club of baron Holbach; the imaginations of the higher orders were set dangerously afloat by Montesquieu; and the multitude of all ranks were surprised, confounded, and hurried away by Rousseau. Thus was the public mind in France completely corrupted, and this, no doubt, greatly accelerated those dreadful events which afterwards transpired in that country.

## Philosophoumena[[@Headword:Philosophoumena]]

             SEE HIPPOLYTUS.

## Philosophy[[@Headword:Philosophy]]

             is the highest department of human speculation, the most abstract knowledge of which the human mind is capable.

Importance of the Subject. — The character of the investigations with which philosophy is concerned, and still more the superabundance during the last century of what has professed itself to be philosophy, render it excessively difficult either to define this branch of inquiry, or to determine what may be legitimately included under the wide designation. Sir William Hamilton devoted seven lectures of his course of metaphysics to the discussion of this single topic. The vagueness of the term, the instability and indistinctness of the boundaries of this department of knowledge, and the dissensions in regard to all its details, have led many quick and ingenious minds to repudiate the study altogether, and to deny to it any valid existence. Nevertheless it is necessary to recognise its reality, in spite of the uncertainty of its nature, of the confusion thus produced, and of the pretensions sheltered under its honorable name. It was a profound and keen reply, which was said to have been made by Aristotle to the assailants and abnegators of philosophy, that "whether we ought to philosophize or ought not to philosophize, we are compelled to philosophize" (εἴτε φιλοσοφητέον φιλοσοφητέον, εἴτε μὴ φιλοσοφητέον φιλοσοφητέον, πάντως δὲ φιλοσοφητέον, David. Prolegom. Phil., ap. Schol. Aristot. page 13, ed. Acad. Berol.), for philosophy is required to demonstrate the inanity and nugatoriness of philosophy: "But the mother of demonstrations is philosophy." The same deep sense of the irrecusable obligation is manifested by Plotinus, when, in a rare access of humor, he utters the paradoxical declaration that all things, rational and irrational — animals, plants, and even minerals, air and water too — alike yearn for theoretical perfection (or the philosophical completion of their nature, Ennead. 3:8:1); and that nature, albeit devoid of imagination and reason, has its philosophy within itself, and achieves whatever it effects by theory, or the philosophy which it does not itself possess. "There is reason in roasting eggs," and philosophy in all things, if we can only get at it:

"the meanest flower that blows can give Thoughts that do often lie too deep for tears."  Philosophy is, like death, one of the few things that we can by no means avoid, whether we welcome or reject it; whether we regard the irresistible tendencies of our intellectual constitution to speculative inquiry, or the latent regularity, order, and law controlling all things that fall under our notice, when they develop themselves in accordance with their intrinsic nature (see Sir W. Hamilton, Metaphysics, lecture 4, page 46; Ueberweg, Hist. of Philosophy, volume 1, § 1, page 5).

There is no longer reason to dread the rarity of philosophy; there has been no occasion for such alarm for more than two thousand years; the terror has been produced by the redundance of what claims this name. There are philosophers of all sorts, who deal with all varieties of subjects. There is mental, moral, political, economical, and natural philosophy; there is the philosophy of religion, the philosophy of enthusiasm, and the philosophy of insanity; the philosophy of logic, the philosophy of rhetoric, the philosophy of language, and the philosophy of grammar; there is the philosophy of history, the philosophy of law, the philosophy of the inductive sciences; there is the philosophy of colors, the philosophy of music, the philosophy of dress, the philosophy of manners, the philosophy of cookery, the philosophy of building, etc. All imaginable topics reveal an aptitude for philosophic treatment, and pretend to furnish a basis for some special philosophy. It would occasion no surprise to encounter a philosophy of jack-straws, and other infantile amusements. There must be some legitimacy, however slight, in these numerous pretensions, some semblance of truth in such easy assumption, or such professions would not continue to be repeated and tolerated. There must be some common element, some cord of similitude, uniting together under one category these multitudinous forms of inquiry, and the unnumbered inquiries which are left unnamed.

Scope of the Term. — The word philosophy first appears in the Father of History. It is applied by Croesus to Solon, in his travels in search of knowledge and information, and is used as almost equivalent to theory, which in the context means scarcely anything more than sight-seeing or observation (Herodot. 1:30). It next appears in Thucydides. Pericles speaks of the Athenians as "philosophizing without effeminacy," where the term seems to denote the acquisition of information and culture (Thuc. 2:40). The origination of the word is ascribed to Pythagoras in a familiar anecdote, which reports that, being asked by Leon, the chief of Phlius, "What were philosophers?" he replied, with a happy allusion to the concourse at the Olympic Games, that " they were those who diligently  observed the nature of things," calling themselves " students, or lovers of wisdom," and occupied with "the contemplation and knowledge of things" (Cicero, Tusc. Qu. 5:3, 9). He is supposed to have thus repudiated the designation of "wise man," or "sophister," previously in vogue, and to have modestly proposed in its stead the appellation of "philosopher," a lover of wisdom. The authenticity of the anecdote has been gravely questioned; and the designation, alleged to have been rejected in this manner, continued in habitual use, with no invidious sense, and was applied to Socrates and the chiefs of the Socratic schools (Grote, Hist. of Greece, part 2, volume 8, chapter 67, page 350). To the numerous passages cited by Grote may be added Androtion, Fr. 39; Phan. Eretrius, Fr. 21; and Synesii Dio, apud Dion Chrysostom, 2:329, ed. Teubner). The censures of the Sophists by Plato and Aristotle, the character of the Socratic teaching, and the almost exclusively inquisitive and indeterminate complexion of the Platonic speculation, appear to have given currency to the designation of philosophy, as a more modest and inconclusive appellative than "sophia," or wisdom.

Originally, then, philosophy imported only the loving pursuit of knowledge, without any implication of actual attainment; but it soon acquired a more positive and distinct acceptation. In the Republic Plato defines philosophy as "the circuit, or beating about of the soul in its ascending progress towards real existence;" and declares those to be philosophers "who embrace the really existent," and "who are able to apprehend the eternal and unchanging." In the Euthydemus he goes farther, and describes philosophy as "the acquisition of true knowledge." In the definitions ascribed to Plato, which, though not his, may preserve the tradition of his teaching, it is only "the desire of the knowledge of eternal existences." Xenophon rarely employs the term, but applies "sophia" to the Socratic knowledge. In one passage where he uses it it signifies the knowledge and practice of the duties of life (Mem. 4:2, page 23).

A great step towards the definite restriction of the meaning of philosophy was made by the Platonic writings, though the name continued, and has always continued, to be employed with great latitude. Aristotle, who gave a sharp, scientific character to nearly everything which he touched, first confined the term to special significations, and gave to it a limited and, in some cases, a purely technical meaning. He calls philosophy "the knowledge of truth;" and he endeavored to discover a "first philosophy," or body of principles common to all departments of speculative inquiry, and  dealing solely with the primary elements and affections of being (Met. 1:1, page 993; Phys. 1:9, page 5; Simplicii Schol. page 345). This first philosophy, or "knowledge of the philosopher," corresponds to metaphysics in its stricter sense — a division of speculative science receiving its name from the remains of Aristotle, and, in great measure, constituted by his labors. It is the science of being as being (τὸ ὀν ἠ ὄν , Met. 6:1, page 1026; 11:3, page 1060; 4, page 1061). Thus, with the Peripatetics, philosophy included all science, but especially theoretical science, and was peculiarly attached to metaphysical science. With this accords the definition of Cicero, which is evidently derived from Peripatetic sources (De Off. 2:2, 5).

This historical deduction is not unnecessary. Many words grow in meaning with the growth of civilization. Many gradually lose with the advancement of knowledge their original vague amplitude, and acquire a definite and precise significance. The real import of either class of words can be ascertained only by tracing their development through their successive changes. The history of the term philosophy enables us to understand the still subsisting vacillation in its employment, and to detect the common principle which runs through all its various and apparently incongruous applications. It brings us, at the same time, to the recognition of the mode and measure of its most rigorous employment.

Philosophy is the earnest investigation of the principles of knowledge, and most appropriately of the first principles, or principles of abstract being. It is not science, but search (Kant, Program. 1765-66; Sir William Hamilton, Metaph. lectures 1, 3; Discussions, page 787). It is distinctively zetetic, or inquisitive, rather than dogmatic. Its chief value consists in the zeal, perspicacity, simplicity, and unselfishness of the persevering desire for the highest truth, not in its attainment; for the highest truth is, in its nature, unattainable by the finite intelligence of man. It has not, or ought not to have, the pretension or confident assurance of knowledge, though this claim has frequently been made (ἡ φιλοσοφία γνῶσίς ἐστι πάντων τῶν ὄντων, David. Interpr. x. Categ. Schol. Aristot. page 29, ed. Acad. Berol.). It is only a systematic craving and continuous effort to reach the highest knowledge.

"For man loves knowledge, and the beams of truth

More welcome touch his understanding's eye

Than all the blandishments of sound his ear,

Than all of taste his tongue" (Akenside).

Philosophy was called by the schoolmen "the science of sciences;" and wherever the recondite principles of knowledge are sought, there is philosophy, in a faint and rudimentary, or in a clear and instructive form. Hence it admits of being predicated of investigations far remote from those higher exercises of abstract contemplation to which it is most properly applied.

What is man? What are his faculties and powers? Whence is he? Whither is he going? How shall he guide himself? What is this vast and varied universe around him? How did it arise? How is it ordered and sustained? What is man's relation to it, and to the great Power behind the veil, manifested by its wondrous movements and changes? What is the nature of this power? What are man's duties to it, to himself, and to his fellow-men? What knowledge of these things can he acquire? What are his destinies, and his aids for their achievement? These questions, and questions like these, constitute the province of philosophy proper. They present themselves dimly or distinctly to every reflecting mind; and they will not be gainsaid. Our intellectual constitution compels us to think of them; and to think of them, however weakly and spasmodically, is the beginning of philosophy. They all admit of partial solution of an answer at least, which stimulates further investigation. None of them can receive a full and complete reply from the human reasonthey stretch beyond its compass. All of them, in every age, have met with some response, either in the poetic and bewildering fancies of the prevalent mythology, or in the wild guesses of popular credulity; either in the aphorisms of the prudent, or in the conclusions of those who have sedulously devoted themselves to the unravelling of these enigmas. This latter class have been the philosophers of each generation, from the commencement of rational inquiry to the current day, as they will continue to be till the closing of the great roll of time; for of philosophy there is no end.

This constant disappointment and continual renewal of effort are strange phenomena, and have often proved utterly disheartening. Hence has proceeded tie objection so frequently urged that philosophy is ever in restless and fretful activity, but does not advance. The allegation of an  entire failure of progress is unjust; but the same questions constantly reappear with changed aspects, and the same solutions are offered under altered forms. But the change in the aspects and the alteration in the forms are themselves an advancement. The true source of encouragement is, however, to be derived less from the progress which can never pass the boundaries imposed by the same old questions than from the knowledge that the pursuit is more than the impracticable attainment — the race more important than the arrival at the goal could be — at least in this finite life, with our finite powers. From this habitual disappointment, and the apparent failures which bring the disappointment, have arisen, too, this variety of solutions which have been proposed for the numerous riddles that philosophy propounds to man. Varro enumerated two hundred and eighty- eight possible sects, apparently on the basis of ethics alone (August. De Civ. Dei, 19:1); and the number of distinguishable schemes of philosophy, to say nothing of diversities of opinion in regard to details, is countless. Yet each of these has contributed something to our knowledge: in the more precise statement of the problems to be solved, in the clearer determination of their conditions, in the refutation of former errors, in the exposure of previous misapprehensions, in presenting the inquiries under new and brighter lights, or in adding to our positive information in regard to these dark and difficult subjects. The gratitude which Aristotle expresses, in a remarkable passage (Met. 1), towards his predecessors, who had gone astray, or who had failed to see the truth, is due to all philosophical inquirers. They have contributed something towards the result, however incomplete that result may remain (καὶ γὰρ ουτοι συνεβάλοντο τι τὴν γὰρ ἕξιν προήσκησαν ἡμῶν; and see Alexander Aphrodis. Schol. Aristot. ad loc. ἡ γὰρ τὼν καταβεβλημένων δοξῶν εὐπορία εὑρετικωτερους ἡμᾶς τῆς ἀληθείας παρασκευάσει).

History of the Subject. — The hopelessness of satisfactory attainment, with the inevitable persistency of the search, and the gradual approximation, or appearance of approximation, to a goal which is never reached, but is ever receding, eventuate in changes, expansions, fluctuations, and revolutions in opinion, which are recorded and appreciated in the history of philosophy. This history chronicles the origins and original phases of philosophical inquiry, its mutations, progresses, and recessions, and the causes of them; it notes the introduction of new doctrines, new methods of procedure, new modes of exposition; the dissensions and controversies which spring up and minister to new developments; the reduction of kindred views to a  coherent body, and the constitution of sects and schools; the fortunes of such schools, the development or perversion of the sev. eral successive or contemporaneous schemes of speculation in the bosom of the schools themselves, either in consequence of their own internal activity, or of the necessities suggested or enforced by external attack. In this manner, and from these motives of change, philosophy exhibits unceasing activity and frequent novelty of form, notwithstanding the substantial identity of the questions debated, and the sameness of the ground surveyed. In these vicissitudes of opinion there is, however, an element which ought never to be overlooked, and which gives an immediate and urgent interest to all the variations. The philosophy of an age or sect is largely influenced by recent experiences, and by the present demands of the society or circle to which it is addressed; and, in turn, it exercises a most potent influence in determining the views of the rising and succeeding generations, not only within the range of theoretical inquiry, but also in government, social organization, manners, habits of thought, arts, and in everything which concerns the daily life of the people. The condition of Athenian politics and morals directly engendered the Socratic inquiries and the Socratic schools. The personal degradation and servility of the Romans under the empire provoked the revival and ardent advocacy of stoicism. The repugnance to Islamism, and the dialectical needs of Christendom, gave birth to medieval scholasticism. The antagonism which issued in the English commonwealth furnished the hotbed in which germinated the philosophy of Hobbes. Locke and the encyclopaedists were the prophets and guides of the French revolutionary spirit; and the materialism of the current years has received form as well as vitality from the predominance and achievements of the physical sciences, and the enormous fascinations of material interests and gratifications. Thus the alternations of philosophy explain and are explained by the concurrent modifications of society.

The history of philosophy admits of two distinct principles of division, both of which are simultaneously employed. It may be divided either with reference to its special subject-matter, as a part of the general domain of philosophy, or with reference to its chronological successions. Each of these distributions of course permits further subdivision.

Plato practically, though not expressly, divided philosophy into dialectics, physics, and ethics, including theology and much of metaphysics, along with natural philosophy, under the head of physics. SEE PLATONIC PHILOSOPHY

The division of Aristotle is indistinct and apparently  variable. But he did not complete his system. His metaphysics, which corresponds nearly with his first philosophy, or with philosophy in its strictest sense, was an incomplete collection of unfinished papers, gathered and arranged after his death. Science, or knowledge, he distributes between practice, production, and theory (Metaph. 6:1, Frag. 137, page 94, ed. Didot). Ueberweg mistakes this for a formal division of philosophy, but the third head is the only one to which Aristotle would have assigned the name of philosophy. He elsewhere distinguishes theory into physical, mathematical, and theological-the last corresponding with philosophy proper (Metaph. 11:7). In one of his fragments, philosophical problems are declared to be of five kinds: political, dialectical, physical, ethical, and rhetorical (Aristot. Frag. 137, page 108). This division excludes the greater part of philosophy. The uncertainty and confusion which these several divisions are calculated to produce may be accounted for and excused by the loose acceptation of the term physics in the Socratic schools; and by the fact that metaphysics, or philosophy, in Aristotle's estimation, lay beyond the domain of physics. Dividing philosophy into metaphysics,physics, and ethics, we now habitually exclude physics, or natural philosophy, and set it apart as the realm of exact science. The other two are assigned to philosophy. But metaphysics and ethics may be united as together constituting philosophy, or they may be kept distinct and variously subdivided. Sir William Hamilton, who, in deference to the narrowness of the Scotch school, at times almost identifies psychology with philosophy, enumerates, by a strained construction, five branches of the former: logic, ethics, politics, aesthetics, and theology (Metaph. lecture 3, page 44). Remusat incidentally distributes philosophy under the five heads of psychology, logic, metaphysics, theodicy (or the philosophy of religion — theology), and morals (Vie d'Ablard, liv. 2, chapter 3, volume 1, page 351 sq.). Ampere, in his ingenious and fantastic classification of human knowledge, by a septuple series of violent dichotomies, manufactures eightyfour distinct departments of philosophical inquiry. For the present purpose, the sufficiency or the insufficiency, the validity or the invalidity, of these various divisions and subdivisions is unimportant. The history of philosophy includes them all, either as definite members or as subordinate parts. Each may be treated separately, or all may be embraced in one treatment, or a distinct discussion may be bestowed upon several of them combined in one view. Thus there may be a history of mental philosophy, and a history of ethics, like the supplements of Dugald Stewart and Sir James Mackintosh to the Encyclopedia Britannica; or a history of  logic, like Mr. Blakey's very feeble treatise on that subject; or a history of heretical opinions, like those so common in the earlier ages of the Christian Charch; or a general history of philosophy, like Brucken's or Tennemann's or Ueberweg's. This is. the mode in which the history of philosophy may be divided.

The other process of division regards primarily the Succession of philosophical systems, or of philosophical schools, where the systems are identified with particular schools. A very loose and general distribution of this kind is.into ancient, mediseval, and modern, each of which has often been handled separately. The distinction between these divisions is mainly the difference of time. They frequently run into each other. In many characteristics, both of doctrine and method, they repeat each other. The scholastic procedure is discernible in Plotinus and Joannes Damascenus, while John Scotus Erigena approached more nearly to the NeoPlatonists than to the schoolmen. Occam and Gerson exhibit many modern features; and among the moderns there are many wide differences, not only in doctrine, but in character. Hence other divisions, more precise than are attainable by these indistinct chronological periods, have latterly won more favor. The following may be offered as an example of such distribution :

I. The commencements of philosophy, chiefly among the Orientals, with whom philosophy, mythology, and the ology were inseparably intertwined.

II. The philosophy of the Greeks, which comprehends of course the philosophy of the Romans, as it was essen tially Greek from Cicero to Boethius.

III. The philosophy of the Schoolmen, which in part overlaps modern systems. To this the philosophy of the Jews and Saracens may be joined as an appendix, since it affords the transition to it from the Greeks.

IV. The philosophy of the Renaissance, or Transition Age, commencing with Gemistus Pletho and the Medicean Academy, and ending with Pascal and Gassendi.

V. The philosophy of Modern Times — from Francis Bacon and Descartes. Each of these periods has many subdivisions, which have been variously constituted by different historians, and necessarily vary  with the variation of the aspects urder which philosophy is contemplated by the several chroniclers of its fluctuations.

Literature. — The fullest repertory of works on the several schemes of philosophy, on its general and special history, and on the history of the philosophers themselves, and of particular doctrines, may be found in Ueberweg, History of Philosophy, translated by George S. Morris (N.Y. 1875, 2 volumes, 8vo). Up to the date of that work the fullest treatise on the subject was H. Ritter's Geschichte der Philosophie (Gotha, 1854, 12 volumes, 8vo). A convenient summary is Maurice's Moral and Metaphysical Philosophy (Lond. 1850-56, and later 4 volumes, 8vo), which gives a historical review of the whole subject. (G.F.H.)

## Philosophy, Chaldean[[@Headword:Philosophy, Chaldean]]

             SEE MAGI; SEE PHILOSOPHY. HEBREW.

## Philosophy, Greek[[@Headword:Philosophy, Greek]]

             It is not in accordance with the scope of this Cyclopcedia to give a full account of the various philosophical systems of the ancient Greeks, These are sufficiently discussed under the names of their respective founders. Our purpose here is only to give so much as will serve to show their relations to Christianity. In doing this, as well as in the following article on Hebrew Philosophy, we combine the Scriptural statements with the results of modern investigations.

I. The Development of Greek Philosophy. — The complete fitness of Greek philosophy to perform a propaedeutic office for Christianity, as an exhaustive effort of reason to solve the great problems of being, must be apparent after a detailed study of its progress and consummation; and even the simplest outline of its history cannot fail to preserve the leading traits of the natural (or even necessary) law by which its development was governed.

The various attempts which have been made to derive Western philosophy from Eastern sources have signally failed. The external evidence in favor of this opinion is wholly insufficient to establish it (Bitter, Gesch. d. Phil. 1:159, etc.; Thirlwall, Hist. of Gr. 2:130; Zeller, Gesch. d. Phil. d. Griechen, 1:18-34; Max Muller, On Language, 84 note), and on internal grounds it is most improbable. It is true that in some degree the character  of Greek speculation may have been influenced, at least in its earliest stages, by religious ideas which were originally introduced from the East; but this indirect influence does not affect the real originality of the great Greek teachers. The spirit of pure philosophy, distinct from theology, is wholly alien from Eastern thought; and it was comparatively late when even a Greek ventured to separate philosophy from religion. But in Greece the separation, when it was once effected, remained essentially complete. The opinions of the ancient philosophers might or might not be outwardly reconcilable with the popular faith; but philosophy and faith were independent. The very value of Greek teaching lies in the fact that it was, as far as is possible, a result of simple reason, or, if faith asserts its prerogative, the distinction is sharply marked. In this we have a record of the power and weakness of the human mind written at once on the grandest scale and in the fairest characters.

Of the various classifications of the Greek schools which have been proposed, the simplest and truest seems to be that which divides the history of philosophy into three great periods, the first reaching to the aera of the Sophists, the next to the death of Aristotle, the third to the Christian aera. In the first period the world objectively is the great centre of inquiry; in the second. the "ideas" of things, truth, and being; in the third, the chief interest of philosophy falls back upon the practical conduct of life. Successive systems overlap each other, both in time and subjects of speculation, but broadly the sequence which has been indicated will hold good (Zeller, Die Philosophie der Griechen, 1:111, etc.). After the Christian iera philosophy ceased to have any true vitality in Greece, but it made fresh efforts to meet the changed conditions of life at Alexandria and Rome. At Alexandria Platonism was vivified by the spirit of Oriental mysticism, and afterwards of Christianity; at Rome Stoicism was united with the vigorous virtues of active life. Each of these great divisions must be passed in rapid review.

1. The pre-Socratic Schools. — The first Greek philosophy was little more than an attempt to follow out in thought the mythic cosmogonies of earlier poets. Gradually the depth and variety of the problems included in the idea of a cosmogony became apparent, and, after each clew had been followed out, the period ended in the negative teaching of the Sophists. The questions of creation, of the immediate relation of mind and matter, were pronounced in fact, if not in word, insoluble, and speculation was turned into a new direction. What is the one permanent element which underlies  the changing forms of things? — this was the primary inquiry to which the Ionic school endeavored to find an answer. Thales (B.C. cir. 625-610), following, as it seems, the genealogy of Hesiod, pointed to moisture (water) as the one source and supporter of life. Anaximenes (B.C. cir. 520- 480) substituted air for water, as the more subtle and all-pervading element; but equally with Thales he neglected all consideration of the force which might be supposed to modify the one primal substance. At a much later date (B.C. cir. 450) Diogenes of Apollonia, to meet this difficulty, represented this elementary "air" as endowed with intelligence (νόησις), but even he makes no distinction between the material and the intelligent. The atomic theory of Democritus (B.C. cir. 460-357), which stands in close connection with this form of Ionic teaching, offered another and more plausible solution. The motion of his atoms included the action of force, but he wholly omitted to account for its source. Meanwhile another mode of speculation had arisen in the same school. In place of one definite element, Anaximander (B.C. 610-547) suggested the unlimited (τὸ ἄπειρον) as the adequate origin of all special existences. Somewhat more than a century later Anaxagoras summed up the result of such a line of speculation: "All things were together; then mind (νοῦς) came and disposed them in order" (Diog. Laert. 2:6). Thus we are left face to face with an ultimate dualism.

The Eleatic school started from an opposite point of view. Thales saw moisture present in material things, and pronounced this to be their fundamental principle; Xenophanes (B.C. cir. 550-530) "looked up to the whole heaven, and said that the One is God" (Arist. Met. 1:5, τὸ ž ν ειναί φησι τὸν θεόν). "Thales saw gods in all things; Xenophanes saw all things in God" (Thirlwall, Hist. of Gr. 2:136). That which is, according to Xenophanes, must be one, eternal, infinite, immovable, unchangeable. Parmenides of Elea (B.C. 500) substituted abstract "being" for "God" in the system of Xenophanes, and distinguished with precision the functions of sense and reason. Sense teaches us of" the many," the false (phenomena); Reason of "the one," the true (the absolute). Zeno of Elea (B.C. cir. 450) developed with logical ingenuity the contradictions involved in our perceptions of things (in the idea of motion, for instance), and thus formally prepared the way for scepticism. If the One alone is, the phenomenal world is an illusion. The sublime aspiration of Xenophanes, when followed out legitimately to its consequences, ended in blank negation.  The teaching of Heraclitus (B.C. 500) offers a complete contrast to that of the Eleatics, and stands far in advance of the earlier Ionic school, with which he is historically connected. So far from contrasting the existent and the phenomenal, he boldly identified being with change. "There ever was, and is, and shall be, an ever-living fire, unceasingly kindled and extinguished in due measure" (ἁπτόμενον μέτρα καὶ ἀποσβεννύμενον μέτρα, Clem. Alex. Strom. 5:14, § 105). Rest and continuance is death. That which is is the instantaneous balance of contending powers (Diog. Laert. 9:7 διὰ τῆς ἐναντιοτροπῆς ἡρμόσθαι τὰ ὄντα). Creation is the play of the Creator. Everywhere, as far as his opinions can be grasped, Heraclitus makes noble "guesses at truth;" yet he leaves "fate" (εἱμαρμένη) as the supreme creator (Stob. Ecclesiastes 1, page 59, ap. Ritter and Preller, § 42). The cycles of life and death run on by its law. It may have been by a natural reaction that from these wider speculations he turned his thoughts inwards. "I investigated myself," he says, with conscious pride (Plutarch, adv. Col. 1118, c); and in this respect he foreshadows the teaching of Socrates, as Zeno did that of the Sophists.

The philosophy of Pythagoras (B.C. cir. 540-510) is subordinate in interest to his social and political theories, though it supplies a link in the course of speculation: others had labored to trace a unitv in the world in the presence of one underlying element or in the idea of a whole; he sought to combine the separate harmony of parts with total unity. Numerical unity includes the finite and the infinite; and in the relations of number there is a perfect symmetry, as all spring out of the fundamental unit. Thus numbers seemed to Pythagoras to be not only "patterns" of things (τῶν ὄντων), but causes of their being (τῆς οὐσίας). How he connected numbers with concrete being it is impossible to determine; but it may not be wholly fanciful to see in the doctrine of the transmigration of souls an attempt to trace in the successive forms of life an outward expression of a harmonious law in the moral as well as in the physical world. (The remains of the pre-Socratic philosophers have been collected in a very convenient form by F. Mullach in Didot's Biblioth. Gr. Paris, 1860.)

The first cycle of philosophy was thus completed. All the great primary problems of thought had been stated, and typical answers rendered. The relation of spirit and matter was still unsolved. Speculation issued in dualism (Anaxagoras), materialism (Democritus), or pantheism (Xenophanes). On one side reason was made the sole criterion of truth (Parmenides); on the other, experience (Heraclitus). As yet there was no  rest, and the Sophists prepared the way for a new method. Whatever may be the moral estimate which is formed'of the Sophists, there can be little doubt as to the importance of their teaching as preparatory to that of Socrates. All attempts to arrive at certainty by a study of the world had failed: might it not seem, then, that truth is subjective? "Man is the measure of all things." Sensations are modified by the individual; and may not this hold good universally? The conclusion was applied to morals and politics with fearless skill. The belief in absolute truth and right was wellnigh banished; but meanwhile the Sophists were perfecting the instrument which was to be turned against them. Language, in their hands, acquired a precision unknown before, when words assumed the place of things. Plato might ridicule the pedantry of Protagoras, but Socrates reaped a rich harvest from it.

2. The Socratic Schools. — In the second period of Greek philosophy the scene and subject were both changed. Athens became the centre of speculations which had hitherto chiefly found a home among the more mixed populations of the colonies. At the same time inquiry was turned from the outward world to the inward, from theories of the origin and relation of things to theories of our knowledge of them. A philosophy of ideas, using the term.in its widest sense, succeeded a philosophy of nature. In three generations Greek speculation reached its greatest glory in the teaching of Socrates, Plato, and Aristotle. When the sovereignty of Greece ceased, all higher philosophy ceased with it. In the hopeless turmoil of civil disturbances which followed, men's thoughts were chiefly directed to questions of personal duty.

The famous sentence in which Aristotle (Met. 13:4) characterizes the teaching of Socrates (B.C. 468-389) places his scientific position in the clearest light. There are two things, he says, which we may rightly attribute to Socrates, inductive reasoning and general definition (τούς τ᾿ ἐπακτικοὺς λόγους καὶ τὸ ὁρίζεσθαι καθόλου). By the first he endeavored to discover the permanent element which underlies the changing forms of appearances and the varieties of opinion: by the second he fixed the truth which he had thus gained. But, besides this, Socrates rendered another service to truth. He changed not only the method, but also the subject of philosophy (Cicero, Acad. Post. 1:4). Ethics occupied in his investigations the primary place which had hitherto been held by physics. The great aim of his induction was to establish the sovereignty of virtue; and, before entering on other speculations, he determined to obey  the Delphian maxim and "know himself" (Plato, Phaadr. page 229). It was a necessary consequence of a first effort in this direction that Socrates regarded all the results which he derived as like in kind. Knowledge (ἐπιστήμη) was equally absolute and authoritative, whether it referred to the laws of intellectual operations or to questions of morality. A conclusion in geometry and a conclusion on conduct were set forth as true in the same sense. Thus vice was only another name for ignorance (Xenoph. Mem. 3:9, 4; Arist. Eth. End. 1:5). Every one was supposed to have within him a faculty absolutely leading to right action, just as the mind necessarily decides rightly as to relations of space and number, when each step in the proposition is clearly stated. Socrates practically neglected the determinative power of the will. His great glory was, however, clearly connected with this fundamental error in his system. He affirmed the existence of a universal law of right and wrong. He connected philosophy with action, both in detail and in general. On the one side he upheld the supremacy of conscience, on the other the working of Providence. Not the least fruitful characteristic of his teaching was what may be called its desultoriness. He formed no complete system. He wrote nothing. He attracted and impressed his followers by his many-sided nature. He helped others to give birth to thoughts, to use his favorite image, but he was barren himself (Plato, Thecet. page 150). As a result of this, the most conflicting opinions were maintained by some of his professed followers, who carried out isolated fragments of his teaching to extreme conclusions. Some adopted his method (Euclides, B.C. cir. 400, the Megarians), others his subject. Of the latter, one section, following out his proposition of the identity of self-command (ἐγκράτεια) with virtue, professed an utter disregard of everything material (Antisthenes, B.C. cir. 366, the Cynics), while the other (Aristippus, B.C. cir. 366, the Cyrenaics), inverting the maxim that virtue is necessarily accompanied by pleasure, took immediate pleasure as the rule of action.

These "minor Socratic schools" were, however, premature and imperfect developments. The truths which they distorted were embodied at a later time in more reasonable forms. Plato alone (B.C. 430-347), by the breadth and nobleness of his teaching, was the true successor of Socrates; with fuller detail and greater elaborateness of parts, his philosophy was as many- sided as that of his master. Thus it is impossible to construct a consistent Platonic system, though many Platonic doctrines are sufficiently marked. Plato, indeed, possessed two commanding powers, which, though  apparently incompatible, are in the highest sense complementary: a matchless destructive dialectic, and a creative imagination. By the first he refuted the great fallacies of the Sophists on the uncertainty of knowledge and right, carrying out in this the attacks of Socrates; by the other he endeavored to bridge over the interval between appearance and reality, and gain an approach to the eternal. His famous doctrines of Ideas and Recollection (ἀνάμνησις) are a solution by imagination of a logical difficulty. Socrates had shown the existence of general notions; Plato felt constrained to attribute to them a substantive existence (Arist. Met. 13:4). A glorious vision gave completeness to his view. The unembodied spirits were exhibited in immediate presence of the "ideas" of things (Phaedr. page 247); the law of their embodiment was sensibly portrayed; and the more or less vivid remembrance of supramundane realities in this life was traced to antecedent facts. All men were thus supposed to have been face to face with truth: the object of teaching was to bring back impressions latent but uneffaced.

The "myths" of Plato, to one of the most famous of which reference has just been made, play a most important part in his system. They answer in the philosopher to faith in the Christian. In dealing with immortality and judgment he leaves the way of reason, and ventures, as he says, on a rude raft to brave the dangers of the ocean (Phaedr. page 85, D; Gorg. page 523, A). The peril and the prize are noble and the hope is great" (Phaedr. page 114, C, D). Such tales, he admits, may seem puerile andl ridiculous; and if there were other surer and clearer means of gaining the desired end, the judgment would be just (Gorg. page 527, A). But, as it is. thus only can he connect the seen and the unseen. The myths, then, mark the limit of his dialectics. They are not merely a poetical picture of truth already gained, or a popular illustration of his teaching, but real efforts to penetrate beyond the depths of argument. They show that his method was not commensurate with his instinctive desires; and point out in intelligible outlines the subjects on which man looks for revelation. Such are the relations of the human mind to truth (Phaedr. page 246-49); the pre-existence and immortality of the soul (Meno, pages 81-3; Phaedr. Pages 110-12; Tim. page 41); the state of future retribution (Gorg. pages 523-25; Rep. pages 614-16); the revolutions of the world (Polit. page 269. Comp. also Synmpos. pages 189-91, 203-5; Zeller, Philos. d. Griech. pages 361-63, who gives the literature of the subject).  The great difference between Plato and Aristotle (B.C. 384-322) lies in the use which Plato thus made of imagination as the exponent of instinct. The dialectics of Plato is not inferior to that of Aristotle, and Aristotle exhibits traces of poetic power not unworthy of Plato; but Aristotle never allows imagination to influence his final decision. He elaborated a perfect method, and he used it with perfect fairness. His writings contain the highest utterance of pure reason. Looking back on all the earlier efforts of philosophy, he pronounced a calm and final judgment. For him many of the conclusions which others had maintained were valueless, because he showed that they rested on feeling, and not on argument. This stern severity of logic gives an indescribable pathos to those passages in which he touches on the highest hopes of men; and perhaps there is no more truly affecting chapter in ancient literature than that in which he states in a few unimpassioned sentences the issue of his inquiry into the immortality of the soul. Part of it mav be immortal, but that part is impersonal (De An. 3:5). This was the sentence of reason, and he gives expression to it without a word of protest, and yet as one who knew the extent of the sacrifice which it involved. The conclusion is, as it were, the epitaph of free speculation. Laws of observation and argument, rules of action, principles of government remain, but there is no hope beyond the grave.

It follows necessarily that the Platonic doctrine of ideas was emphatically rejected by Aristotle, who gave, however, the final development to the original conception of Socrates. With Socrates "ideas" (general definitions) were mere abstractions; with Plato they had an absolute existence; with Aristotle they had no existence separate from things in which they were realized, though the form (μορφή), which answers to the Platonic idea, was held to be the essence of the thing itself (comp. Zeller, Philos. d. Griech. 1:119, 120).

There is one feature common in essence to the systems of Plato and Aristotle which has not yet been noticed. In both, ethics is a part of politics. The citizen is prior to the man. In Plato this doctrine finds its most extravagant development in theory, though his life, and, in some places, his teaching, were directly opposed to it (e.g. Gorg. page 527, D). This practical inconsequence was due, it may be supposed, to the condition of Athens at the time, for the idea was in complete harmony with the national feeling; and, in fact, the absolute subordination of the individual to the body includes one of the chief lessons of the ancient world. In Aristotle the "political" character of man is defined with greater precision, and brought  within narrower limits. The breaking up of the small Greek states had prepared the way for more comprehensive views of human fellowship, without destroying the fundamental truth of the necessity of social union for perfect life. But in the next generation this was lost. The wars of the succession obliterated the idea of society, and philosophy was content with aiming at individual happiness.

The coming change was indicated by the rise of a school of sceptics. The scepticism of the Sophists marked the close of the first period, and in like manner the scepticism of the Pyrrhonists marks the close of the second (Stilpo, B.C. cir. 290; Pyrrho, B.C. cir. 290). But the Pyrrhonists rendered no positive service to the cause of philosophy, as the Sophists did by the refinement of language. Their immediate influence was limited in its range, and it is only as a symptom that the rise of the school is important. But in this respect it foreshows the character of after-philosophy by denying the foundation of all higher speculations. Thus all interest was turned to questions of practical morality. Hitherto morality had been based as a science upon mental analysis, but by the Pyrrhonists it was made subservient to law and custom. Immediate experience was held to be the rule of life (comp. Ritter and Preller, § 350).

3. The post-Socratic Schools. — After Aristotle, philosophy, as has already been noticed, took a new direction. The Socratic schools were, as has been shown, connected by a common pursuit of the permanent element which underlies phenomena. Socrates placed virtue in action, truth in a knowledge of the ideas of things. Plato went farther, and maintained that these ideas are alone truly existent. Aristotle, though differing in terms, yet only followed in the same direction when he attributed to form, not an independent existence, but a fashioning, vivifying power in all individual objects. But from this point speculation took a mainly personal direction. Philosophy, in the strict sense of the word, ceased to exist. This was due both to the circumstances of the time and to the exhaustion consequent on the failure of the Socratic method to solve the deep mysteries of being. Aristotle had, indeed, laid the wide foundations of an inductive system of physics, but few were inclined to continue his work. The physical theories which were brought forward were merely adaptations from earlier philosophers.

In dealing with moral questions two opposite systems are possible, and have found advocates in all ages. On the one side it may be said that the  character of actions is to be judged by their results; on the other, that it is to be sought only in the actions themselves. Pleasure is the test of right in one case; an assumed or discovered law of our nature in the other. If the world were perfect and the balance of human faculties undisturbed, it is evident that both systems would give identical results. As it is, there is a tendency to error on each side, which is clearly seen in the rival schools of the Epicureans and Stoics, who practically divided the suffrages of the mass of educated men in the centuries before and after the Christian aera.

Epicurus (B.C. 352-270) defined the object of philosophy to be the attainment of a happy life. The pursuit of truth for its own sake he regarded as superfluous. He rejected dialects as a useless study, and accepted the senses, in the widest acceptation of the term, as the criterion of truth. Physics he subordinated entirely to ethics (Cicero, De Fin. 1:7). But he differed widely from the Cyrenaics in his view of happiness. The happiness at which the wise man aims is to be found, he said, not in momentary gratification, but in lifelong pleasure. It does not consist necessarily in excitement or motion, but often in absolute tranquillity (ἀταραξία). "The wise man is happy even on the rack" (Diog. Laert. 10:118), for "virtue alone is inseparable from pleasure" (id. page 138). To live happily and to live wisely, nobly, and justly, are convertible phrases (id. page 140). But it followed as a corollary from his view of happiness that the gods, who were assumed to be supremely happy and eternal, were absolutely free from the distractions and emotions consequent on any care for the world or man (id. page 139; comp. Lucr. 2:645-47). All things were supposed to come into being by chance, and so pass away; and the study of nature was chiefly useful as dispelling the superstitious fears of the gods and death by which the multitude are tormented. It is obvious how such teaching would degenerate in practice. The individual was left master of his own life, free from all regard to any higher law than a refined selfishness.

While Epicurus asserted in this manner the claims of one part of man's nature in the conduct of life, Zeno of Citium (B.C. cir. 280), with equal partiality, advocated a purely spiritual (intellectual) morality. The opposition between the two was complete. The infinite, chance-formed worlds of the one stand over against the one harmonious world of the other. On the one side are gods regardless of material things, on the other a Being permeating and vivifying all creation. This difference necessarily found its chief expression in ethics. For when the Stoics taught that there were only two principles of things, matter (τὸ πάσχον), and God, fate,  reason — for the names were many by which it wasfashioned and quickened (τὸ ποιοῦν) — it followed that the active principle in man is of divine origin, and that his duty is to live conformably to nature (τὸ ὁμολογουμένως [τῇ φύσει] ζῆν). By "nature" some understood the nature of man, others the nature of the universe; but both agreed in regarding it as a general law of the whole, and not particular passions or impulses. Good, therefore, was but one. All external things were indifferent. Reason was the absolute sovereign of man. Thus the doctrine of the Stoics, like that of Epicurus, practically left man to himself. But it was worse in its final results than Epicurism, for it made him his own god.

In one point the Epicureans and Stoics were agreed. They both regarded the happiness and culture of the individual as the highest good. Both systems belonged to a period of corruption and decay. They were the efforts of the man to support himself in the ruin of the state. But at the same time this assertion of individual independence and breaking down of local connections performed an important work in preparation for Christianity. It was for the Gentile world an influence corresponding to the Dispersion for the Jews. Men, as men, owned their fellowship as they had not done before. Isolating superstitions were shattered by the arguments of the Epicureans. The unity of the human conscience was vigorously affirmed by the Stoics (comp. Antoninus, 4:4, 33, with Gataker's notes).

Meanwhile in the New Academy Platonism degenerated into scepticism. Epicurus found an authoritative rule in the senses. The Stoics took refuge in what seems to answer to the modern doctrine of "commonsense," and maintained that the senses give a direct knowledge of the object. Carneades (B.C. 213-129) combated these views, and showed that sensation cannot be proved to declare the real nature, but only some of the effects, of things. Thus the slight philosophical basis of the later schools was undermined. Scepticism remained as the last issue of speculation; and, if we may believe the declaration of Seneca (Quaest. Nat. 7:32), scepticism itself soon ceased to be taught as a system. The great teachers had sought rest, and in the end they found unrest. No science of life could be established. The reason of the few failed to create an esoteric rule of virtue and happiness. For in this thev all agreed, that the blessings of philosophy were not for the mass. A "gospel preached to the poor" was as yet unknown.

But though the Greek philosophers fell short of their highest aim, it needs no words to show the work which they did as pioneers of a universal  Church. They revealed the wants and the instincts of men with a clearness and vigor elsewhere unattainable, for their sight was dazzled by no reflections from a purer faith. Step by step great questions were proposed — fate, providence — conscience, law — the state, the man; and answers were given which are the more instructive because they are generally one- sided. The discussions which were primarily restricted to a few, in time influenced the opinions of the many. The preacher who spoke of "an unknown God" had an audience who could understand him, not at Athens only or Rome, but throughout the civilized world.

The complete course of philosophy was run before the Christian sera, but there were yet two mixed systems afterwards which offered some novel features. At Alexandria Platonism was united with various elements of Eastern speculation, and for several centuries exercised an important influence on Christian doctrine. At Rome Stoicism was vivified by the spirit of the old republic, and exhibited the extreme Western type of philosophy. Of the first nothing call be said here. It arose only when Christianity was a recognised spiritual power, and was influenced both positively and negatively by the Gospel. The same remark applies to the efforts to quicken afresh the forms of paganism, which found their climax in the reign of Julian. These have no independent value as an expression of original thought; but the Roman Stoicism calls for brief notice from its supposed connection with Christian morality (Seneca, t A.D. 65; Epictetus, t A.D. cir. 115; M. Aurelius Antoninus, 121-180). The belief in this connection found a singular expression in the apocryphal correspondence of Paul and Seneca, which was widely received in the early Church (Jerome, De Vir. III. 12). And lately a distinguished writer (Mill, On Liberty, page 58, quoted by Stanley, Eastern Ch. lecture 6, apparently with approbation) has speculated on the "tragical fact" that Constantine, and not Marcus Aurelius, was the first Christian emperor. The superficial coincidences of Stoicism with the New Testament are certainly numerous. Coincidences of thought, and even of language, might easily be multiplied (Gataker, Antoninus, Praef. page 11, etc,), and in considering these it is impossible not to remember that Shemitic thought and phraseology must have exercised great influence on Stoic teaching (Grant, Oxford Essays, 1858, page 82).

But beneath this external resemblance of Stoicism to Christianity, the later Stoics were fundamentally opposed to it. For good and for evil they were the Pharisees of the Gentile world. Their highest aspirations are mixed with the thanksgiving "that they were not as other men are" (comp.  A nton. i). Their worship was a sublime egotism. The conduct of life was regarded as an art, guided in individual actions by a conscious reference to reason (Anton. 4:2, 3; 5:32) and not a spontaneous process rising naturally out of one vital principle. The wise man, "wrapt in himself" (7:28), was supposed to look with perfect indifference on the changes of time (4:49); and yet beneath this show of independence he was a prev to a hopeless sadness. In words he appealed to the great law of fate, which rapidly sweeps all things into oblivion, as a source of consolation (4:2, 14; 6:15); but there is no confidence in any future retribution. In a certain sense the elements of which we are composed are eternal (5:13), for they are incorporated in other parts of the universe, but we shall cease to exist (4:14, 21; 6:24; 7:10). Not only is there no recognition of communion between an immortal man and a personal God, but the idea is excluded. Man is but an atom in a vast universe, and his actions and sufferings are measured solely by their relation to the whole (Anton. 10:5, 6, 20; 12:26; 6:45; v, 22; 7:9). God is but another name for "the mind of the universe" (ὁ τοῦ ὅλου νοῦς, 5:30), "the soul of the world" (4:40), “the reason that ordereth matter" (6:1). "universal nature" (ἡ τῶν ὅλων φύσις, 7:33; 9:1 comp. 10:1), and is even identified with the world itself (τοῦ γεννήσαντος κόσμου, 12:1; comp. Gataker on 4:23). Thus the stoicism of M. Aurelius gives many of the moral precepts of the Gospel (Gataker, page 18), but without their foundation, which can find no place in his system. It is impossible to read his reflections without emotion, but they have no creative energy. They are the last strain of a dying creed, and in themselves have no special affinity to the new faith. Christianity necessarily includes whatever is noblest in them, but they affect to supply the place of Christianity, and do not lead to it. The real elements of greatness in M. Aurelius are many, and truly Roman; but the study of his Meditations by the side of the New Testament can leave little doubt that he could not have helped to give a national standing-place to a catholic Church.

The history of ancient philosophy in its religious aspect has been strangely neglected. Nothing, so far as we are aware, has been written on the pre- Christian aera answering to the clear and elegant essay of Matter on post- Christian philosophy (Histoire de la Philosophie dans ses rapports avec la Religion depuis lere Chretienne, Paris, 1854). There are useful hints in Carove's Vorhalle des Christenthums (Jena, 1851), and Ackermann's Das Christliche in Plato (Hamb. 1835). The treatise of Denis, Histoire des Theories et des Idles morales dans l'Antiquite (Paris, 1856), is limited in  range and hardly satisfactory. Dollinger's Vorhalle zur Gesch. d. Christenthums (Regensb. 1857; transl. Lond. 1862) is comprehensive, but covers too large a field. The brief surveys in De Pressense's Hist. des Trois Premiers Siecles de l'Eglise Chritienne (Paris, 1858; transl. Edinb. 1862), and in Cocker, Christianity and Greek Philosophy (N.Y. 1870), are much more vigorous, and on the whole just. But no one seems to have apprehended the real character and growth of Greek philosophy so well as Zeller (though with no special attention to its relations to religion) in his history (Die Philosophie der Griechen, 2d ed. Tub. 1856), which for subtlety and completeness is unrivalled. See (in addition to works named in the adjoining articles) Brandis, Handb. d. gr.-rom. Philosophie (Berl. 1835 sq.); Maury, Hist. de la Religion de la Grece (Paris, 1857 sq., 3 volumes); Butler, Hist. of Anc. Philos. (Lond. 1866, 2 volumes).

II. Connection of Greek with Hebrew Philosophy.The literature of Greece and Judaea came in contact at Alexandria; and the first known attempt to accomplish their fusion is that ascribed to the Jewish Peripatetic Aristobulus, in the reign of Ptolemy Philometor (B.C. 180-146); but the principal extant specimens are to be found in the writings of the Jewish Platonist Philo, the date of whose birth may be placed about B.C. 20. (Aristobulus is said to have been a Peripatetic; but of his exact relations to this philosophy nothing is known. From the few fragments which remain of his writings, he seems to have anticipated Philo in the employment of an allegorical interpretation of Scripture. His name, however. is more known in connection with forgeries of the Greek poets in support of his theory that the wisdom of the Greeks was borrowed from Moses. See Valckenser, Diatribe de Aristobulo, Lugd. Bat. 1806, reprinted in Gaisford's edition of Eusebii Praep. Evang.; Dahne, 2:73; Vacherot, Histoire de l'Ecole d'Alexandrie, 1:140.) Philo's system may be described as the result of a contact between the Hellenic theory of the absolute and the Jewish belief in God as represented in the Old Testament. (See Dorner, Person of Christ, volume 1, note A [page 330, Eng. transl.]. For some of the details of this contact, see Dahne, 1:31 sq.) In his religion Philo was a Jew, with all a Jew's reverence for the oracles of God committed to the charge of his people; but his philosophical studies attached themselves to those doctrines of the Platonic philosophy which, while dealing with the same great question, approached it from an opposite point of view. (For Philo's testimony to the divine authority of the Scriptures. see Vit. Mos. lib. 3, c. 23 [page 163, Mangey]; Quis rer. div. her. c. 52, 53, pages 510, 511.  Other passages to the same effect are cited by Gfr6rer, i, 54. Philo even maintains the divine inspiration of the Septuagint version, Vit. Mos. 2, c. 6, 7, pages 139, 140.) The result in his writings was an attempted combination of the two — the Greek philosophy supplying the fundamental idea, while the Jewish Scriptures, through the Septuagint translation, contributed, by means of an extravagant license of allegorical interpretation, much of the language and illustration of the system, besides imparting to it the apparent sanction of a divine authority. The leading idea of Philo's teaching is the expansion of that thought of Plato's which forms the connecting link between the philosophy of Greece and the pantheism of the East — that thought which represents the supreme principle of things as absolutely one and simple, beyond personality and beyond definite existence, and as such immutable and incapable of relation to temporal things. (Comp. Plato, Rep. 6:509; 2:381. Gfrorer, 1:134, and Franck, Dict. des Sciences Philosophiques, art. Philon, regard this feature of Philo's theology as of Oriental origin. But his Greek studies might suggest the same idea, and much of his language seems to point to this origin. See Dahne, 1:31, 41.)

In place of the God of the Hebrew Scriptures, who, even in his most hidden and mysterious nature, is never regarded as other than a person, Philo is led to substitute the Greek abstraction of an ideal good or absolute unity, as the first principle of a system in which philosophy and theology are to be reconciled and united: and though he is unable entirely to abandon the language of personality which the Scriptures at every page force upon their readers, he is at the same time unable, consistently with his philosophical assumptions, to admit an immediate personal relation between the Supreme Being and the creature. (See De Mut. Nom. c. 4, page 582; Grorer, 1:144; Dihne, 2:154. The various passages inconsistent with this, in which Philo seems to speak of a direct action of God in the world may perhaps be explained by supposing this action to be exerted through the medium of the Logos. Comp. Quod Deus sit immut. c. 12, page 281: Gfrorer, 1:199, 293.) The medium of reconciliation is sought in a development of the scriptural manifestation of the Wisdom and the Word of God, which take the place of the soul of the world as it appears in the Timnceus, being represented as a second God — the connecting link between the first principle and the world; in whom are concentrated those personal attributes which are indispensable to religious belief, and which are so conspicuously present in the Scripture theology (Fragm. page 625,  ex Euseb. Prcep. Evang. 7:13: Διὰ τί ὡς περὶ ἑτέρου θεοῦ φησὶ τὸ ἐν εἰκόνι θεοῦ τὸν ἄνθρωτον, ἀλλ᾿ οὐχὶ τῇ ἑαυτυῦ; Παγκαλῶς καὶ σοφῶς τουτὶ κεχρησν®δηται. θνητὸν γὰρ οὐδεν ἀπεικονισθῆναι πρὸς τὸν ἀνωτάτω καὶ Πατέρα τῶν ὅλων ἐδύνατο, ἀλλὰ πρὸς τὸν δεύτερον θεὸν ὅς ἐστιν ἐκείνου Λόγος). The following short summary of Philo's system will serve to exhibit those of its features which are most nearly related to our present inquiry (in this summary use has been made chiefly of that of Hegel, Gesch. der Philos. in his Werke, 15:18-23, and of that of Zeller, Philos. der Griechen. 3:594-665): The highest aim of philosophy, and the most perfect happiness, according to Philo, is the knowledge of God in his absolute nature (De Vita Contempl. c. 2, page 473. Comp. De Conf. Ling. c. 20, page 419; De Vict. Offerent. c. 16, page 264; De Monarch. 1:3, 4, page 216), in which he is exalted above all affinity to finite things, without qualities, and not to be expressed in speech (Legis Alleg. 1, c. 13, page 50: ἄποιος ὁ θεός. Ibid. c. 15, page 53: δεῖ γὰρ ἡγεῖσθαι καὶ ἄποιον αὐτὸν ειναι, καὶ ἄφθαρτον καὶ ἄτρεπτον. De Somn. 1:39, page 655: λέγεσθαι γὰρ οὐ πέφυκεν, άλλὰ μόνον ειναι τὸ ὄν. Comp. De Vit. Cont. c. 1, page 472; Quod Deus immut. c. 11, page 281). Such knowledge, though not fully attainable by any man, is nevertheless to be earnestly sought after, that it may be attained at least in that second degree in which we apprehend directly the existence of God, though falling short of a comprehension of his essence (De Prcem. et Pan. c. 7, page 415. Comp. Gfrorer, 1:135, 199. By this hypothesis of a primary and secondary knowledge, Gfrorer reconciles those passages in which the knowledge of God is spoken of as unattainable with others apparently of an opposite import: e.g. De Post. Caini, c. 48, page 258; De Monarch. 1:6, page 218). Even this amount, however, of direct knowledge is not to be gained by any effort of human thought, but only by God's revelation of himself; and such a revelation is only possible in the form of an ecstatic intuition, in which the seer, himself passive, is elevated by divine inspiration above the conditions of finite consciousness, and becomes one with the God whom he contemplates (De Poster. Cain. c. 5, page 229; Legis Alleg. 3:33, page 107; De Abr. c. 24, page 19; De Migr. Abr. c. 31, page 463; Fragn. page 654; Quis rer. div. haer. c. 13, 14, page 482; comp. Neander, Ch. Hist. 1:79, ed. Bohn. This ecstatic intuition is insisted upon also by Plotinus and the later Platonists, as in modern times by Schelling). But this ecstatic vision is possible only to a chosen few; for the many, who are incapable of it, there remains only that inferior and improper apprehension of God which can be gained through the means of derived  and created existences, especially of his Word or Wisdom, who is the medium by which God is related to the world, the God of imperfect men, as the Supreme Being is the God of the wise and perfect (Legis Alleg. 3:32, page 107; 3:73, page 128; De Abr. c. 24, page 19; De Migr. Abr. c. 31, page 463; De Conf. Ling. c. 28, page 427). This Word, or Logos, is described in various ways, some more naturally denoting an impersonal, others a personal being. (Whether the Logos of Philo is to be regarded as a distinct person or not is matter of controversy. The negative is maintained by Burton [Bampton Lectures, note 93] and by Dorner [Person of Christ, 1:27, Engl. transl. and note A], against Gfrorer, Dahne, Licke, and the majority of recent critics. An intermediate view is taken by Zeller, 3:626, and to some extent by Prof. Jowett, Epistles of St. Paul, 1:484, 2d ed.) He is the intelligible world, the archetypal pattern, the idea of ideas (De Mlundi Opif c. 6, page 5; elsewhere the Λόγος is distinguished from the παράδειγμα. See De Conf. Ling. c. 14, page 414), the wisdom of God (Legis Alleg. 1:19, page 56), the shadow of God, by which, as by an instrument, he made the world (Legis. Alley. 3:31, page 106; comp. De Monarch. 2:5, page 225; De Cherub. c. 35, page 162): he is the eternal image of God (De Conf. Ling. c. 28, page 427. The contradiction between this representation and the concrete attributes ascribed to the Logos is pointed out by Hegel, Werke, 15:20), the eldest and most general of created things (Legis Alleg. 3, 61, page 121): he is the first-born of God, the eldest angel or archangel (De Conf. Ling. c. 28, page 427; Quis rer. div. haer. c. 42, page 501), the high-priest of the world (De Som. 1:37, page 653; comp. De Gig. c. 11, page 269; De Migr. Abr. c. 18, page 452), the interpreter of God (Legis Alleg. 3:73, page 128), the mediator between the Creator and his creatures, the suppliant in behalf of mortals, the ambassador from the ruler to his subjects (Quis rer. div. haer. c. 42, page 501). He is moreover the God in whose likeness man was made; for the supreme God cannot have any likeness to a mortal nature (Fragm. p. 625): he is the angel who appeared to Hagar (De Somn. 1:41, page 656; De Prof. c. 1. page 547), the God of Jacob's dream and the angel with whom he wrestled (De Somn. 1:39, page 655; De Mut. Nom. c. 13, page 591), the image of God who appeared to Moses at the bush (Vit. Mos. 1:12, page 91; comp. Gfrorer, 1, page 283, 284), the guide of the Israelites in the wilderness (De Migr., Abr. c. 31, page 463). This interposition of the Logos thus serves to combine the theology of contemplation with that of worship and obedience; it endeavors to provide one God for those whose philosophical meditations aspire to an intuition of the absolute, and another  for those whose religious feelings demand a personal object; while at the same time it attempts to preserve the unity of God by limiting the attribution of proper and supreme deity to the first principle only.

In addition to this, which may be regarded as the Central point of Philo's system, some have endeavored to elicit from his writings a closer approximation to Christian doctrine, in the recognition of a third divine being, distinct both from the supreme God and from the Logos. (See Allix, Judgmyent of the Jewish Church, page 118, ed. 1821; Kidder, Demonstration of the Messias, part 3, chapter 5.) A remarkable passage sometimes cited for this purpose occurs in his allegorizing commentary on the cherubim and the flaming sword placed in Eden. "With the one truly existent God," he says, "there are two first and highest powers, goodness and authority: by goodness he has produced everything, and by authority he rules over that which he has produced; and a third, which brings both together as a medium, is reason; for by reason God is both a ruler and good. Of these two powers — authority and goodness — the cherubim are the symbol; and of reason, the flaming sword" (De Cherub. c. 9, page 143). In like manner he comments on the threefold appearance to Abraham in the plains of Mamre: "The middle appearance represents the Father of the universe, who in the sacred writings is called by his proper name, the Existent (ὁ ῎Ων), and those on each side are the most ancient powers and nearest to the Existent; one of which is called the creative and the other the kingly power. The creative power is God, for by this power he made and arranged the universe; and the kingly power is Lord, for it is meet that the Creator should rule over and govern the creature" (De Abi. c. 24. page 19; comp. De Sacr. Ab. et Cain. c. 15, page 173). The inference, however, which has been drawn from these and similar passages rests on a very precarious foundation. There is no consistency in Philo's exposition, either as regards the number or the nature of these divine powers. Even granting the disputed opinion that the powers represent distinct personal beings, we find in one of the above passages the three beings all distinguished from the supreme God; while in the other he seems to be identified with one of them; and the confusion is increased if we compare other passages in which additional powers are mentioned with further distinctions. (Comp. De Mut. Nom. c. 4, page 582, where a εὐεργετικὴ δύναμις is mentioned as distinct from the βασιλική and ποιητική, and all three are distinguished from the supreme God.) The truth seems to be that Philo indulged his allegorizing fancy in the invention of divine powers ad libitum, in any  number and with any signification which the text on which he was commenting for the moment might happen to suggest; and he has no more difficulty in finding six divine powers to be represented by the six cities of refuge (De Prof: c. 18, 19, pages 560, 561. In this passage, again, the three higher powers, represented by the three cities beyond Jordan, are clearly distinguished from the supreme God) than he has in finding three, to suit the two cherubim and the flaming sword. In this kind of desultory playing with the language of Scripture it is idle to look for any definite doctrine, philosophical or theological.

It must not be supposed that the doctrines here attributed to Philo are clearly and unambiguously enunciated in his writings. Many passages might be quoted apparently indicating different views; and probably no consecutive summary of doctrines could be drawn up against which similar objections might not be urged. This difficulty is unavoidable in the case of a writer like Philo, who attempts to combine together two antagonistic systems, of whose antagonism he is himself but imperfectly, if at all, conscious. Philo's system has been called an eclecticism; but it was not so much an eclecticism fuunded on definite principles of selection as an accumulation of speculations which he was unable to combine into a consistent whole, though persuaded of the existence of a common principle of truth concealed under them. There is a perpetual struggle between the Jewish and the heathen, the religious and the philosophical elements of his system, if system it can be called, which cannot be set at rest by all the latitude of interpretation which he so freely indulges in. Hence his religious convictions perpetually manifest themselves in language inconsistent with his philosophical theories; and the utmost that can be attempted in a short analysis of his teaching is to give an outline of the system as it probably would have been had it been logically carried out, not as it actually appears in his own very illogical attempt to carry it out.

In the language as well as in the doctrines of Philo we may trace the influence of Greek philosophy in conjunction with the literature of his own nation. The theory, indeed, which would trace the term Λόγος to the few and unimportant passages in which it is employed by Plato is too fanciful and far-fetched to be tenable; but the appearance in Philo of the Stoical distinction between λόγος ἐνδιάθετος and λόγος προφορικός, as well as his general use of the term, seems to indicate that in the employment of this word he was influenced by the language of the Greek philosophy, though perhaps in conjunction with that of the Sept. (On the λόγος of the  Stoics and its relation to Philo, see Zeller, Philos. der Griechen, 3:630. Comp. Wyttenbach on Plutarch, 2:44, A. The distinction between ἐνδιάθετος and προφορικὸς λόγος, though acknowledged by Philo, is not applied by him directly to the divine reason [see Gfrorer, 1:177]. On other affinities between Philo and the Stoics, see Valckenlar, Diatr. de Aristobulo, sec. 32.) In the use of the cognate term Σοφία, as nearly, if not quite equivalent to Λόγος, he was probably more directly influenced by writers of his own nation, by the Sept. version of the Proverbs, and by the books of Ecclesiasticus and Wisdom. (On the identity of Λόγος and Σοφία in Philo, see Gfrorer, 1:213 sq.) Thus his language, no less than his matter, indicates the compound character of his writings; the twofold origin of his opinions being paralleled by a similar twofold source of the terms in which they are expressed.

It is necessary to dwell to some extent upon the writings of Philo, because it is through them, if at all, that the influence of the Greek philosophy on the Christian Scriptures is to be traced. Whether we admit the conjecture that St. John, during his residence at Ephesus, might have become acquainted with Philo's writings; or whether we regard these writings as the extant representatives of a widely diffused doctrine, which might have reached the apostle through other channels (see. for the one supposition, dean Milman, in a note on Gibbon, chapter 21; and for the other, Gfrorer, 1:307; 2:4), it is to the asserted coincidences between this evangelist and the Alexandrian philosopher that we must look for the chief evidence for or against the theory which asserts an influence of Greek speculations on Christian doctrine. The amount of that influence, however, has been very differently estimated by different critics; one of whom, as has been before observed, ascribes to it nearly all the distinctive doctrines of the Christian Church; while another considers that the whole resemblance between St. John and Philo may be accounted for by their common use of certain passages of the O.T., especially those concerning the angel of the Lord, and the distinction between the hidden and the revealed God (see Tholuck on the Gopyel of St. John, page 65, Engl. transl.). The truth may perhaps be found in an intermediate view, if we distinguish between the Christian doctrine itself and the language in which it is expressed. Notwithstanding the verbal parallels which may be adduced between the language of Philo and that of some portions of the N.T., the relation between the Alexandrian and the Christian doctrine is one rather of contrast than of resemblance. The distinguishing doctrine of the Christian revelation — that of the Word  made flesh — not only does not appear in Philo, but could not possibly appear, consistently with the leading principles of his philosophy, according to which the flesh, and matter in general, is condemned as the source of all evil. The development of Philo's doctrine, if applied to the person of Christ, will lead, as has been pointed out, not to Christianity, but to docetism (see Dorner on the Person of Christ, 1:17, Engl. transl.); and in the distinction, which he constantly makes, between the absolute God and the secondary deity, who alone is capable of relation to finite things, we may trace the germ of a theory which afterwards, in various forms, became conspicuous in the different developments of gnosticism.

In fact, the method of Philo, both in his philosophical theories and in his interpretations of Scripture, is so far from being, either in substance or in spirit, an anticipation of the Christian revelation, that it may rather be taken as a representative of the opposite spirit of rationalism, the tendency of which is to remove all distinction between natural and revealed religion, by striving to bring all religious doctrines alike within the compass of human reason. It is not the reception of divine truth as a fact, resting on the authority of an inspired teacher, telling us that these things are so; it is rather an inquiry into causes and grounds, framing theories to explain how they are so. The doctrine of the Logos, as it appears in Philo, is a hypothesis assumed in order to explain how it is possible that the God whom his philosophy taught him to regard as above all relation to finite existence, could nevertheless, as his religion taught him to believe, be actually manifested in relation to the world. To explain this difficulty, he has recourse to the supposition of an intermediate being between God and the world; standing, as it were, midway between the abstract and impersonal on the one side, and the definite and personal on the other; and described in language which wavers between the two conceptions, without succeeding in combining them. In this respect the theory reminds us not only of those forms of gnosticism which subsequently emanated from the Alexandrian philosophy under the influence of Christianity, as Philo's system emanated from the same philosophy under the influence of Judaism, but also, to some extent, of later speculations, which, in the endeavor to transfer the Catholic faith from a historical to a metaphysical foundation, have regarded the doctrine of the incarnation of the divine Word, not as the literal statement of a fact which took place at an appointed time, but as the figurative representation of an eternal process in the divine nature. (See Fichte, Anweisung zum seligen Leben, Werke, 5:482; Schelling,  Vorlesungen uber Acad. Stud. page 192; Hegel, Philosophie der Geschichte, Werke, 9:388; Baur, Christliche Gnosis, page 715.)

On the other hand, the Christian revelation, while distinctly proclaiming as a fact the reconciliation of man to God by One who is both God and man, yet announces this great truth as a mystery to be received by faith, not as a theory to be comprehended by reason. The mystery of the union between God's nature and man's does not cease to be mysterious because we are assured that it is real. No intermediate hypothesis is advanced to facilitate the union of the two natures by removing the distinctive attributes of either; no attempt is made to overcome the philosophical difficulties of the doctrine by deifying the humanity of Christ or humanizing his divinity. His divine nature is not less divine than that of his Father; his human nature is not less human than that of his brethren. The intellectual difficulty of comprehending how this can be remains still; but the authority of a divine revelation is given to enable us to believe notwithstanding.

But while we acknowledge the wide and fundamental differences which exist between the doctrines of the Alexandrian Judaism and those of the Christian Scriptures, we must also acknowledge the existence of some striking similarities of language between the writings of Philo and some parts of the N.T. The following instances exhibit some of the most remarkable parallels of this kind:  N.T.

Joh 1:1. Ε᾿ν ἀρχῇ ην ὁ Λόγος, καὶ ὁ Λόγος ην πρὸς τὸν θεόν, καὶ θεὸς ην ὸ Λόγος.

Joh 1:3. Πάντα δἰ αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο, καὶ χωρὶς αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο αὐδὲ ž ν ὃ γέγονεν.

Joh 1:4. Καί.ἡ ζωὴ η῏ν τὸ φῶς τῶν ἀνθρώπων ἧν τὸ φῶς τὸ ἀληθινόν ὅ φωτίζει πάντα ἄνθρωπον

Joh 1:18. θεὸν οὐδεὶς ἐώρακε πώποτε· ὁ μονογενὴς υἱὸς ὁ ž ν εις τὸν κόλπον τοῦ πατρός, ἐκεῖνος ἐξηγήσατο. (The parallels sometimes adduced from Joh 4:10; Joh 6:32, as compared with De Prof. 15, page 560, and Legis Alleg. 2:21; 3:56, 59, are very questionable. In both cases the allusion seems to arise naturally from the conversation, and not from any reference to Philo.)

1Jn 1:5. ῞Οτι ὁ θεὸς θῶς ἐστι, καὶ σκοτία ἐν αὐτῷ οὐκ ἔστιν οὐδεμία

1Jn 2:1. Καὶ ἐάν τις ἁμάρτη, παράκλητον ἔχομεν πρὸς τὸν πατέρα, ]Ιησοῦν Χριστὸν δίκαιον.

Rom 4:17. θεοῦ τοῦ καλοῦντος τὰ μὴ ὄντα ὡς ὄντα.

1Co 3:1-2. ὡς νηπίοις ἐν Χριστῷ· γάλα ὑμᾶς ἑπότισα, καὶ οὐ βρῶμα; comp. Heb 5:12-13.

1Co 4:1. ὡς ὑπηρέτας Χριστοῦ καὶ οἰκονόμους μυστηρίων θεοῦ.

1Co 10:4. ἔπινον γὰρ ἐκ πνευματικῆς ἀκολουθούσης πέτρας· η δὲ πέτρα ην ὁ Χριστός

1Co 13:12. βλέπομεν γὰρ ἄρτι δἰ ἐσόπτρου ἐν α νιγματι.

2Co 3:18. ἡμεῖς δὲ πάντες ἀνακεκαλυμμένῳ προσώπῳ τὴν δόξαν Κυρίου κατοπτριζόμενοι

2Co 3:3. ἐπιστολὴ Χριστοῦ διακονηθεῖσα ὑφ᾿ ἡμῶν, ἐγγεγραμμένη οὐ μέλανι, ἀλλὰ πνεύματι θεοῦ ζῶντος, οὐκ ἐν πλαξὶ λιθιναις, ὰλλὰ ἐν πλαξι καρδιας σαρκίναις.

2Co 4:4. τοῦ Χριστοῦ ὅς ἐστιν εἰκὼν τοῦ θεοῦ; comp. Col 1:15.

Col 1:15. πρωτότοκος πάσης κτίσεως; comp. Heb 1:6.

1Ti 2:5. Εις γὰρ θεός εις καὶ μεσίτης θεοῦ καὶ ἀνθρώπων, ἄνθρωπος Χριστὸς Ι᾿ησοῦς

Heb 1:2. δἰ ου καὶ ἐποίησεν τοὺς αἰῶνας.

Heb 1:3. ὃς ]ν ἀπαύγασμα τῆς δόξης καὶ χαρακτὴρ τῆς ὑποστάσεως αὐτοῦ.

Heb 3:1. Κατανοήσατε τὸν ἀπόστολον καὶ ἀρχιερέα τῆς ὁμολογίας ἡμῶν Χριστὸν Ι᾿ησοῦν.

Heb 3:4. πὰς γὰρ οικος κατασκευάζεται ὑπό τινος· ὁ δὲ τὰ πάντα κατασκευάσας θεός

Heb 4:12. ζῶν γὰρ ὁ λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ, καὶ ἐνεργής, καὶ τομώτερος ὑπὲρ πᾶσαν μάχαιραν δίστομον, καὶ διικνούμενος ἄχρι μερισμοῦ ψυχις τε καὶ πνεύματος, ἁρμῶν τε καὶ μυελῶν.

Heb 4:14-15. ῎Εχοντες ουν ἀρχιερέα μεγαν, διεληλυθότα τοὺς οὐρανούς, Ι᾿ησοῦν τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ θεοῦ,κρατῶμεν τῳς όμολογίας. Οὐ γὰρ ἔχομεν ἀρχιερέα μὴ δυνάμενου συμπαθῆσαι ταῖς ασθενείαις ἡμῶν, πεπειραμένον δὲ κατὰ πάντα καθ᾿ ὁμοιότητα χωρὶς αμαρτιας.

Heb 6:13. Τῷ γὰρ Αβραὰμ ἐπαγγειλάμενος ὁ θεός, ἐπεὶ κατ᾿ οὐδενὸς εἰχε μειζονος ομόσαι, ὤμοσε καθ᾿ ἑαυτοῦ.

Heb 7:25. πάντοτε ζῶν εἰς τὸ ἐντυγχάνειν ὑπὲρ αὐτῶν. (It may be questioned whether the allegorical commentary on Melchisedek [Leg. Allg. 3:26, page 103] is a fair parallel to Heb.vii. The latter seems more likely to have been taken directly from Psalm ex, without the intervention of Philo.)

Heb 11:4. καὶ δἰαὐτῆς ἀποθανών ἔτι λαλεῖται.

PHILO.  De Conf. Ling. 28, page 427. τῆς ἀιδίου εἰκόνος αὐτοῦ, λόγου τοῦ ἱερωτάτου. De Somn. 1:39, page 655. καλεῖ δὲ θεὸν τὸν πρεσβύτατον αὐτοῦ νυνὶ λόγου. Fragm. page 625. πρὸς τὸν δεύτερον θεὸν ὅς ἐστιν ἐκείνου λόγος.

De Monarch. 2:5, page 225. Λόγος δέ ἐστιν εἰκών θεοῦ, δἰου σύμπας ὁ κόσμος ἐδημιουργεῖτο

De Mundi Opif. 8, page 6. καὶ ταύτης εἰκόνα τὸ νοητὸν φῶς ἐκεῖνο, ὃ θείου λόγου γέγονεν ε.κὼν τοῦ διερμηνεύσαντος τὴν γένεσιν αὐτοῦ.

Legis Alleg. 3:73, page 128. οὑ περὶ τῆς φύσεως αὐτοῦ διαγνῶναι δύναται, ἀλλ᾿ ἀγαπητόν ἐὰν τοῦ ὀνόματος αὐτοῦ δυνηθῶμεν, ὃπερ ην, τοῦ ἑρμηνέως λόγου.

De Somn. 1:13, page 632. ἐπειδὴ πρῶτον μὲν ὁ θεὸς φῶς ἐστι.

De Vit. Mos. 3:14, page 155. Α᾿ναγκαῖον γὰρ ην ὶερωμένον τῷ τοῦ κόσμον πατρὶ παρακλήτῳ χρῆσθαι τελειοτάτῳ τὴν ἀρε τὴν νίῷ πρός τε ἀμνηστείαν ἁμαρτημάτων, κ.τ.λ.

[The Son of God here is the world, represented by the vestments of the high-priest.]

De Creat. Princ. 7, page 367. τὰ γὰρ μὴ ὄντα ἐκάλεσεν εἰς τὸ ειναι

De Agricult. 2, page 301. Ε᾿πεὶ δὲ νηπίοις μέν ἐστι γάλα τροφή, τελείοις δὲ τὲ ἐκ πυρῶν πέμματα, καὶ ψυχῆ γαλακτωδεις μὲν ¨ν ειεν τροφαί, κ.τ.λ.

De Praem. et Poen. 20, page 427. νοῦν καθαρθέντα καὶ μύστην γεγονότα τῶν θείων τελετῶν.

Legis Alleg. 2:21, p. 82. ἡ γὰρ ἀκρότομος πέτρα ἡ σοφία τοῦ θεοῦ...ἐξ ης ποτίζει τὰς φιλοφέους ψυχάς.

De Decal. 21, page 198. ὡς γὰρ διὰ κατόπτρου φαντασιοῦται ο1 νοῦς θεοῦ, κ.τ.λ.

Quod Omn. prob. lib. 7, page 452. Νόμος δὲ ἀψευδὴς ὁ ὀρθὸς λόγος οὐχ ὑπὸ τοῦ δεῖνος ἢ τοῦ δεῖνος φθαρτὸς ἐν  χαρτιδίοις ἢ στήλαις ἄψυχος ἀψύχοις, ἀλλ᾿ ἀθανάτου φύσεως ἄφθαρτος ἐν ἀθανάτῳ διανοίᾷ τυπωθείς.

De Monarch. 2:5, page 225. λόγος δέ ἐστιν εἰκὼν θεοῦ. De Conf. Ling. 28, p. 427. θεοῦ γὰρ εικὼν λόγος ὁ πρεσβύτατος.

Legis Alleg. 3:61, page 121. ὁ λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ. . . . πρεσβιτα τος καὶ γενικώτατος τῶν ὅσα γέγονε. De Agricult. 12, p. 308. τὸν ὀρθὸν αὑτοῦ λόγου, πρωτόγονον υἱόν. De Prof. 20, page 562, ὁ μὲν πρεσβύτατος τοῦ ὄντος λόγος. De Somin. 1:37, page 653. ἀρχιερεὺς ὀ πρωτόγονος αὐτο ῾υ θεῖος λόγος. Quis rer. div. haer. 42, page 501. Τῷ δὲ ἀρχαγγέλῳ καὶ πρεσβυτάτῳ λόγῳ δωρεὰν ἐξαίρετον ἔδωκεν ο τὰ ὁλα γέννησας πατήρ, ἵνα μεθόριος στὰς το γενόμενον διακρίνῃ τοῦ πεποιηκότος, κ.τ.λ.

De Cherub. 35, page 162. αἴτιον μὲν αὐτοῦ τὸν θεὸν. . . .νὄργανον δὲ λόγον θεοῦ, δἰ ου κατεσκευάσθη.

De Mundi Opif. 51, page 35. πᾶς ἄνθρωπος κατὰ μὲν τὴν διάνοιαν ᾠκεἰωται θείῳ λόγῳ, τις μακαρίας (Comp. Sap. Sol. 7:26). De Plant. Noe, 5, page 332. φύσεως ἐκμαγεῖον ἣ ἀπόσπασμα ἢ ἀπαύγασμα γεγονὼς σφραγῖδι θεοῦ ης ὁ χαρακτήρ ἐστιν ἀϊvδιος λόγος.

De Somn. 1:38, page 654. ὁ μὲν δὴ μέγας ἀρχιερεὺς τῆς ὁμολογίας κ.τ.λ.

De Cherub. 35, page 162. οἱκία καὶ πόλις πᾶσα ἵνα κατασκευασθῇ, τίνα συνεισελθεῖν δεῖ; ἀῤ οὐ δημιουργόν κ.τ.λ. . . . Μετεθὼν οὐν ἀπὸ τῶν ἐν μέρει κατασκευῶν ίδε τὴν μεγίστην οικίαν ἢ πόλιν, τὸν κόσμον· εὑρήσεις γὰρ αἴτιον μὲν αὐτοῦ τὸν θεόν, κ.τ.λ.τ.

Quis rer. div. hoer. 26, page 491. τῶ τομεῖ τῶν συμπάντων αὐτοῦ λόγῳ, ὃς εις τὴν ὀξυτάτην ἀκονηθεὶς ἀκμὴν διαιρῶν οὐδέποτε λήγει τὰ α σθητὰ πάντα. 27, page 492. οὕτως ὁ θεὸς ἀκονησάμενος τὸν τομέα τῶν συμπάντων αὐτοῦ λόγον, διαιρσι τήν τε ἄμορφον καὶ ἄποιον τῶν ὁλω οὐσίαν.  De Prof. 20, page 562. Λέγομεν γὰρ τὸν ἀρχιερέα οὐκ ἄνθρωπον ἀλλὰ λόγον θεῖον ειναι, πάντων οὐχ ἐκουσίων μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἀκουσίων ἀδικημάτων ἀμέτοχον.

De Vict.10, page 246. ὅτι ὁ πρὸς ἀλήθειαν ἀρχιερεὺς καὶ μὴ ψευδώννμος ἀμέτοχος ἀμέτοχος ἁμαρτημάτων ἐστίν.

Legis Alleg. 3:72, page 127. ῾Ορᾶ'/ς γὰρ ὅτι οὐ καθ᾿ ἑτέρου ὀμνύει θεός, οὐδεν γὰρ αὐτοῦ κρειττον, ἀλλὰ καθ᾿ ἑαυτοῦ, ὅς ἐστι πάντων ἄριστος.

Quis rer. div. haer. 42, page 501. ὁ δ᾿ αὐτὸς ἱκέτης μέν ἐστι τοῦ θνητοῦ κηραίνοντος ἀεὶ πρὸς τὸ ἄφθαρτον.

Quod deter, potiori insid. 14, page 200. Μαρτυρήσει δὲ τὸ χρησθὲν λόγιον ἐν ῳ φωνῆ χρώμενος και βοῶν § πέπονθεν ὑπὸκακοῦ συνθέτου τηλαυγῶς εὑρίσκεται. Πῶς γὰρ ὀ μηκέτ᾿ ]ν διαλέγεσθαι δυνατός ;

An examination of these passages will, we believe, confirm the view which has been above taken of the doctrinal differences between them; while, at the same time, it will enable us to discern a purpose to be served by the verbal resemblances which they undoubtedly exhibit. If we except instances of merely accidental similarity in language, without any affinity in thought; or quotations by way of illustration, such as St. Paul occasionally borrows from heathen writers; or thoughts and expressions derived from the O.T., and therefore common to Philo and the apostles, as alike acknowledging and making use of the Jewish Scriptures; they may be reduced, for the most part, to two heads: first, the use of the name ὁ Λόγος, by St. John, as a title of Christ, and the application to him, both by St. John and St. Paul, of various attributes and offices ascribed by Philo to the divine Word, and to the various philosophical representations with which the Word is identified; and, secondly, the recognition, chiefly in the acknowledged writings of St. Paul and in the Epistle to the Hebrews, of a spiritual sense, in parts of Scripture, distinct from the literal interpretation; though this is employed far more cautiously and sparingly than in Philo, and as an addition to, rather than, as Philo for the most part employs it, as a substitute for the literal sense. The apostles, it would appear from these passages, availed themselves, in some degree, of the language already established in the current speculations of their countrymen, in order to correct the errors with which that language was associated, and to lead  men's minds to a recognition of the truth of which these errors were the counterfeit. This is only what might naturally be expected from men desirous of adapting the truths which they had to teach to the circumstances of those to whom thev had to teach them.

There was an earlier gnosticism founded in part on the perversion of the Law, as there was a later gnosticism founded in part on the perversion of the Gospel; and it is probable that, at least at the time when St. John wrote, the influence of both had begun to be felt in the Christian Church, and had modified to some extent the language of its theology (see Burton. Bampton Lectures, page 218). If so, the adoption of that language, as a vehicle of Christian doctrine, would furnish the natural means both of correcting the errors which had actually crept into the Church and of counteracting the influence of the source from which they sprang. If the philosophical Jews of Alexandria, striving, as speculative minds in every age have striven, to lay the foundations of their philosophy in an apprehension of the one and the absolute, were driven by the natural current of such speculations to think of the supreme God as a being remote and solitary, having no relation to finite things, and no attributes out of which such a relation can arise, it is natural that the inspired Christian teacher should have been directed to provide, by means of their own language, the antidote to their error: to point, in the revelation of God and man united in one Christ, to the truth, and to the manner of attaining the truth; to turn the mind of the wandering seeker from theory to fact, from speculation to belief; to bid him look, with the eye of faith, to that great mystery of godliness in which the union of the infinite and the finite is realized in fact, though remaining still incomprehensible in theory. If the same philosophers, again, seeking to bridge over the chasm which their speculations had interposed between God and man, distorted the partial revelation of the Angel of the Covenant, which their Scriptures supplied, into the likeness of the ideal universe of the Platonist, or of the half-personified world-reason of the Stoic, it was surely no unworthy object of the apostolic teaching to lead them, by means of the same language, to the true import of that revelation, as made known, iln its later and fuller manifestation, by the advent of the Word made flesh. If the Platonizing expositor of the Jewish Scriptures, eager to find the foreign philosophy which he adopted in the oracles of God committed to his own people, explained away their literal import by a system of allegory and metaphor, it was natural that the inspired writers of the New Covenant should point out the true meaning of those marks which the Jewish history and religion so clearly bear of a spiritual significance beyond themselves, by  showing how the institutions of the Law and the record of God's dealings with his chosen people are not an allegory contrived for the teaching of a present philosophy, but an anticipation, designed by the divine Author of the whole as a preparation, directly and indirectly, by teaching and training, by ritual and prophecy, by type and symbol, to make ready the way for him that was to come.

The attempts made by Grossmann, Gfrorer, and others, to explain the origin of Christianity as an offshoot of the Jewish philosophy of Alexandria rest mainly on these occasional coincidences of language, while overlooking fundamental differences of doctrine. The ideal Logos, the distinguishing feature of the Alexandrian philosophy, has no place in the teaching of the N.T. The belief in one Christ, very God and very man, has not only no place in, but is diametrically opposed to the philosophical speculations of Philo. For his personal relations to Christianity, SEE PIILO. Christianity came into the world at a time when the Graeco-Jewish modes of thought, of which Philo is the representative, were prevalent; and the earliest Christian teachers, so far as they had to deal with those to whom that philosophy was familiar, could do so most effectually by means of its language and associations. These considerations — seem naturally to explain the resemblance and the difference between the two systems — resemblance as regards the language employed; difference as regards the doctrine which that language conveys.

See Keferstein, Philo's Lehre v.d gottl. Mittelwesen (Leips. 1846); Niedner, De λόγῳ apetd Philonem (in the Zeitschr. f. hist. Theol. 1849); Clarke's Comm. ad loc. Joh.; Bryant, Philo Judcus (Cambr. 1797, 8vo). SEE LOGOS.

III. Christianity in Contact with Ancient Philosophy. — The only direct trace of the contact of Christianity with Western philosophy in the N.T. is in the account of Paul's visit to Athens, where "certain philosophers of the Epicureans and of the Stoics" (Act 17:18) the representatives, that is, of the two great moral schools which divided the West — 'encountered him;" and there is nothing in the apostolic writings to show that it exercised any important influence upon the early Church (comp. 1 Corinthians 2:22-24). But it was otherwise with Eastern speculation, which, as it was less scientific in form, penetrated more deeply through the mass of the people. The "philosophy" against which the Colossians were warned (Col 2:8) seems undoubtedly to have been of Eastern origin,  containing elements similar to those which were afterwards embodied in various shapes of gnosticism, as a selfish asceticism and a superstitious reverence for angels (Col 2:16-23), and in the Epistles to Timothy, addressed to Ephesus, in which city Paul anticipated the rise of false teaching (Act 20:30), two distinct forms of error may be traced, in addition to Judaism, due more or less to the same influence. One of these was a vain spiritualism, insisting on ascetic observances, and interpreting the resurrection as a moral change (1Ti 4:1-7; 2Ti 2:16-18); the other a materialism allied to sorcery (2Ti 3:13, γόητες). The former is that which is peculiarly "false-styled gnosis" (1Ti 6:20), abounding in "profane and old wives' fables" (4:7) and empty discussions (1:6; 6:20); the latter has a close connection with earlier tendencies at Ephesus (Act 19:19), and with the traditional accounts of Simon Magus (comp. 8:9), whose working on the early Church, however obscure, was unquestionably most important. These antagonistic and yet complementary forms of heresy found a wide development in later times; but it is remarkable that no trace of dualism, of the distinction of the Creator and the Redeemer, the Demiurge and the true God, which formed so essential a tenet of the Gnostic schools, occurs in the N.T. (comp. Thiersch, Versuch zur Herstellung d. hist. Standpunktes, etc., pages 231- 304).

The writings of the sub-apostolic age, with the exception of the famous anecdote of Justin Martyr (Dial 2-4), throw little light upon the relations of Christianity and philosophy. The heretical systems again are too obscure and complicated to illustrate more than the general admixture of foreign (especially Eastern) tenets with the apostolic teaching. One book, however, has been preserved in various shapes, which, though still unaccountably neglected in Church histories, contains a vivid delineation of the speculative struggle which Christianity had to maintain with Judlaism and heathenism. The Clementine Homilies (ed. Dressel, 1853) and Recognitions (ed. Gersdorf, 1838) are a kind of philosophy of religion, and in subtlety and richness of thought yield to no early Christian writings. The picture which the supposed author draws of his early religious doubts is evidently taken from life (Clem. Recogn. 1:1-3; Neander, Ch. Hist. 1:43, Engl. transl.); and inl the discussions which follow there are clear traces of Western as well as Eastern philosophy (Uhlhorn, Die Hom. u. Recogn. d. Clem. Hom. page 404, etc.).  At the close of the 2d century, when the Church of Alexandria came into marked intellectual pre-eminence, the mutual influence of Christianity and Neo-Platonism opened a new field of speculation, or, rather, the two systems were presented in forms designed to meet the acknowledged wants of the time. According to the commonlly received report, Origen was the scholar of Ammonius Saccas, who first gave consistency to the later Platonism, and for a long time he was the contemporary of Plotinus (A.D. 205-270), who was its noblest expositor. Neo-Platonism was, in fact, an attempt to seize the spirit of Christianity, apart from its historic basis and human elements. The separation between the two was absolute; and yet the splendor of the onesided spiritualism of the Neo-Platonists attracted in some cases the admiration of the Christian fathers (Basil, Theodoret), and the wide circulation of the writings of the pseudo-Dionysius the Areopagite served to propagate many of their doctrines under an orthodox name among the schoolmen and mystics of the Middle Ages (Vogt, Neu- Platonisnsms u. Christenthum, 1836; Herzog, Encyklop. s.v. Neu- Platonismus). SEE NEO-PLATONISM.

The want which the Alexandrian fathers endeavored to satisfy is in a great measure the want of our own time. If Christianity be truth, it must have points of special connection with all nations and all periods. The difference of character in the constituent writings of the N.T. are evidently typical, and present the Gospel in a form (if technical language may be used) now ethical, now logical, now mystical. The varieties of aspect thus indicated combine to give the idea of a harmonious whole. Clement rightly maintained that there is a "gnosis" in Christianity distinct from the errors of gnosticism. The latter was a premature attempt to connect the Gospel with earlier systems; the former a result of conflict grounded on faith (Mohler, Patroloqie, page 424, etc.). Christian philosophy may be in one sense a contradiction in terms, for Christianity confessedly derives its first principles from revelation, and not from simple reason; but there is no less a true philosophy of Christianity, which aims to show how completely these, by their form, their substance, and their consequences, meet the instincts and aspirations of all ages. The exposition of such a philosophy would be the work of a modern Origen.

See Haber, Philosophie der Kirchenvater (Miunch. 1859); Stockl, Philos. d. patristischen Zeit (Wurzburg, 1859); M6ller, Kosmologie in d. griech. Kirche (Halle, 1868).

IV. Patristic Recognition of the Propaedeutic Office of Greek Philosophy. — The divine discipline of the Jews was in nature essentially moral. SEE PHILOSOPHY, HEBREW. The lessons which it was designed to teach were embodied in the family and the nation. Yet this was not in itself a complete discipline of our nature.

The reason, no less than the will and the affections, had an office to discharge in preparing man for the incarnation. The process and the issue in the two cases were widely different, but they were in some sense complementary. Even in time this relation holds good. The divine kingdom of the Jews was just overthrown when free speculation arose in the Ionian colonies of Asia. The teaching of the last prophet nearly synchronized with the death of Socrates. All other differences between the discipline of reason and that of revelation are implicitly included in their fundamental difference of method. In the one, man boldly aspired at once to God; in the other, God disclosed himself gradually to man. Philosophy failed as a religious teacher practically (Rom 1:21-22), but it bore noble witness to an inward law (2:14, 15). It laid open instinctive wants which it could not satisfy. It cleared away error, when it could not found truth. It swayed the foremost minds of a nation, when it left the mass without hope. In its purest and grandest forms it was "a schoolmaster to bring men to Christ" (Clem. Alex. Strom. 1, § 28).

This function of ancient philosophy is distinctly recognised by many of the greatest of the fathers. The principle which is involved in the doctrine of Justin Martyr on "the Seminal Word" finds a clear and systematic expression in Clement of Alexandria (comp. Redepenning, Origenes, 1:437439). "Every race of men participated in the Word. And they who lived with the Word were Christians, even if they were held to be godless (ἄθεοι), as, for example, among the Greeks, Socrates and Heraclitus, and those like them" (Just. Mart. Ap. 1:46; comp. 1:5, 28, and 2:10, 13). "Philosophy," says Clement, "before the coming of the Lord, was necessary to Greeks for righteousness; and now it proves useful for godliness, being in some sort a preliminary discipline (προπαιδεια τις ουσα) for those who reap the fruits of the faith through demonstration. . . . Perhaps we may say that it was given to the Greeks with this special object (προηγουμένως), for it brought (ἐπαιδαγώγει) the Greek nation to Christ, as the law brought the Hebrews" (Clem. Alex. Strom. 1:5, § 28; comp. 9, § 43, and 16, § 80). In this sense he does not scruple to say that  "Philosophy was given as a peculiar testament (διαθήκην) to the Greeks, as forming the basis of the Christian philosophy" (ibid. 6:8, § 67; comp. 5, § 41). Origen, himself a pupil of Ammonius Saccas, speaks with less precision as to the educational power of philosophy, but his whole works bear witness to its influence. The truths which the philosophers taught, he says, referring to the words of Paul, were from God, for "God manifested these to them, and all things that have been nobly said" (c. Cels. 6:3; Philoc. 15). Augustine, while depreciating the claims of the great Gentile teachers, allows that "some of them made great discoveries, so far as they received help from heaven, while they erred so far as they were hindered by human frailty" (August. De Civ. 2:7; comp. De Doctr. Chr. 2:18). They had, as he elsewhere says, a distant vision of the truth, and learned from the teaching of nature what prophets learned from the Spirit (Serm. 68:3; 140, etc.).

But while many thus recognised in philosophy the free witness of the Word speaking among men, the same writers in other places sought to explain the partial harmony of philosophy and revelation by an original connection of the two. This attempt, which in the light of a clearer criticism is seen to be essentially fruitless and even suicidal, was at least more plausible in the first centuries. A multitude of writings were then current bearing the names of the Sibyl or Hystaspes, which were obviously based on the O.-T. Scriptures, and as long as they were received as genuine it was impossible to doubt that Jewish doctrines were spread in the West before the rise of philosophy. On the other hand, when the fathers ridicule with the bitterest scorn the contradictions and errors of philosophers, it must be remembered that they spoke often fresh from a conflict with degenerate professors of systems which had long lost all real life. Some indeed there were, chiefly among the Latins, who consistently inveighed against philosophy. But even Tertullian, who is among its fiercest adversaries, allows that at times the philosophers hit upon truth by a happy chance or blind goodfortune, and vet more by that "general feeling with which God was pleased to endow the soul" (Tertull. De An. 2). The use which was made of heathen speculation by heretical writers was one great cause of its disa paragement by their catholic antagonists. Irenaeus endeavors to reduce the Gnostic teachers to a dilemma: either the philosophers with whom they argued knew the truth or they did not; if they did, the incarnation was superfluous; if they did not, whence comes the agreement of the true and the false? (Adv. Haer. 2:14, 7). Hippolytus follows out the connection of different  sects with earlier teachers in elaborate detail. Tertullian, with characteristic energy, declares that "Philosoophy furnishes the arms and the subjects of heresy. What (he asks) has Athens in common with Jerusalem? the Academy with the Church? heretics with Christians? Our training is from the Porch of Solomon. . . . Let those look to it who bring forward a Stoic, a Platonic, a dialectic Christianity. We have no need of curious inquiries after the coming of Christ Jesus, nor of investigation after the Gospel" (Tertull. De Praescr. Haer. 7).

This variety of judgment in the heat of controversy was inevitable. The full importance of the history of ancient philosophy was then first seen when all rivalry was over, and it became possible to contemplate it as a whole, animated by a great law, often trembling on the verge of truth, and sometimes by a "bold venture" claiming the heritage of faith. Yet even now the relations of the "two old covenants" — philosophy and the Hebrew Scriptures — to use the language of Clement have been traced only imperfectly. What has been done may encourage labor, but it does not supersede it. In the porticos of Eastern churches Pythagoras and Plato are pictured among those who prepared the way for Christianity (Stanley, page 41); but in the West, sibyls, and not philosophers, are the chosen representatives of the divine element in Gentile teaching.

## Philosophy, Hebrew[[@Headword:Philosophy, Hebrew]]

             The term philosophy, as seen above, may be properly used in a wider and in a more restricted sense. In the former it is nearly synonymous with science, and embraces all departments of human knowledge capable of being scientifically classified — that is, where the facts are presented in their causes, where phenomena are referred to principles, and arranged under laws. In the latter it is confined to speculative knowledge, that which the mind has of its own operations and laws, or which it acquires by reasoning from its own thoughts. We have no evidence that philosophy in the stricter sense was cultivated by the ancient Hebrews; nor have we much reason to believe that scientific study, even as regards external phenomena, was much followed by them. Forming our estimate from what of their literature has been preserved to us in the Bible, we must conclude that the ancient Hebrew mind was not specially characterized by those tendencies, nor largely endowed with those faculties which give birth to speculative research. The analytical and the logical are but slightly perceptible in their mental products, while the imaginative, the synthetic, and the historical  largely predominate. We should be led to infer that they delighted rather in putting things together according to their analogies than in distributing them according to their differences. They were careful observers of phenomena, and their minds sought scope in bold flights of imagination, or reposed in calm, protracted, and profound reflection; but it was as historians and poets rather than as philosophers that they looked on the world both of being and event.

It thus appears that philosophy, if we limit the word strictly to describe the free pursuit of knowledge of which truth is the one complete end, is essentially of Western growth. In the East the search after wisdom has always been connected with practice: it has remained there, what it was in Greece at first, a part of religion. The history of the Jews offers no exception to this remark: there is no Jewish philosophy properly so called. Yet on the other hand speculation and action meet in truth; and perhaps the most obvious lesson of the O.T. lies in the gradual construction of a divine philosophy by fact, and not by speculation. The method of Greece was to proceed from life to God; the method of Israel (so to speak) was to proceed from God to life. The axioms of one system are the conclusions of the other. The one led to the successive abandonment of the noblest domains of science which man had claimed originally as his own, till it left bare systems of morality; the other, in the fulness of time, prepared many to welcome the Christ — the Truth.

From what has been said, it follows that the philosophy of the Jews, using the word in a large sense, is to be sought for rather in the progress of the national life than in special books. These, indeed, furnish important illustrations of the growth of speculation, but the history is written more in acts than in thoughts. Step by step the idea of the family was raised into that of the people; and the kingdom furnished the basis of those wider promises which included all nations in one kingdom of heaven. The social, the political, the cosmical relations of man were traced out gradually in relation to God. SEE JEWS; SEE JUDAISM.

I. The Philosophy of Nature. —

1. Primitive Period. — With the Hebrews the original theory of the world was so simple that little occasion was given to them for speculation on the mysteries of existence. Their conception of it was essentially and wholly monotheistic. They held the existence of one God, besides whom there was  no other; and as the world had come into being by his simple fiat, so it was kept in being by his will, governed by his immediate agency, and subordinated to the fulfilment of his designs. No trace is discoverable in the Bible of those pantheistic notions in which the thinkers and writers of other ancient nations seem so generally to have taken refuge from the perplexities arising out of the relations of the finite to the infinite, and which at a later period took such hold of the Jewish mind, as is attested by their cabalistic books (Freystadt, Philosophia Cabbalistica et Pantheismus, 1832). The world and the things in the world were regarded by them not as emanations from God, nor as in any sense God; they are all the work of his hands, proceeding from him, but as distinct from him as the work is distinct from the workman. By the word of Jehovah all things were created, and by his word they are upheld. They all belong to him as his property, and he does with them as he wills. They are his, but not in any sense he. As little do the Hebrews seem to have realized the idea of an order of nature distinct from the will and power of God. The phenomena of being and event they referred alike to the immediate agency of the Almighty. Causation was with them simply God acting. They thus removed the distinction between the natural and the supernatural; not, as some modern speculatists propose, by reducing all phenomena under natural laws, but by the reverse process, resolving all into the immediate operation of God. Man, as part of God's creation, is equally subject with the rest to his control. His times and ways are all in God's hand. By God's power and wisdom he has been fashioned; by God's goodness he is upheld and guided; by God's law his entire activity is to be regulated; at God's command he retires from this active sphere and passes into the unseen world, where his spirit returns to him who gave it.

But though this simple and childlike theory of the universe gave little scope for speculative thinking and inquiry, and though the Bible presents us with but little that indicates the existence of philosophic study among the ancient Hebrews, we are not entitled to conclude from these data that such pursuits had no existence among them. It is to be borne in mind that it was foreign to the design and pretensions of the sacred writers to discuss speculatively points on which they were commissioned to speak authoritatively in the name of God; nor must it be forgotten that we have not in the Bible the entire literature of the Hebrew people, and that, as philosophic writings would, because not addressed to the popular mind, be precisely those most likely to be allowed to perish, it is possible that much  may have been lost which, had it been preserved, would have shown how and to what extent scientific research flourished among the Hebrews. This suggestion acquires force, not only from the fact that we know that certain utterances by Solomon of a scientific kind, probably committed to writing, have perished (1Ki 4:33), but also from the statement in Ecc 12:12, which, besides indicating that the literature of the Hebrews was more copious than what we now possess, leads, from its connection, to the conclusion that part of it at least was devoted to philosophic inquiry. The book of Ecclesiastes itself, as well as that of Job, may be held as proving that the Hebrew mind did not acquiesce wholly in simple faith, but had, like mind elsewhere, its seasons of doubt, question, and speculation on matters relating to man's condition and destiny. We may also point to Psalm 49:73, and to many passages in the book of Proverbs, as indicating the same thing. Nor must we overlook the fact that the Hebrew is rich in terms which are appropriate to philosophic inquiry, and indicate habits of analytic research among those by whom they were used. Of these may be mentioned חָכְמָה, wisdom, often used as we use pkilosopsy (comp. Ecc 1:13, where תור בחכמהmight almost be rendered to philosophize); בַּין, from בֵּין, etween, to separate, to discern, to understand, i.e., to analyze perceptions into their component elements, so as to arrive at just notions of them, whence בַּינָה, insight, itelligence, judgment; דָּרִשׁand חָקֵד, to investigate, to examine; הָגָה, to think, to reflect; אַזֵּן, to poder; יָדִע, to know, whence דִעִת, knowledge. To these may be added their names for the mental part of man, רוּה, πνεῦμα; נֶפֶשׁ, ψύχη; נְשָׁמָה, anima; לֵב, καρδία, φρήν.

It is further to be observed that though the Bible does not present philosophic truth in a speculative form, it presents abundantly the materials out of which philosophies may be constructed. Philosophy thus exists in it as it exists in nature, not (to use the scholastic phraseology) in a manifest and evolute, hut in a concrete and involute state; and it needs only a patient collection of its statements, and the arrangement of these according to their meaning and relations, to enable us to construct systematic developments of them. We may thus form not only a theology from the Bible, but an anthropology, including physiology and a system of ethics. See Roos, Fundamenta Psychologie ex Sac. Script. Collecta (1769); Beck, Urriss d. biblischen Seelenlehre (1843); Haussmann, Die bibl. Lehre von Menschen (1848); Von Schubert, Gesch. der Seele (4th ed. 1850); Delitzsch, System  der bibl. Psychologie (2d ed. 1861); Taylor, Ductor Dubitantium (1660); Buddaeus, Instit. Theolog. Moralis (1715); Staudlin, Lehrbuch der Moralflir Theologen (2d ed. 1817); Schleiermacher, Die Christliche Sitte (1843); Harless, Christliche Ethik (4th ed. 1849); Wuttke, Handb. der Christl. Sittenlehre (2 volumes). SEE BIBLICAL THEOIOGY

For the natural science of the Hebrews, SEE ASTRONOMY, SEE BOTANY, SEE MEDICINE, SEE ZOOLOGY, and the articles on subjects of natural history in this work. For the exact sciences, see the articles SEE CHRONOLOGY and SEE NUMBER.

2. Exilian Period. — This is of great interest to the student of the Bible, in consequence of the influence which the Babylonian philosophy exerted on the opinions and manner of thinking of the Israelites during their captivity in Babylon — an influence of a general and decided character, which the rabbins themselves admit, in alleging that the names of the angels and of the months were derived by the house of Israel from Babylon (Rosh Hashanah, page 56). The system of opinion and manner of thinking which the captives met with in Babylon cannot be characterized exclusively as Chaldaean, but was made up of elements whose birthplace was in various parts of the East, and which appear to have found in Babylon a not uncongenial soil, where they grew and produced fruit which coalesced into one general system. Of these elements the two principal were the Chaldoean and the Medo-Persian or Zoroastrian. It is to the first that the reader's attention is invited in this article.

The Chaldaeans, who lived in a climate where the rays of the sun are never darkened, and the night is always clear and bright by means of the light of the moon and stars, were led to believe that light was the soul of nature. Accordingly it was by the light of the sun and stars that the universal spirit brought forth all things; and therefore the Chaldaeans offered their homage to the Supreme Being in the heavenly bodies, where he appeared to them in a special manner to dwell. As the stars form separate bodies, imagination represented them as distinct existences, which had each their peculiar functions, and exerted a separate influence in bringing forth the productions of nature. The idea of a universal spirit disappeared, as being too abstract for the people, and not without difficulty for cultivated minds; and worship was offered to the stars as so many powers that governed the world. It is easy to see how the Chaldeeans passed from this early  corruption of the primitive religion of the Bible to a low and degrading polytheism.

As light was regarded as the only moving power of nature, and every star had its own influence, so natural phenomena appeared the result of the particular influence of that heavenly body which at any given time was above the horizon; and the Chaldsean philosophers believed that they found the cause of events in its position, and the means of foretelling events in its movements. These views, and perhaps the extraordinary heat and the pestilential winds which in certain months prevail in the country, and against which there is no protection except in the hills, led the Chaldeeans to the mountains which gird the land. On these observatories, which nature seems to have expressly formed for the purpose, they studied the positions and movements of the heavenly host. They thought they saw that similar phenomena were constantly accompanied by the same conjunction of the stars, which seemed to observe regular movements and a similar course. On this the Chaldaean priests came to the conviction that natural events are bound together, and that sacrifices do not interrupt their course; that they all have a common origin, which works according to unknown principles and laws, whose discovery is so important as to deserve their best attention. The heavenly bodies themselves are obedient to these laws; their formation, position, and influence are consequences of these universal laws, by which nature was controlled. This determined the Chaldaeans to seek in the heavens the knowledge of the original cause which created the world, and of the laws which that cause followed in the formation of things and in the production of phenomena, since in the heavens dwelt the power which brings all things forth.

The stars were masses of light; the space which held them were filled with light; no other power appeared to operate therein: accordingly the Chaldaeans held light to be the moving power which had produced the stars. It could not be doubted that this power possessed intelligence, and the operations of the mind appear to have so much resemblance to the subtlety and fleetness of light that men who had only imagination for their guide had no hesitation to represent intelligence as a property of light, and the universal spirit of highest intelligence as light itself. The observations of the Chaldeeans had taught them that the distances of the stars from the earth are unequal, and that light decreases in its approach to the earth, on which they concluded that light streams forth from an endless fountain far removed from the earth, in doing which it fills space with its beams, and  forms the heavenly bodies in different positions and of different magnitudes. The creative spirit was therefore set forth by them under the image of an eternal, inexhaustible fountain of light; they thought this fountain was to the universe what the sun is to the regions lighted and warmed by his beams.

As light becomes less in propagating itself, its fountain must be of an inconceivable subtlety and purity, and, accordingly, in its loftiest condition, intelligent. As its beams are removed from their source they lose their activity, and by the gradual waning of their influeince sink from their original perfection; they therefore produced different existences and intelligences, in proportion as they became more distant from the fountain of light; at last, passing from one element into another, they lost their lightness, were pressed together, and made dense, till they became corporeal, and produced chaos. There accordingly was between the Supreme Being and the earth a chain of intermediate existences, whose perfections decreased as they were more remote from the First Great Cause. This Supreme Being had communicated in a distinguished degree his primary radiations, intelligence, power, productiveness; all other emanations had, in proportion to their distance from the highest intelligence, a less and less share in these perfections; and thus were the different regions of light, from the moon to the dwelling-place of the Supreme, filled with various orders of spirits.

The space which contained the First Cause, or Fountain of radiations, was filled with pure and happy intelligences. Immediately beneath this region began the corporeal world, or the empyreum, which was a boundless space, lighted by the pure light which flowed immediately from the Great Source; this empyreum was filled with an infinitely less pure fire than the original light, but immeasurably finer than all bodies. Below this was the ether, or grosser region, filled with still grosser fire. Next came the fixed stars, spread over a wide region where the thickest parts of the ethereal fire had come together and formed the stars. The world of planets succeeded, which contained the sun, moon, and the wandering stars. Then came the last order of beings-the rude elements which are deprived of all activity, and withstand the motions and influence of light. The different parts of the world are in contact, and the spirits of the upper regions can influence the lower, as well as descend and enter into them. As the chaotic elements were without shape and motion, the spirits of the higher regions must have formed the earth, and human souls are spirits sprung from them. To these  spirits from above the system of the Chaldaeans ascribed all the productions, appearances, and movements upon the earth. The formation of the human body, the growth of the fruits, all the gifts of nature, were attributed to beneficent spirits. In the space below the moon, in the midst of night, tempests arose, lightnings threaded the dark clouds, thunder broke forth and laid waste the earth; there were found spirits of darkness, corporeal daemons spread through the air. Often, too, were flames of fire seen to rise out of the bosom of the earth, and the mountains were shaken. Earthly powers or deemons were supposed to dwell in the centre of the earth; and since matter was held to be without activity, all movements were attributed to spirits. Storms, volcanoes, tempests, appeared to have no other object than to destroy human happiness; and these daemons were held to be wicked spirits who produced these evils; to them every unfortunate event was ascribed, and a sort of hierarchy was formed of these evil beings, as had been done in the case of the good spirits. But why did not tie Supreme Mind put down, by an exertion of his power, this swarm of wicked spirits? Some thought it was beneath the dignity of the Primary Essence to contend with these deemons; others were of opinion that these bad spirits were naturally indestructible, and as the Supreme could neither destroy nor improve them, he had banished them to the centre of the earth and to the region beneath the moon, where they indulged in their baseness and exercised their dominion: in order, however, to protect the human race against fiends so numerous and fearful, he commissioned good spirits, whose office it was to defend men against these corporeal daemons. As the good and the bad spirits had various degrees of power and different offices, so they had names given to them which described their functions. As the good spirits were under an obligation to protect men and furnish succor in their need, they were compelled to learn human language; accordingly, it was believed that a guardian angel against every evil was possessed by every one who bore his mysterious name — a name which was to be pronounced only when succor was needed. All manner of names were therefore devised, by which the good spirits were conjured or informed of human necessities; and all the combinations of the alphabet were exhausted in order to bring about a commerce between men and angels. Here is the origin of the Cabala, which gave strange names to these spirits in order to bring them into connection with men, and by this means to do wonderful things (Mat 12:24-27). These names also sometimes served to drive bad spirits away: they were a kind of exorcism. For since it was believed that these daemons had  been banished to the centre of the earth, and that they could do evil only in consequence of having baffled the vigilance of the guardian spirits and escaped to the outer world, so, it was held, they were compelled to flee as soon as they heard the name of the good angels whose business it was to keep them shut up in subterranean caverns, and to punish them if they ventured from their prison-house. A power, too, was ascribed to the name of the spirit, or to the image which marked his office-a power which forced the spirit to come on being called; and, accordingly, it was held that this name carved on a stone kept the spirit near the person who wore the stone — a notion in which is probably found the origin of talismans, formed either by words or symbolical figures.

3. Cabalistic Period. — It is uncertain at what date the earliest Cabala (i.e., Tradition) received a definite form; but there can be no doubt that the two great divisions of which it is composed, "the Chariot" (Mercabah, Ezekiel 1), and "the Creation" (Bereshith, Genesis 1), found a wide development before the Christian aera. The first dealt with the manifestation of God in himself; the second with his manifestation in Nature; and as the doctrine was handed down orally, it received naturally, both from its extent and form, great additions from foreign sources. On tlh3 one side it was open to the Persian doctrine of emanation, on the other to the Christian doctrine of the Incarnation; and the tradition was deeply impressed by both before it was first committed to writing in the 7th or 8th century. At present the original sources for the teaching of the Cabala are the Sepher Jezirah, or Book of Creation, and the Sepher Hazohar, or Book of Splendor. The former of these dates, in its present form, from the 8th, and the latter from the 13th century (Zunz, Gottesd. Vortr. d. Juden, page 165; Jellinek, Moses ben-Schenmtob de Leon, Leips. 1851). Both are based upon a system of pantheism. In the Book of Creation the cabalistic ideas are given in their simplest form, and offer some points of comparison with the system of the Pythagoreans. The book begins with an enumeration of the thirty-two ways of wisdom seen in the constitution of the world; and the analysis of this number is supposed to contain the key to the mysteries of Nature. The primary division is into 10+22. The number 10 represents the ten Sephiroth (figures) which answer to the ideal world; 22, on the other hand, the number of the Hebrew alphabet, answers to the world of objects; the object being related to the idea as a word, formed of letters, to a number. Twenty-twb again is equal to 3+7+12; and each of these numbers, which constantly recur in the O.-T. Scriptures, is invested with a  peculiar meaning. Generally the fundamental conceptions of the book may be thus represented: The ultimate Being is Divine Wisdom (Chokmah, σοφία). The universe is originally a harmonious thought of Wisdom (Number, Sephirah); and the thought is afterwards expressed in letters, which form, as words, the germ of things. Man, with his twofold nature, thus represents in some sense the whole universe. He is the microcosm in which the body clothes and veils the soul, as the phenomenal world veils the spirit of God. It isimpossible to follow out here the details of this system, and its development in Zohar; but it is obvious how great an influence it must have exercised on the interpretation of Scripture. The calculation of the numerical worth of words (comp. Rev 13:18; Gemnatria, Buxtorf, Lex. Rabb. page 446), the resolution of words into initial letters of new words (Notaricon, Buxtorf, page 1339), and the transposition or interchange of letters (Temurah), were used to obtain the inner meaning of the text; and these practices have continued to affect modern Jewish exegesis.

The fragments of Berosus, preserved by Eusebius and Josephus, and to be found in Scaliger (De Emeindat. Temp.), and more fully in Fabricius (Bibl. Gr. 14:175), afford some information on the subject of Chaldaean philosophy. Berosus was a priest of the god Baal, at Babylon. in the time of Alexander the Great. On the naturalistic philosophy of the Jews in general, the Talmud and other works of the Jewish rabbins mav also be advantageously consulted, together with the following authorities: Euseb. Praep. Evang. 9:10; Philo, De Mig. Mun.; Selden, De Diis Syris, Proleg. 3; Stanley, Hist. of Oriental Philosophy; Kleuker. Ueber die Natur und den Ursprung der Emanationslehre bei den Kabbalisten (Riga, 1786); Molitor, Philos. der Geschichte (1827-28); Hartmann, Die enge Verbindung des A.T. mit dent N. (1831); Ketzer, Lexicon von P. Fritz (1838); Brucken, Hist.-Crit. Phil.; Ritter, Geschichte der Phil.; Nork, Vergleichende Mythologie (1836); Lutterbeck, Neu-test. Lehrbegsrif 1:223-254; Reuss, Kabbala, in Herzog's Encyklop.; Joel, Die Religions philos. d. Zohar (1849); Westcott, Introd. to Gospels, pages 131-134; Franck, La Kabbale (1843). SEE CABALA

II. The Philosophy of History. — The philosophy of the Jews is, as has been seen from the above outline of its naturalistic relations, essentially a moral philosophy, resting on a definite connection with God. The doctrines of Creation and Providence, of an Infinite Divine Person and of a  responsible human will, which elsewhere form the ultimate limits of speculation, are here assumed at the outset. The difficulties which they involve are but rarely noticed. Even when they are canvassed most deeply, a moral answer drawn from the great duties of life is that in which the questioner finds repose. The earlier chapters of Genesis contain an introduction to the direct training of the people which follows. Premature and partial developments, kingdoms based on godless might, stand in contrast with, the slow foundation of the divine polity. To distinguish rightly the moral principles which were successively called out in this latter work would be to write a history of Israel; but the philosophical significance of the great crises through which the people passed lies upon the surface. The call of Abraham set forth at once the central lesson of faith in the Unseen, on which all others were raised. The father of the nation was first isolated from all natural ties before he received the promise; his heir was the son of his extreme age; his inheritance was to him "as a strange land." The history of the patriarchs brought out into yet clearer light the sovereignty of God; the younger was preferred before the elder; suffering prepared the way for safety and triumph. God was seen to make a covenant with man, and his action was written in the records of a chosen family. A new aera followed. A nation grew up in the presence of Egyptian culture. Persecution united elements which seem otherwise to have been on the point of being absorbed by foreign powers. God revealed himself now to the people in the wider relations of Lawgiver and Judge. The solitary discipline of the desert familiarized them with his majesty and his mercy. The wisdom of Egypt was hallowed to new uses. The promised land was gained by the open working of a divine Sovereign. The outlines of national faith were written in defeat and victory; and the work of the theocracy closed. Human passion then claimed a dominant influence. The people required a king. A fixed Temple was substituted for the shifting Tabernacle. Times of disruption and disaster followed; and the voice of prophets declared the spiritual meaning of the kingdom. In the midst of sorrow and defeat and desolation the horizon of hope was extended. The kingdom which man had prematurely founded was seen to be the image of a nobler "kingdom of God." The nation learned its connection with "all the kindred of the earth." The Captivity confirmed the lesson, and after it the Dispersion. The moral effects of these, and the influence which Persian, Greek, and Roman, the inheritors of all the wisdom of the East and West, exercised upon the Jews, have been elsewhere noticed. SEE CYRUS; SEE DISPERSED. The divine discipline closed before the special human  discipline began. The personal relations of God to the individual, the family the nation, mankind, were established in ineffaceable history, and then other truths were brought into harmony with these in the long period of silence which separates the two Testaments. But the harmony was not always perfect. Two partial forms of religious philosophy arose. On the one side the predominance of the Chaldaean or Persian element gave rise to the Cabala; on the other the predominance of the Greek element issued in Alexandrian theosophy.

Before these one-sided developments of the truth were made the fundamental ideas of the divine government found expression in words as well as in life. The Psalms, which, among the other infinite lessons that they convey, give a deep insight into the need of a personal apprehension of truth, everywhere declare the absolute sovereignty of God over the material and moral worlds. The classical scholar cannot fail to be struck with the frequency of natural imagery, and with the close connection.which is assumed to exist between man and nature as parts of one vast order. The control of all the elements by one All-wise Governor, standing out in clear contrast with the deification of isolated objects, is no less essentially characteristic of Hebrew as distinguished from Greek thought. In the world of action Providence stands over against fate, the universal kingdom against the individual state, the true and the right against the beautiful. Pure speculation may find little scope, but speculation guided by these great laws will never cease to affect most deeply the intellectual culture of men. (Comp. especially Psalm 8:19; 29:1; 65, 68, 77, 78, 79, 95, 97, 104, 106, 136, 147, etc. It will be seen that the same character is found in Psalms of every date.) For a late and very remarkable development of this philosophy of Nature, see Dillmann, Das B. Henoch, 14, 15.

One man above all is distinguished among the Jews as "the wise man." The description which is given of his writings serves as a commentary on the national view of philosophy. "And Solomon's wisdom excelled the wisdom of all the children of the east country, and all the wisdom of Egypt . . . And he spake three thousand proverbs; and his songs were a thousand and five. And he spake of trees, from the cedar that is in Lebanon even unto the hyssop that springeth out of the wall: he spake also of beasts, and of fowl, and of creeping things, and of fishes" (1Ki 4:30-33). The lesson of practical duty, the full utterance of "a large heart" (1Ki 4:29), the careful study of God's creaturesthis is the sum of wisdom. Yet in fact the very practical aim of this philosophy leads to the revelation of the most sublime  truth. Wisdom was gradually felt to be a person, throned by God, and holding converse with men (Proverbs 8). She was seen to stand in open enmity with "the strange woman," who sought to draw them aside by sensuous attractions; and thus a new step was made towards the central doctrine of Christianity — the Incarnation of the Word.

Two books of the Bible — Job and Ecclesiastes — of which the latter, at any rate, belongs to the period of the close of the kingdom, approach more nearly than any others to the type of philosophical discussions. But in both the problem is moral and not metaphysical. The one deals with the evils which afflict "the perfect and upright;" the other with the vanity of all the pursuits and pleasures of earth. In the one we are led for an answer to a vision of " the enemy" to whom a partial and temporary power over man is conceded (Job 1:6-12); in the other to that great future when "God shall bring every work to judgment" (Ecc 12:14). The method of inquiry is in both cases abrupt and irregular. One clew after another is followed out, and at length abandoned; and the final solution is obtained, not by a consecutive process of reason, but by an authoritative utterance, welcomed by faith as the truth, towards which all partial efforts had tended. (Comp. Maurice, Moral and Metaphysical Philosophy, 1st ed.)

The Captivity necessarily exercised a profound influence upon Jewish thought. The teaching of Persia seems to have been designed to supply important elements in the education of the chosen people. But it did yet more than this. The imagery of Ezekiel (chapter 1) gave an apparent sanction to a new form of mystical speculation. The contact of the Jews with Persia thus gave rise to a traditional mysticism. Their contact with Greece was marked by the rise of distinct sects. In the 3d century B.C. the great doctor Antigonus of Socho bears a Greek name, and popular belief pointed to him as the teacher of Sadoc and Boethus, the supposed founders of Jewish rationalism. At any rate, we may date from this time the twofold division of Jewish speculation which corresponds to the chief tendencies of practical philosophy. The Sadducees appear as the supporters of human freedom in its widest scope; the Pharisees of a religious Stoicism. At a later time the cycle of doctrine was completed, when by a natural reaction the Essenes established a mystic asceticism. The characteristics of these sects are noticed elsewhere. It is enough now to point out the position which they occupy in the history of Judaism (comp. Westcott, Introd. to Gospels, pages 60-66). At a later period the Fourth Book of Maccabees (q.v.) is a  very interesting example of Jewish moral (Stoic) teaching. SEE SECTS, JEWISH.

The conception of wisdom which appears in the book of Proverbs was - elaborated with greater detail afterwards, SEE WISDOM OF SOLOMON, both in Palestine, SEE ECCLESIASTICUS, and in Egypt; but the doctrine of the Word is of greater speculative interest. Both doctrines, indeed, sprang from the same cause, and indicate the desire to find some mediating power between God and the world, and to remove the direct appear.. ance and action of God from a material sphere. The personification of Wisdom represents only a secondary power in relation to God; the Logos, in the double sense of Reason (λόγος ἐνδιάθετος) and Word (λόγος προφορικός), both in relation to God and in relation to the universe. The first use of the term Word (Memra), based upon the common formula of the prophets, is in the Targum of Onkelos (1st century B.C.), in which "the Word of God" is commonly substituted for God in his immediate, personal relations with man (Westcott, Introd. to Gospels, page 137); and it is probable that round this traditional rendering a fuller doctrine grew up. But there is a clear difference between the idea of the Word then prevalent in Palestine and that current at Alexandria. In Palestine the Word appears as the outward mediator between God and man, like the Angel of the Covenant; at Alexandria it appears as the spiritual connection which opens the way to revelation. The preface to John's Gospel includes the element of truth in both. In the Greek apocryphal books there is no mention of the Word (yet comp. Wis 18:15). For the Alexandrian teaching it is necessary to look alone to Philo (cir. B.C. 20-A.D. 50); and the ambiguity in the meaning of the Greek term, which has already been noticed, produces the greatest confusion in his treatment of the subject. In Philo language domineers over thought. He has no one clear and consistent view of the Logos. At times he assigns to it divine attributes and personal action; and then again he affirms decidedly the absolute indivisibility of the divine nature. The tendency of his teaching is to lead to the conception of a twofold personality in the Godhead, though he shrinks from the recognition of such a doctrine (De Monarch. § 5; De Somnz. § 37; Quod. det. pot. ins. § 24; De Somn. § 39, etc.). Above all, his idea of the Logos was wholly disconnected from all Messianic hopes, and was rather the philosophic substitute for them. (See Westcott, Introd. to Gospels, pages 138-141; Dathne, Jud.-Alex. Relygions philos. [1834]; Gfrorer, Philo, etc. [1835]; Dorner, Die Lehre v. d. Person Chrlisti, 1:23 sq.; Lucke, Comm.  1:207, who gives an account of the earlier literature.) SEE PHILOSOPHY, GREEK.

On the general subject, see Buch, Weisheitslehre der Hebraer (Strasb. 1851); Nicolas, Les doctrines religielses des Juifs (Par. 1860).

## Philostorgius[[@Headword:Philostorgius]]

             (Φιλοστόργιος), an Eastern ecclesiastical historian of some note, was a native of Borissus, in Cappadocia. He was the son of Carterius and Eulampia, and was born in the reign of Valentinian and Valens, in A.D. 358, according to Gothofredus (Proleg. ad Philost. page 5, etc.), about A.D. 367, according to Vossius (De Hist. Gr. page 314). He was twenty years old when Eunomius (q.v.) was expelled from Caesarea. He was educated at Constantinople, and, together with his father, warmly embraced the doctrines of Eunomius. Philostorgilus wrote an ecclesiastical history from the heresy of Arius, in A.D. 300, to the period when Theodosius the Younger conferred the empire of the West on Valentinian the Younger (A.D. 425). The work, composed in twelve books, began respectively with the twelve letters of his name, so as to form a sort of acrostic. In this history he lost no opportunity of extolling the Arians and Eunomians, while he overwhelmed the orthodox party with abuse, with the single exception of Gregory of Nazianzum. Photius charges Philostorgius with introducing gross misrepresentations and unfounded statements, and says that the work is not a history, but a panegyric upon the heretics. Philostorgius, nevertheless, was a man of learning. and was possessed of considerable geographical and astronomical knowledge. Being a heretic, it is not to be wondered at that his work has not come down to us. An abstract of it, however, was made by Photius in a separate work, which has been preserved. Photius characterizes him as bering elegant in his style, making use of figurative expressions, though not in excess. His figures were, however, sometimes harsh and far-fetched, and his narrative involved and indistinct (Phot. Bibl. cod. 40). Photius's abstract was published at Geneva in 1643 by Jac. Godefroi, or Gothofredus, entitled Ecclesiastices historiae, a Constantino M. Antique initiis ad sua usque tempora., libri 12 Photio in epitomen contraci; nunc primum editi a Jacobo Gothofredo, Gr. et Lat. cum supplementis nonnullis, indiceque accurato, ex prolixioribus dissertationibus (Lugd. 1643, 4to), and in a somewhat corrected form, with a new Latin translation, by H. Valesius (Paris, 1673), together with the ecclesiastical history of Theodoritus, Evagrius, and Theodorus; also by  Reading, Ex ecclesiasticis Philostorgii historiis epitome, et fragmenta (Cantabr. 1720). There is also a French version: Abrege de l'Histoire de l'Eglise de Philostorge (Paris, 1676). See Fabricius, Bibl. Gr. 7:420, etc.; Vossius, De Hist. Gr. page 313, etc.; Scholl, Gesch. der Griech. Lit. 3:313. — Smith, Dict. of Gr. and Rom. Biog. s.v. See Dowling, Introd. to Church Hist.; Hook, Eccles. Biog. 8:72; Hagenbach, Hist. of Doctrines, 1:328; Jortin, Remarks, 2:121; Stanley, Hist. of East. Ch. page 168; Staudlin, Gesch. d. Kirchengesch. page 72.

## Philostratus, Flavius[[@Headword:Philostratus, Flavius]]

             a famous Greek Sophist, was a native of the island of Lemnos, and was born in the second half of the 2d century of our sera. He taught rhetoric first at Athens, and Eusebius therefore calls him an Athenian, but Eunapius and Suidas always speak of him as a Lemnian, and he himself hints in his Life of Apollonius that he used to be at Lemnos when he was young. He frequented the schools of the Sophists, and mentions having heard Damianus of Ephesus, Proclus Naucratitas, and Hippodromus of Larissa. This shows that he lived in the reign of the emperor Severus (193-212). He also taught at Rome, where he became known and was patronized by the empress Julia, the wife of Septimius Severus, who was partial to the learned, and was surnamed "the philosophic," because she gathered about herself such a brilliant circle of scholars. She commissioned him to compile the biography of Apollonius of Tyana from some memoirs written by a certain Damis of Nineveh, who had accompanied Philostratus in his peregrinations, and which had come into her possession. Philostratus professes also to have used in his compilation a collection of letters of Apollonius, which were at one time in the possession of Hadrian, and were placed by that emperor in his palace at Antium, together with certain responses of the Oracle of Trophonius, which Apollonius had also collected. The biographer availed himself also, according to his own statement, of the narrative of a certain Maximus who had known Apollonius.

The book of Philostratus displays great credulity in the compiler, and a great want of critical discrimination; it also contains many anachronisms and geographical errors. Huet and others have imagined that the object of Philostratus was to write a parody of the life of Christ, but this seems doubtful: the parody, if intended as such, is too gross; besides which, it appears from the testimony of Lampridius (Life of Alex. Severus), that Christ was really worshipped by some of the later heathen emperors,  together with Abraham, Orpheus, and Apollonius, these being all looked upon as holy men and tutelary genii. That Apollonius of Tyana was a real character, a philosopher, and a traveller appears from various passages of ancient authors; but it is remarkable that no one mentions him until nearly a century after the time assigned for his death. The empress Julia, a Syrian by birth, was probably fond of the marvellous; and Philostratus, intending to entertain her, inserted in his book all the wonderful stories he could collect relative to his hero. It seems, however, that in the time of the great struggle between the heathen and Christian religions under Diocletian and his immediate successors, some of the heathen writers thought of availing themselves of the Life of Apollonius as a kind of counterpoise to the Gospel narrative. Hierocles, prefect of Alexandria, and an enemy of the Christians, wrote a book with that object, in the shape of a comparison between the life of Apollonius by Philostratus and that of Christ, of which book Eusebius wrote a refutation: Eusebii Pamphili Animadversiones in Philostrati de Apollonio Tyanensi Commentarios ob institutam cum illo ab Hierocle Christi comparationem, adornatce. Lactantius (Divin. Instit. 5:3) also combats the same notion as absurd. Augustine (Epist. 4) refers to Apollonius as a magician whom the heathens compared with Christ. (See Tillemont, Hist. des Empereurs Roemains, volume 2, and Bayle's article Apollonius de Tyane.) The other works of Philostratus are, The Lives of the Sophists, in two books (ed. by Kayser, Heidelberg, 1838): — Heroica, or comments on the lives of some of the heroes of Homer, in the shape of a dialogue (ed. by Boissonade, Paris, 1806, 8vo): — Icones, or descriptions of sixty-four paintings which were in a portico near Neapolis by the seashore (these descriptions contain valuable information concerning the state of ancient art) (ed. by F. Jacobs and F.G. Welcker, Leips. 1825, 8vo): — Epistles, mostly erotic, excepting a few on matters of literature; one, which is inscribed to Julia Augusta, is an apology for the Sophists. Philostratus wrote also many other works, such as a Lexicon Rhetoricum, orations, etc.. but they are lost. Different editions of all the existing works of Philostratus have been published. Those by Morellius (Paris; 1608) and Olearius (Leips. 1709, fol.) are good, but a better one, far more critical and correct, is that by Kayser (Zurich, 1844, 4to), with a valuable body of notes on each work. There are separate editions of the lives of the Sophists. See Neander, Christian Dogmas, 1:192 sq.; Baur, Apollonius v. Tyana u. Christus (Tub. 1832); Alzog, Kirchengesch. 1:149; Ritter, Hist. of Philos.; Smith, Dict. of Gr. and Rom. Biog. s.v.; Butler, Hist. of Ancient Philosophy, volume 2; Lardner, Works (see Index).

## Philotheia[[@Headword:Philotheia]]

             (φιλοθεία, i.e. the love of God), is a term which was sometimes applied by ancient Christian writers to the monastic life, because those who embraced that life professed to renounce all for the love of God. Hence Theodoret entitles one of his books Philotheus (q.v.).

## Philotheos Historia[[@Headword:Philotheos Historia]]

             (φιλόθεος ἱστορία, Godloving history), the name given by Theodoret, the wellknown commentator, bishop of Cyrus, to his lives of thirty ascetics or Eastern monks. "Their virtues," he confesses, "cannot be adequately described," and he relates the most astounding prodigies of them. The tract is in the third folio of Sirmond's edition of his works. SEE PHILOTHEIA

.

## Philotheus[[@Headword:Philotheus]]

             (Φιλόθεος) (1), an Eastern prelate, flourished as patriarch of Alexandria about A.D. 995. He was a man of luxurious habits and a most scandalous course of life. Philotheus wrote four works, the titles of which, as translated from the Arabic, are, Declarator: — Rara Commentatorum, et Depravationes Haereticorum: — Detectio Arcanorum: — Autobiographia. All of these works are lost, and it does rot appear whether the author wrote in Arabic or in Greek. A sermon, De Mandatis Donmini nostri Jesu Christi (ed. Greek and Latin by P. Possinus in his A scetica), is ascribed to one S. Pilotheus, perhaps the same person. See Cave. Hist. Litt. ad an. 995; Smith, Dict. of Gr. and Rom. Biog. s.v.

## Philotheus (2) Coccinus[[@Headword:Philotheus (2) Coccinus]]

             also an Eastern ecclesiastic, flourished as patriarch of Constantinople. He was probably born in the beginning of the 14th century, and early took the monastic habit. After living for a considerable time as a monk in, and afterwards as superior of, the convent of St. Laura on Mount Sinai, he was appointed archbishop of Heracleia (before 1354). In 1355 he was employed by the emperor John Cantacuzenus in bringing about a reconciliation between Michael, the son, and John Palaeologus, the son-in- law of the emperor; and in the same year he was chosen patriarch of Constantinople, in the place of Callistus, who, however, recovered his see after John Palaeologus had taken possession of Constantinople. Callistus, however, died soon afterwards, and now Philotheus was once more placed  in the patriarchal chair, which post he occupied with great dignity till his death, which occurred in 1371, according to Cave, or in 1376 according to the Chronologia reformata of J.B. Riccioli quoted by Fabricius. We append the titles of the most important of the numerous works of Philotheus, very few of which have been published: Liturgia et Ordo instituendi Diaconum, printed in Latin in the 26th vol. of Bibl. Pat. Max.: — Libri xv Antirrhetici, a defence of his friend the celebrated Palama, extant in different libraries: — Sermno Encomiasticus in tres Hierarchas, Basilium, Gregorium Theologum, et Joannen Chrysostomum, Latin, in the 26th vol. of Bibl. Pat. Max., Gr. and Lat. by Jac. Pontanus, together with Philippi Solitarii Dioptra (Ingolstadt, 1604, 8vo); by Fronto Ducaeus, in the 2d volume of Auctuar. Patr. (Paris, 1624): — Oratio de Cruce, Gr. and Lat. apud Gretser. De Cruce (Ingolstadt, 1616, fol. volume 2); there is another Oratio de Cruce, in the same volume, which is attributed by some to our Philotheus: — Oratio in tertiam Jejuniorum Dominicam, Gr. and Lat. (ibid.): — Refutatio Anathematismorum ab Harmenopulo scriptorum, Gr. and Lat. apud Leunclav. Jus. Gr. Rom. lib. 4: — Confutatio Capitum xiv Acindynii et Barlaami, extant in MS.: — Homilia: — Compendium de (Economia Christi, etc. Wharton, in Cave, and Fabricius give a catalogue of the numerous works of Philotheus. See Fabricius, Bibl. Graec. 11:513, etc.; Cave, Hist. Litt. ad an. 1362. See Smith, Dict. Gr. and Rom. Biog. s.v.; Neale, Hist. of the East. Church (Patriarchate of Constantinople).

## Philotheus (3) Monachus or Sanctus[[@Headword:Philotheus (3) Monachus or Sanctus]]

             an unknown monk, wrote De Mandatis Domini nostri Jesu Christi, ed. Gr. and Lat. in P. Possinus's A scetica (Paris, 1684). Although this work bears the same title as the one quoted above under the head Philotheus No. 1, the works are apparently by different authors. See Fabricius, Bibl. Grcac. 11:519; Cave, Hist. Litf. Dissert. 1, page 17, ed. Oxon.

## Philotheus (4), archbishop of Selymbria[[@Headword:Philotheus (4), archbishop of Selymbria]]

             of unknown age, wrote Oratio in T. Agothonicum, which is still extant in MS.

## Philoxenian Version[[@Headword:Philoxenian Version]]

             SEE SYRIAC VERSIONS.

## Philoxenus Of Bagdad[[@Headword:Philoxenus Of Bagdad]]

             an Eastern prelate of some distinction as an author, also known as Lazarus Bar-Sapta, flourished in the early part of the 9th century as bishop of Bagdad. This episcopate was founded in 762, but Philoxenus is the first incumbent of whom we have any notice. His character seems to have been a questionable one, for in the year 829 he was deposed, on which he appealed to Alalmelon, the caliph, by whom the sentence was confirmed. Philoxenus is the author of a Syro-Jacobite liturgy, which is in nowise remarkable. See Neale, Hist. of the Eastern Church (Introd.), 1:329.

## Philoxenus Of Mabug Or Hierapolis[[@Headword:Philoxenus Of Mabug Or Hierapolis]]

             an Eastern prelate of some note, flourished in the second half of the 5th century. He was a devoted Jacobite, and for his zeal in the propagation of their doctrines is reckoned among the saints of that branch of the Syrian Church. He was bishop of Mabug, to which see he was consecrated by Peter the Fuller, after A.D. 485, though he is said not to have been baptized. He is the author of two Jacobite liturgies, of which only one is authenticated. The other is, according to Neale, "a sadly inflated specimen of mediaeval taste in the East." He is also noted as the translator of certain portions of the sacred Scriptures into Syrian, and as the supervisor of a general and complete version. Besides, he was the head of the Monophysites about 500, when they fought with Nestorianism at the Council of Chalcedon. See Neale, Hist. of the East. Ch. (Introd.), 1:333; Assemani, Bibl. Orient. 2:10; Le Quien, Oriens Christianus, 2:928; Renaudot, Lit. Orient. 2:300; Petavius, De theol. dogmat. lib. 1, cap. 18; Walch, Gesch. der Ketzereien, 6:955 sq.; 7:10 sq.; Dorner, Entwickelungsgesch. etc., 2:23-46,152, 168. (J.H.W.)

## Philpot, John[[@Headword:Philpot, John]]

             an English divine of the Reformation period, noted for his learning and his devotion to the Prbtestant cause, for which he paid his life, was born near Winchester about the close of the 15th century. He was educated at New College, Oxford, which he entered in 1534, and of which he finally became a fellow. After leaving Oxford he travelled through Italy, where, on account of his religion, he was brought into danger. On returning to England he received the preferment of the archdeaconry of Winchester. During the time of Edward his labors were abundantand successful. He  was well furnished both by nature and grace for his calling, and he devoted himself with an uncompromising zeal to the advancement of pure and undefiled religion. After the accession of Mary, Philpot distinguished himself by his bold stand for the Protestant cause. In a convocation of bishops and dignitaries, held for the purpose of changing the established religion from Protestantism to popery, the learned archdeacon, and a few others, bore a noble testimony against the design. For his exertions, notwithstanding the promised freedom of debate, he was called before the bishop of Winchester (Stephen Gardiner), and was by his order imprisoned a year and a half. He was then sent to bishop Bonner, and other commissioners, who confined him in the bishop's coal-house. He here met with every insult: was once confined from morning till night in the stocks; was examined some fifteen or sixteen times; and, though he firmly and unanswerably defended his cause, was met only with taunts and abusive epithets.

Yet in all this persecution the consolations of the Holy Spirit were abundantly administered to him; insomuch that on one occasion Bonner said to him, "I marvel that you are so merry in prison, singing in your naughtiless," etc. Philpot, proving a most uncompromising devotee to the new religion, and a most ingenious exponent of the law of the land, was regarded by the Papists as a dangerous man to be abroad, and he was therefore condemned as a heretic. After his condemnation he suffered many indignities in Newgate. But he was soon brought to the stake. He kissed the wood, and said, "Shall I disdain to suffer at this stake, when my Lord and Saviour refused not to suffer a most vile death on the cross for me?" When he was bound to it, he repeated the 106th, 107th, and 108th Psalms, and prayed most fervently; till at length, in the midst of the flames, with great meekness and joy, he gave up his spirit to God. This occurred at Smithfield, December 18, 1555. For both learning and piety he was esteemed as only next to Ridley among the English Reformers. They had sound and clear views of that Gospel which they sealed with their blood. Philpot's writings have been collected and published under the title, Examinations and Writings, edited for the Parker Society by the Reverend R. Eden (Camb. 1842, 8vo). They contain besides a Biographical Notice of Philpot; Notices of the Bishops and other Clergy, etc., who examined Philpot in 1555; the Process and History of Master John Philpot, examined, condemned, and martyred; Disputation in the Convocation House, October, 1553; Letters; Apology for Spitting upon an Arian; Defence of the True and Old Authority of Christ's Church, by Coelius Secundus Curio, translated by John Philpot.  See also Richmond's Fathers, 4:335; British Reformers, volume 3; Fox, Acts and Monuments, anno 1555; Strype, Memorials, and his Cranmer; Fuller, Abel Redivivus; Wood, Athenae Oxon.; Bickersteth, Christian Student, page 328; Middleton, Evangel. Biogr. 1:428 sq.; Burnet, Hist. of the English Ref.; Soames, Hist. of the Ref.; Hardwick, Hist. of the Ref. page 216; Froude. Hist. of England (see Index in volume 8); Hook, Eccles. Biog. 8:74. (J.H.W.)

## Philpotts[[@Headword:Philpotts]]

             SEE PHILLPOTTS.

## Philter, Philtre[[@Headword:Philter, Philtre]]

             (Gr. φίλτρον, love-charm, lovepotion). A superstitious belief in the efficacy of certain artificial means of inspiring and securing love seems to have been generally prevalent from very early times; and among the Greeks and Romans (among the latter in the later days of the republic, and under the emperors) love-charms, and especially love-potions, were in continual use. It is not certainly known of what these love-potions were composed- nor can we rely entirely on the details given us on this subject by classic writers, and their commentators in later time-but there is no doubt that certain poisonous or deleterious herbs and drugs were among their chief ingredients, to which other substances, animal as well as vegetable, are said to have been added, coupled with the employment of magic rites. Thessaly had the credit of producing the most potent herbs, and her people were notorious as the most skilful practicers of magic arts, whence the wellknown “Thessala philtra" of Juvenal (6:610). These potions were violent and dangerous in operation, and their use resulted often in the weakening of the mental powers, madness, and death, instead of the purpose for which they were intended. Lucretius is said to have been driven mad by a love-potion, and to have died by his own hand in consequence-though the story does not perhaps rest on sufficient authority; and the madness of the emperor Caligula was attributed by some persons to love-potions given him by his wife Coesonia by which also she is said to have preserved his attachment till the end of his life. In the corrupt and licentious days of the Roman empire the manufacture of love-charms of all kinds seem to have been carried on as a regular trade; the purchasers, if not the makers of them, being chiefly women. The use of philters seems to have been not unknown during the Middle Ages; and in the East, the nurse  of superstition of all kinds, belief in the power of love-potions lingers probably down to the present day

## Philumena[[@Headword:Philumena]]

             one of the youngest, and in Italy one of the most revered of saints, especially as the protectress of the imprisoned, deserves to be mentioned here as one of the most extravagant examples of Romish credulity and superstition. Her remains were reported to have been exhumed in 1802 from the catacomb of St. Priscilla (q.v.) at Rome. Her history is claimed to have been revealed at the time to three different persons, and according to this she was the descendant of a Greek prince, and in her thirteenth year was brought to Rome as a Christian devotee, and came under the notice of the emperor Diocletian, who desired her for wife — an honor which she refused on the ground that she had two years previously wedded herself to her Lord in her virginity. For this refusal the emperor condemned her to death by martyrdom. In 1805 her remains were removed to her supposed birthplace — Mugnano, twenty miles from Naples. The wonders wrought at her tomb were related far and near, and soon her resting-place became the object of many pilgrimages, and she is now known as the "wonderworker of the 19th century." Pope Gregory XVI put her in the calendar of saints, and she is commemorated August 11. See Sintzel, Verehrung der heil. Philomiena (Munich, 1844); Wetzer u. Welte, Kirchen-Lexikon, 12:984 sq.; Abel, Die Legende vom heil. Johann v. Nepomuck (Berl. 1855), page 6. (J.H.W.)

## Phinees[[@Headword:Phinees]]

             (Φινεές), the Griecized form of the Heb. name PHINEHAS SEE PHINEHAS (q.v.):

a. The son of Eleazar, son of Aaron, the great hero of the Jewish priesthood (1Es 5:5; 1Es 8:2; 1Es 8:29; 2Es 1:2 b; Sir 45:23; 1Ma 2:26);

b. The son of Eli (2Es 1:2 a): but the insertion of the name in the genealogy of Ezra (in this place only) is evidently an error, since Ezra belonged to the line of Eleazar, and Eli to that of Ithamar;

c. A priest or Levite of the time of Ezra, father of Eleazar (1Es 8:63).  (Φινοέ) In 1Es 5:31 it stands for PASEAH SEE PASEAH (q.v.) of the Heb. text (Ezr 2:49).

## Phinehas[[@Headword:Phinehas]]

             (Heb. Pinechas', פַּינְחָס, mouth of brass [Gesen.], or of utterance [Furst]; Sept. Φινεές v.r. Φεινεἐς ; Josephus, Φινεέσης), the name of two or three Hebrews.

1. Son of Eleazar and grandson of Aaron (Exo 6:25). His mother is recorded as one of the daughters of Pntiel, an unknown person, who is identified by the rabbins with Jethro the Midianite (Targ. Pseudoj)on. on Exo 6:25; Wagenseil, Sota, 8:6). Phinehas is memorable for having while quite a youth, by his zeal and energy at the critical moment of the licentious idolatry of Shittim, appeased the divine wrath and put a stop to the plague which was destroying the nation (Num 25:7). B.C. 1619. For this he was rewarded by the special approbation of Jehovah, and by a promise that the priesthood should remain in his family forever (Num 25:10-13). This seems to have raised him at once to a very high position in the nation, and he was appointed to accompany as priest the expedition by which the Midianites were destroyed (Num 31:6). Seven years later he also headed the party who were despatched from Shiloh to remonstrate against the altar which the transjordanic tribes were reported to have built near Jordan (Jos 22:13-32). In the partition of the country he received an allotment of his own-a hill on Mount Ephraim which bore his name-Gibeath-Pinechas. Here his father was buried (Jos 24:32).

During the life of Phinehas he appears to have been the chief of the great family of the Korahites or Korhites who guarded the entrances to the sacred tent and the whole of the sacred camp (1Ch 9:20). After Eleazar's death he became high-priest — the third of the series. B.C. cir. 1580-1523. In this capacity he is introduced as giving the oracle to the nation during the struggle with the Benjamites in the matter of Gibeah (Jdg 20:28). Where the ark and tabernacle were stationed at that time is not clear. From Jdg 20:1 we should infer that they were at Mizpeh, while from Jdg 20:18; Jdg 20:26 it seems equally probable that they were at Bethel (which is also the statement of Josephus. Ant. 5:2, 11). Or the Hebrew words in these latter verses may mean, not Bethel the town, but. as they are rendered in the A.V., "house of God," and refer to the tabernacle at Shiloh. But wherever the ark may have been, there was the aged priest  "standing before it," and the oracle which he delivered was one which must have been fiully in accordance with his own vehement temper, "Shall we go out to battle . . . or shall we cease?" The answer was, "Go up for tomorrow I will deliver them into your hand."

The memory of this champion of Jehovah was very dear to the Jews. The narrative of the Pentateuch presents him as the type of an ardent and devoted priest. The numerous references to him in the later literature all adopt the same tone. He is commemorated in one of the Psalms (Psa 106:30-31) in the identical phrase which is consecrated forever by its use in reference to the great act of faith of Abraham; a phrase which perhaps more than any other in the Bible binds together the old and new dispensations —"that was counted to him for righteousness unto all generations for evermore" (comp. Gen 15:6; Rom 4:3). The "covenant" made with him is put into the same rank for dignity and certainty with that by which the throne was assured to king David (Sir 45:25). The zeal of Mattathias the Maccabee is sufficiently praised by a comparison with that of "Phinees against Zambri, the son of Salom" (1Ma 2:26). The priests who returned from the captivity are enrolled in the official lists as the sons of Phinehas (Ezr 8:2; 1Es 5:5). In the Seder Olam?, (chapter 20) he is identified with "the prophet" of Jdg 6:8.

Josephus (Ant. 4:6, 12), out of the traditions which he frequently introduces, adds to the narrative of the Pentateuch a statement that "so great was his courage and so remarkable his bodily strength that he would never relinquish any undertaking, however difficult and dangerous, without gaining a complete victory." The later Jews are fond of comparing him to Elijah, if indeed they do not regard them as one and the same individual (see the quotations in Meyer, Chron. Hebr. page 845; Fabricius, Codex Pseudepiq. page 894, note). In the Targum Pseudojonathan of Numbers 25 the slaughter of Zimri and Cozbi is accompanied by twelve miracles, and the covenant made with Phinehas is expanded into a promise that he shall be "the angel of the covenant, shall live forever, and shall proclaim redemption at the end of the world." His Midianitish origin (already noticed) is brought forward as adding greater luster to his zeal against Midian, and enhancing his glorious destiny. The verse which closes the book of Joshua is ascribed to Phinehas, as the description of the death of Moses at the end of Deuteronomy is to Joshua (Baba Bathra, in Fabricius,  page 893). He is also reported to be the author of a work on sacred names (ibid.), which, however, is so rare that Fabricius had never seen it.

The succession of the posterity of Phinehas in the high-priesthood was interrupted when Eli, of the race of Ithamar, was priest; but it was resumed in the person of Zadok, and continued in the same line to the destruction of Jerusalem. SEE HIGH-PRIEST. One of the members of the family — Manasseh, soil of Johanan, and brother of Jaddua — went over to the Samaritans, and they still boast that they preserve the succession (see their letter to Scaliger, in Eichhorn's Repertorium, 13:262).

The tomb of Phinehas, a place of great resort to both Jews and Samaritans, is shown at Awertah, four miles south-east of Nablus. It stands in the centre of the village, enclosed within a little area or compound, which is overshadowed by the thickly trellised foliage of an ancient vine. A small mosque joins the wall of the compound. Outside the village, on the next hill, is a larger enclosure, containing the tomb of Eleazar, and a cave ascribed to Elijah, overshadowed by two venerable terebinth-trees, surrounded by arcades, and forming a retired and truly charming spot. The local tradition asserts that Awertah and its neighborhood are the ' Hill of Phinehas."

2. Second son of Eli (1Sa 1:3; 1Sa 2:34; 1Sa 4:4; 1Sa 4:11; 1Sa 4:17; 1Sa 4:19; 1Sa 14:3). He was not of the same line as his illustrious and devoted namesake, but of the family of Ithamar. SEE ELI. Phinehas was killed with his brother by 'the Philistines when the ark was captured. B.C. 1125. He had two sons, Ahitub, the eldest — whose sons Ahijah and Ahimelech were high-priests at Shiloh and Nob in the time of Saul (14:3) — and Ichabod. He is introduced, apparently by mistake, in the genealogy of Ezra in 2Es 1:2 a.

3. A Levite, mentioned in Ezr 8:33 as the father of the Eleazar who aided Meremoth to weigh the vessels of the sanctuary. B.C. ante 458. The meaning, however, may be that Eleazar was of the family of the great Phinehas.

## Phinehas, Hill And Tomb Of[[@Headword:Phinehas, Hill And Tomb Of]]

             According to Lieut. Conder these have been identified. He says (Tent Work, 1:77):

"The village of Awertah, called Abearthah in the Samaritan dialect, stands in the Plain of the Miikhnah, and is sacred to the Samaritans and to the Jews as conmiraining the tombs of Phinehas and Eleazar, Abishall and Ihamarin. It is probably to be recognized as the Hill of Philnehas, where Eleazar was buried according to the Bible (Jos 24:33), and which is described a in Mount Ephraim.

"In 1872 I visited the village and examined the two principal monuments. That of Eleazar, west of the houses, is a rude structure of masonry in a court open to the air. It is eighteen feet long, plastered all over, and shaded by a splendid terebinth. In one corner is a little mosque with a Samaritan inscription bearing the date 1180 of the Moslem era. The tomb of Phiueha is s apparently an older building, and the walls of its court have an arcade of round arches now supporting at trellis covered with a grape-vine; the floor is paved. A Samaritan inscription exists here as well as at the little mosque adjacent. The tombs of Ithaunmar and of Abishna, the supposed author of the famous roll, are shown by the Samaritans, close by." (See illustration on following page.)

## Phinney, Clement[[@Headword:Phinney, Clement]]

             an American Free-will Baptist preacher, noted especially as an evangelist, was born in Gorham, Maine, August 16, 1780. He possessed a good physical constitution, a large share of good-nature and cheerfulness, as well  as strong common-sense. His love of music was remarkable. When a youth his talent of song made him a favorite with both old and young. In 1806 he.was converted, and after his talents had been consecrated to God his gift of song became instrumental in awakening in the human heart responses to the calls of the divine Word. He sang with the Spirit and with power, which at times produced wonderful effect. He received ordination in 1816, and feeling called of God to labor as an evangelist, declined the work of the pastorate. He seemed to be, specially qualified by nature and grace for the work of winning souls to Christ, and God gave him many as seals of his ministry — thousands were awakened by his earnest and affectionate ministrations. Though his advantages for an education were limited, yet college professors and other learned men were frequently found among his delighted auditors. He was a devoted friend of the slave, and, with the leaders of his denomination, early espoused the antislavery cause. His amiability, integrity, wisdom, and purity of character won for him universal confidence and esteem. He died at Portland, Maine, where he had performed the most of his public labors, full of years and abounding in faith.

## Phipps, Joseph[[@Headword:Phipps, Joseph]]

             a noted member of the Society of Friends, flourished in the second half of last century, Hle is distinguished as the writer of eight important theological treatises (Lond. 1767-96), of which we mention here, Brief Remarks on the Common Arguments now used in Support of divers Ecclesiastical Impositions in this Nation (1769, 8vo): — The Original and Present State of Man briefly considered; wherein is shown the Nature of his Fall, and the Necessity, Means, and Manner of his Restoration; to which are added some Remarks on the Arguments of Samuel Newton, of Norwich (1773, 8vo): — A Reply to a late Publication of S. Newton, intituled An Appendix, etc.; in Answer to which it is plainly shown that the Quakers are not Calvinists, that the Gospel comprehends more than Words, and that the Spirit of Truth is to be experienced and sensibly felt in the Minds and Consciences of Men (1774, 8vo); — An Address to the Youth of Norwich (1776, 12mo): — Dissertations on the Nature and Effect of Christian Baptism, Christian Communion, and Religious Waiting upon God; to which are added a few Reflections on the Observance of Public Fasts and Festivals (1781, 8vo).

## Phison[[@Headword:Phison]]

             (Φισών), a Graecized form (Sir 24:25) of the name of the river PISON SEE PISON (q.v.).

## Phlegethon[[@Headword:Phlegethon]]

             a river m the infernal regions, according to the system of ancient heathenism. It was one of the four rivers which the dead must cross before finding admission to the realms of Orcus. See Gardner, Faiths of the World, 2:655.

## Phlegon[[@Headword:Phlegon]]

             (Φλεγων, burning), one of the Christians of Rome to whom Paul sent his salutations (Rom 16:14). A.D. 55. The legend (apud Dorotheus) makes him to have been one of the seventy disciples, and bishop of Marathon. So likewise Pseudo-Hippolytus (De LXX Apostolis). He is said to have suffered mar.tyrdom on April 8 (Martyrologium Romanumn, apud Estium), on which day he is commemorated in the calendar of the Byzantine Church.

## Phlegon (2)[[@Headword:Phlegon (2)]]

             (Φλέγων), surnamed TRALLIANUS, from Tralles, a city of Lydia, where he was born, flourished in the reign of the emperor Hadrian. Nothing is known of the events of his life, and the date of his death is uncertain; however, as one of his chronological works, which is no longer extant, carried the history down to 01. 229.2=A.D. 141 (Suidas), he probably lived to the middle of the 2d century A.D. Phlegon's name is familiar among the moderns because, though a heathen, he bore witness to the accomplishment of Christian prophecies (Origen, Contra Cels. lib. 3, § 14, page 69, ed. Spencer, Cantab. 1677; but see Lardner's Credibility, part 2, Heathen Testimonies, chapter 12, who concludes that "upon the whole this citation is of no great moment"). There is also in Phlegon's writings a passage which may be reckoned still more material, as it is supposed to relate to the miraculous darkness which prevailed at the time of Christ's crucifixion. In St. Jerome's Latin version of the Chronicle of Eusebius (page 155, ed. Pont., Burdig. 1604), the passage occurs as follows, "And so writes Phlegon, an excellent compiler of the Olympiads, in his thirteenth book, saying, 'In the fourth year of the two hundred and second Olympiad  there was a great and extraordinary eclipse of the sun, distinguished among all that had happened before. At the sixth hour the day was turned into dark night, so that the stars in the heavens were seen, and there was an earthquake in Bithvnia which overthrew many houses in the city of Nice" (comp. Origen, Contra Cels. lib. 2, § 33, page 80; § 59, page 96; and other authorities quoted by Lardner). This passage was the origin of a controversy in England in the early part of the last century between Mr. Whiston, Dr. Sykes, Mr. Chapman. and others, a long and complete account of which may be found in the English translation of Bayle's Dictionnaire Historique, s.v., and in Chauffepid's "Supplement" to it. The immediate cause of the controversy was the omission of the passage in the eighth edition of Dr. S. Clarke's Boyle Lectures, published soon after his death in 1732, although it had been inserted in the first edition, which came out in 1706. This was done at the persuasion of Dr. Sykes, who had suggested to Clarke that an undue stress had been laid upon the passage. Whiston, who informs us of this affair, expresses great displeasure against Sykes, and calls "the suggestion groundless." Upon this Sykes published A Dissertation on the Eclipse mentioned by Phlegon, or an Inquiry whether that Eclipse had any Relation to the Darkness which happened at our Saviour's Passion (1732, 8vo). Sykes concludes it to be most probable that Phlegon had in view a natural eclipse, which happened November 24, in the first year of the two hundred and second Olympiad, and not in the fourth year of the Olympiad in which Christ was crucified. Many pieces were written against Sykes, who replied to some of them, but it may well be considered as a controversy still unsettled. The principal objections against the authority of the passage in question are thus briefly summed up by Dr. Adam Clarke (Comment. on Mat 27:45);

1. All the authors who quote Phlegon differ, and often very materially, in what they say was found in him.

2. He says nothing of "Judaea;" what he says is that in such an Olympiad (some say the one hundred and second, others the two hundred and second) there was "an eclipse in Bithynia," and "an earthquake at Nice."

3. He does not say that the earthquake happened at the time of the eclipse.

4. He does not intimate that this "darkness" was "extraordinary," or that the eclipse happened at the "full of the moon," or that it lasted "three hours;"  all of which circurmstances could not have been omitted by him if he had known them.

5. He speaks merely of an ordinary though perhaps total eclipse of the sun, and cannot mean the darkness mentioned by the evangelists. And,

6, he speaks of an eclipse that happened in some year of the one hundred and second or two hundred and second Olympiad, and therefore, upon the whole, little stress can be laid on what he says as applying to this event. Some fragments of his works are all that remain, the longest belongs to a treatise, Περὶ θαυμασίων, De Mirabilibus. It is a curious work, divided into thirty-five chapters (some of which are very short), and containing (as might be expected from the title) a great many absurd fables. The same may be said of a shorter fragment of four chapters, Περι μακροβίων, De Longaevis. The third fragment that remains is a chapter, Περι τῶν Ο᾿λυμπίων, De Olympiis, which is supposed by Salmasius (Ad Spartian. page 43) to be the preface to a lost work, De Olympionicis. These fragments were first published in 1568 (Basil. 8vo, Greek and Latin). by Xylander, together with Antoiini Liberalis, Transform. Conger., Apollonii Hist. Mirab.; Antigoni Carystii Hist. Mirab., and M. Antoninus, De Vita sua. An improved edition, with notes by Meursius, appeared in 1620 (Lugd. Bat. 4to, Greek and Latin), which is reprinted by Gronoviius in his Thesaur. Antiquit. Graec. 8:2690 sq., and 2727, and 9:1289 sq.; and also inserted among the works of Meursius, 7:77 sq. The best edition is by Westermann, in his Scriptores Rerum Mirabilium Graeci (Bruns. 1839). See, besides the references already given, Engl. Cyclop. s.v., Genesis Biog. Dict. s.v., Smith, Dict. of Gr. and Rom. Biog. and Mythol. s.v.

## Phobetor[[@Headword:Phobetor]]

             (Φοβήτωρ,frightener), an attendant on Somnus, the god of sleep, in the ancient heathen mythology. It was his office to suggest to the mind images of animated beings, and in this capacity he is mentioned by Ovid in his Metamorphoses.

## Phobus[[@Headword:Phobus]]

             (Φόβος), the personification of Fear among the ancient Greeks. He is said to have been the sonl of Ares and Cythereia, and a constant attendant upon his father. He was worshipped by the Romans under the equivalent name of Metus.

## Phocas[[@Headword:Phocas]]

             a Christian martyr of the early Church, flourished as bishop of Pontus in the 3d century. He was condemned to death for his refusal to sacrifice to Neptune, and was put to death by being first cast into a hot limekiln, and afterwards thrown into a scalding bath (Fox, page 16).

Another martyr of the same name flourished near the opening of the 4th century. He was put to death in A.D. 303. He was inserted in the list of martyrs in the days of the emperor Constantine. This Phocas is to the Greek Christians the Castor and Pollux of ancient Greece, and mariners revere his memory and pray for his intercession. He is commemorated by the Romanists July 14.

## Phocas, John[[@Headword:Phocas, John]]

             a noted Eastern monastic, flourished at Crete near the middle of the 12th century. He is especially distinguished by his description of a visit to Palestine, which work is entitled ῎Εχφρασις ἐν συνόψει τῶν τῶν ἀπ᾿ Α᾿ντιοχείας μέχοι ῾Ιεροσ;ύμων κάστρων καὶ χωρῶν Συρίας, Φοινικης καὶ τῶν κατὰ Παλαιστίνην ἁγίων τόπων (ed. Gr. et Lat.  Leo Allatius, Colon. 1653). This is a most important contribution to the department of Biblical geography, and is prized even in our day. See Smith, Dict. of Gr. and Rom. Biog. 2:601.

## Phoebadius[[@Headword:Phoebadius]]

             an eminent prelate of the 4th century, flourished as bishop of Agen, in Gaul. He was living in 392, when Jerome wrote his Catalogue, but was then in extreme old age. He is noted as the author of Liber contra Arianos (published in Bibl. Max. Patr. 4:300; Bibl. Patr. Gall. 5:250; Athanasii Dialogi, 5:1570, 8vo).

## Phoebe[[@Headword:Phoebe]]

             (Φοίβη, radiant), a deaconess of the Church at Cenchreae, recommended to-the kind attention of the Church of Rome by Paul, who had received hospitable treatment from her (Rom 16:1). A.D. 55. Her name occurs first in the long list of Christian men and women of whom express mention is there made. For the most part these were persons who had been previously known to Paul, and had some connection with him in his apostolic labors, but were at the time residing in Rome. Phoebe, however, was in the neighborhood of the apostle, probably still in Cenchreae, and was on the eve of setting out for Rome — on what business it is not said; but that she had something of importance in hand is evident from the request of the apostle, that the Christians at Rome would "receive her in the Lord, and assist her in whatever business she had need of them" (Rom 16:2). SEE PAUL. It is probable that she was the bearer of the Epistle to the Romans. SEE ROMANS, EPISTLE TO. "What is said of her is worthy of especial notice, because of its bearing on the question of the deaconesses of the Apostolic Church. On this point we have to observe,

(1) that the term διάκονος, here applied to her, though not in itself necessarily an official term, is the term which would be applied to her if it were meant to be official;

(2) that this term is applied in the Apostolical Constitutions to women who ministered officially, the deaconess being called ἡ διάκονος, as the deacon is called ὁ διάκονος;

(3) that it is now generally admitted that in 1Ti 3:11 Paul applies it so himself;

(4) that in the passage before us Phoebe is called the διάκονος of a particular Church, which seems to imply a specific employment;

(5) that the Church of Cenchreee, to which she belonged, could only have been a small Church: whence we may draw a fair conclusion as to what was customary, in the matter of such female ministration, in the larger churches;

(6) that, whatever her errand to Rome might be, the independent manner of her going there seems to imply (especially when we consider the secluded habits of Greek women) not only that she was a widow or a woman of mature age, but that she was acting officially;

(7) that she had already been of great service to Paul and others (προστάτις πολλῶν, καὶ ἐμοῦ αὐτοῦ), either by her wealth or her energy, or both; a statement which closely corresponds with the description of the qualifications of the enrolled widows in 1Ti 5:10;

(8) that the duty which we here see Phoebe discharging implies a personal character worthy of confidence and respect." SEE DEACONESS.

## Phoebus[[@Headword:Phoebus]]

             (Φοῖβος, bright), a title, and subsequently a name, of Apollo. It had reference both to the youthful beauty of the god, and to the radiance of the sun, when, latterly, Apollo became identified with Helios, the sun-god.

## Phoebus, William[[@Headword:Phoebus, William]]

             a Methodist Episcopal minister, was born in Somerset County, Maryland, August 1754. In 1783 he was admitted to the Conference, and preached in various places until 1798, when he located in the city of New York, entering upon the practice of medicine. In 1806 he was readmitted into the New York Conference, laboring effectively till 1821, after which time he was either supernumerary or superannuated. He died in New York November 9, 1831. He was a sound preacher and an excellent man. — Minutes of Conferences, 2:162; Sprague, Ann. of the Amer. Pulpit, 7:87.

## Phoenice[[@Headword:Phoenice]]

             [some Phe'niceJ, or, rather, PHOENIX (Φοίνιξ, a palm-tree [q.v.], which Theophrastus says was indigenous there), a town and harbor in the island of Crete, which the vessel in which the apostle Paul sailed, was attempting to reach when driven away by the euroclydon and wrecked (Act 27:12). The harbor or "haven" (λιμήν) is described by Luke as βλέποντα κατὰ λίβα καὶ κατὰ χῶρον, which the A.V. renders " lieth towards the south-west and north-west." But Mr. Smith contends that Kara in connection with winds means "in the same direction as." Thus βλέποντα κατὰ λίβα would not mean, as is generally supposed, that the haven looked to the point from which the libs blows, but to the point towards which it blows. Consequently the haven looked towards the north-east and the south-east (Smith, Voyage and Shipwreck of St. Paul, page 86 sq., 2d ed.). In this rendering Mr. Smith is sustained by ancient authorities, and also by some of the best modern critics (Alford, ad loc.; Conybeare and Howson, Life of St. Paul, 2:334, note; see, however, for the contrary opinion, Hacket On Acts, ad loc.). It is certain that one meaning of iara with the accusative is "opposite," or "over against," as it is correctly translated in Act 27:7 of this very chapter. Schweighauser, in his Lexicon Herodoteum, has pointed out some very instructive instances of this in Herod. 9:31, where κατά is used indiscriminately with ἀντίον and ἀντία In this sense, βλέποντα κατὰ Λίβα, etc., would be equivalent to Βλέποντα πρὸς Λίβα, etc.; a phrase as to the meaning of which there could be no doubt (Xenophon, Mem. 3:8, 9). Κατά with an accusative also often signifies "down." But the objection to translating it so in this passage is that it would thus, with extreme awkwardness, inferentially mean the exact contrary of what it directly means in its other acknowledged sense, as marking the local relation between two objects.

Both Ptolemy and Strabo mention a town Φοίνιξ; while Ptolemy alone mentions a haven, of a similar name, which he calls in the accusative: Φοινικοῦντα. Strabo locates it on the southern coast, at the narrowest part of the island (10:4, page 475). Hierocles identifies it with A radena, and seems to place it opposite the island of Clauda (Vet. Rom. Itin. ed. Wessel. pages 650, 651); and Stephen of Byzantium identifies Aradena and Acropolis (s.v.). On the south coast of Crete, at the narrowest part of the island, and opposite the island of Clauda, is the harbor of Lutro. It is open  to the east; but, as a little island lies almost in front of it, it has two entrances, one looking to the north-east, and the other to the south-east. It is thus described by captain Spratt: "Having in 1853 examined generally the south coast of Crete, I was fully convinced that Lutro was the Phenice of St. Paul, for it is the only bay to the westward of Fair Havens in which a vessel of any size could find any shelter during the winter months. By hauling inside the island, and securing to the south shore of the bay, a vessel is nearly land-locked. South-east and east winds only could endanger her; but with the former, where the fetch is greatest, the wind would iot blow home against such a mountain as the White Mountains, so immediately over the bay, and rising to an elevation of 9000 feet" (Smith, page 89). Mr. Brown, who since visited it, adds: "It is the only secure harbor, in all winds, on the south coast of Crete" (Id. page 256). This identification is confirmed by the researches of Mr. Pashley (Travels in Crete, 2:257), who discovered, a short distance above Lutro, a village called Acropolis ("upper city"), and another near it called Aradhena. Captain Speke also (Researches in Crete, 2:249) asserts that the name Phineka is still currently applied to Lutro, and that a Latin inscription found there, dating from the emperor Nerva, shows that ships from Alexandria resorted to this harbor. Lechler, on the other hand (Die Apostelgesch. 1869, page 400), maintaining the usual interpretation of KarCi here (towards), suggests that Luke is only reporting a popular opinion as to the situation of Phcenix, which Paul's company did not reach; and that hence we are not to look for the usual accuracy of the writer. SEE SHIPWRECK (OF PAUL).

## Phoenicia[[@Headword:Phoenicia]]

             (Φοινίκη), a country whose inhabitants necessarily held important and intimate relations, not only to the Hebrews, but to all antiquity. The latest and most complete authority on this subject is Rawlinson's History of Phelnicia (London, 1889).

I. The Land. —

1. Name. — "Phoenice" was not the name by which its native inhabitants called it, but was given to it by the Greeks, who called those merchants who came from that coast of the Mediterranean Sea which runs parallel with Mount Lebanon Φοινικες. In Cicero (De Fin. 4:20) there occurs the doubtful reading Phoenicia (comp. the Vulgate in Num 33:51).  However, this latter form of the name has come into general use (comp. Gesenii Monumenta Phenicia [Leips. 1837], page 338; Forbiger, Handbuch der alien Geographie [ibid. 1842-1844], page 659 sq.). This name has been variously derived. It is possibly from Phoenix the son of Agenor and the brother of Cadmus. It perhaps arose from the circumstance that the chief article of the commerce of these merchants was φοινός, purple. The word φοινός means blood-red, and is probably related to φόνος, mzurder. This derivation of the name is alluded to by Strabo (1:42). Others imagine as naturally that the color does not give name to the people, but is named after them: as our damask, from Damascus; or our "calico," from Calicut. The term, as an epithet of color, may also apply, as Kenrick supposes, to the sunburnt complexion of the people. But after all, in the opinion of others, a Greek derivation may not be admissible, for the name may be original or Shemitic — though it is ridiculous in Scaliger, Fuller, and Glassius to identify it with פנג, "to live luxuriously," in allusion to the results of Phoenician wealth and merchandise. Strabo, however, maintains that the Phoenicians were called Φοίνικες , because they resided originally on the coasts of the Red Sea. Bochart, in his Canaan (1:1), derives the name from the Hebrew בני ענק, sons of Anak. Reland, in his Palcestina ex Monumentis Veteribus IIlustrata, derives it from φοίνιξ, palm-tree; and this is the etymology now generally acquiesced in. The palmtree is seen, as an emblem, on some coins of Aradus, Tyre, and Sidon; and there are now several palm-trees within the circuit of modern Tyre, and along the coast at various points; but the tree is not at the present day one of the characteristic features of the country. The native name of Phoenicia was Kendan (Canaan) or Kna, signifying Lowland, so named in contrast to the adjoining Aram, i.e., Highland, the Hebrew name of Syria. The name Kenaan is preserved on a coin of Laodicea of the time of Antiochus Epiphanes, whereon Laodicea is styled "a mother city in Canaan," ללארכא אם בכנעןKna or Chnd (Χνᾶ) is mentioned distinctly by Herodian the grammarian as the old name of Phoenicia. Hence, as Phoenicians or Canaanites were the most powerful of all tribes in Palestine at the time of its invasion by Joshua, the Israelites, in speaking of their own territory as it was before the conquest, called it "the land of Calnaan." SEE CANAAN.

In the O.T. the word Phoenicia does not occur, as might be expected from its being a Greek name. In the Apocrypha it is not defined, though spoken of as being, with Coele-Syria, under one military commander (2Ma 3:5; 2Ma 3:8; 2Ma 8:8; 2Ma 10:11; 3Ma 3:15). In the N.T. the word occurs only in three passages, Act 11:19; Act 15:3; Act 21:2; and not one of these affords a clew as to how far the writer deemed Phoenicia to extend. On the other hand, Josephus possibly agreed with Strabo; for he expressly says that Csesarea is situated in Phoenicia (Ant. 15:9, 6); and although he never makes a similar statement respecting Joppa, yet he speaks, in one passage, of the coast of Syria, Phoenicia, and Egypt, as if Syria and Phoenicia exhausted the line of coast on the Mediterranean Sea to the north of Egypt (War, 3:9, 2).

The Phoenicians in general are sometimes called Sidonians (comp. Gesenii Monumenta Phoenicia, 2:267 sq.; Thesaurus Linguce Hebraicae, under the word צידון). Justinus (18:3) alludes to the etymology of this name: "A city being built which they called Sidon, from the abundance of fishes; for the Phoenicians call a fish sidon." This statement is not quite correct. But the root צוד, which in Hebrew means only to catch beasts and birds, can also be employed in Arabic when the catching of fishes is spoken of. This root occurs also in the Aramaic, in the signification of both hunting and fishing ( SEE ZIDON ).

2. Extent. — Phoenicia in general is the name applied to a country on the coast of Syria, bounded by the Mediterranean Sea on the west and Lebanon on the east; Syria and Judaea forming its northern and southern limits respectively, situated between about 34° to 366 N. lat., and 45° to 36° E. long. Yet the extent of its territory varied so considerably at different times that the geographical definitions of the ancient writers differ in a very remarkable manner. Thus, while in Gen 10:19 Canaan does not reach northwards beyond Sidon-a place which in early times gave the name to the whole people (יושבי צידון צידנים, Deuteronomy, Judges) — and Byblus and Berytus are considered as lying beyond it (Gen 10:15 sq.; Jos 13:5), it comprised in the Persian period (Herod. 3:91) Posidium, as high as 35° 52'. Later still (Pliny, Strabo, Ptolemy) the Eleutherus (340 60'), and subsequently (Mela, Stephanus) the island of Aradus (34° 70'), were considered its utmost northern, limits. To the south it was at times Gaza (Gen 10:19; Zep 2:5; Herod., Philo, Eustath.), at others Egypt (Num 24:5; Jos 15:4; Jos 15:47; Strabo, Procop., etc.); and, from the Macedonian period chiefly, Csesarea is mentioned as its extreme point. Eastward the country sometimes  comprised parts of Syria and Palestine, beyond the mountain-ridges of the former and the hill-chains of the latter.

It will thus be seen that the length of coast to which the name Phoenicia was applied varied at different times, and may be regarded under different aspects before and after the loss of its independence.

(1.) What may be termed Phoenicia proper was a narrow undulating plain, extending from the pass of Ras el-Beyad or Abyad, the "Promontorium Album" of the ancients, about six miles south of Tyre, to the Nahr el-Auly, the ancient Bostrenus, two miles north of Sidon (Robinson, Bib. Res. 2:473). The plain is only twenty-eight miles in length, and, considering the great importance of Phoenicia in the world's history, this may well be added to other instances in Greece, Italy, and Palestine, which show how little the intellectual influence of a city or state has depended on the extent of its territory. Its average breadth is about a mile (Porter, Handbookfor Syria, 2:396); but near Sidon the mountains retreat to a distance of two miles, and near Tyre to a distance of five miles (Kenrick, Phoenicia, page 19). The whole of Phoenicia, thus understood, is called by Josephus (Ant. 5:3, 1) the great plain of the city of Sidon (τὸ μέγα πεδίον Σιδῶνος πόλεως). In it, near its northern extremity, was situated Sidon, in the north latitude of 330 34' 05"; and scarcely more than seventeen geographical miles to the south was Tyre, in the latitude of 33° 17' (admiral Smyth's Mediterranean, page 469): so that in a straight line those two renowned cities were less. than twenty English miles distant from each other. Zarephath, the Sarepta of the N.T., was situated between them, eight miles south of Sidon, to which it belonged (1Ki 17:9; Oba 1:20; Luk 4:26).

(2.) A still longer district, which afterwards became fairly entitled to the name of Phoenicia, extended up the coast, to a point marked by the island of Aradus, and by Antaradus towards the north; the southern boundary remaining the same as in Phoenicia proper. Phoenicia, thus defined, is estimated by Mr. Grote (Hist. of Greece, 3:354) to have been about one hundred and twenty miles in length; while its breadth, between Lebanon and the sea, never exceeded twenty miles, and was generally much less. This estimate is most reasonable, allowing for the bends of the coast; as the direct difference in latitude between Tyre and Antaradus (Tortosa) is equivalent to one hundred and six English miles; and six miles to the south of Tyre, as already mentioned, intervene before the beginning of the pass of  Ras el-Abyad. The claim of this entire district to the name of Phoenicia rests on the probable fact that the whole of it, to the north of the great plain of Sidon, was occupied by Phoenician colonists; not to mention that there seems to have been some kind of politicalconnection, however loose, between all the inhabitants (Diodorus, 16:41). Scarcely sixteen geographical miles farther north than Sidon was Berytus; with a roadstead so well suited for the purposes of modern navigation that, under the modern name of Beirut, it has eclipsed both Sidon and Tyre as an emporium for Syria. Whether this Berytus was identical with the Berothah and Berothai of Eze 47:16, and of 2Sa 8:8, is a disputed point. Still farther north was Byblus, the Gebal of the Bible (Eze 27:9), inhabited by seamen and calkers. Its inhabitants are supposed to be alluded to in the word Giblim, translated "stonesquarers" in the A.V. of 1Ki 5:18 (32). It still retains in Arabic the kindred name of Jebeil. Then came Tripolis (now Tarabulus), said to have been founded by colonists from Tyre, Sidon, and Aradus, with three distinct towns, each a furlong apart from one another, each with its own walls, and each named from the city which supplied its colonists. General meetings of the Phoenicians seem to have been held at Tripolis (Diod. 16:41), as if a certain local jealousy had prevented the selection for this purpose of Tyre, Sidon, or Aradus. Lastly, towards the extreme point north was Aradus itself, the Arvad of Gen 10:18 and Eze 27:8, situated, like Tyre, on a small island near the mainland, and founded by exiles from Sidon.

During the period of the conquest of Canaan by the Israelites, the Phoenicians possessed the following towns, which we will enumerate successively in the direction from south to north: Dora (דור. Jos 11:2; Jos 17:11 sq.); Ptolemais (עכו, Jdg 1:33); Ecdippa (אכזיב, Jos 19:29); Tyre (צור, Jos 19:29); Sarepta (צרפת, 1Ki 17:9 sq.; Luk 4:26); Sidon (צידון, Gen 10:15); Berytus (ברותה, Eze 47:16; 2Sa 8:8); Byblus (גבל, Jos 13:5); Tripolis, Simyra (הצמרי, Gen 10:18); Arka (הערקי, Gen 10:17); Simna (הסיני, Gen 10:16); Aradus (הארודי, Gen 10:18). Comp. the respective articles on these towns. Sidon is the only Phoenician town mentioned in Homer (see Iliad, 6:239; 23:743; Odyss. 15:415; 17:424).

3. Geographical Features. — The whole of Phoenicia proper is well watered by various streams from the adjoining hills; of these the two largest are the Khasimiyeh, a few miles north of Tyre — the ancient name of which, strange to say, is not certain, though it is conjectured to have been the Leontes and the Bostrenus, already mentioned, north of Sidon. The soil is fertile, although now generally ill-cultivated; but in the neighborhood of Sidon there are rich gardens and orchards. The havens of Tyre and Sidon afforded water of sufficient depth for all the requirements of ancient navigation, and the neighboring range of the Lebanon, in its extensive forests, firnished what then seemed a nearly inexhaustible supply of timber for ship-building. To the north of Bostrenus, between that river and Beirfit, lies the only desolate and barren part of Phoenicia. It is crossed by the ancient Tamyras or Damuras, the modern Nahr ed-Damur. From Beirut the plains are again fertile. The principal streams are the Lycus, now the Nahr el-Kelb, not far north from Beirat; the Adonis, now the Nahr Ibrahim, about five miles south of Gebal; and the Eleutherus, now the Nahr el-Kebir, in the bend between Tripolis and Antaradus.

The climate of Phoenicia — an item of immense moment in the history of a nation — varies very considerably. Near the coast, and in the lower plains, the heat in summer is at times tropical, while the more mountainous regions enjoy a moderate temperature, and in winter even heavy falls of snow are not uncommon. In the southern parts the early rains begin in October, and are, after an interval of dry weather, followed by the winter rains, which last till March, the time of the "latter" rains. From May till October the sky remains cloudless. The rare difference of temperature found in so small a compass is thus happily described by Volney: "If the heat of July is oppressive, a six hours' journey to the neighboring mountains transports you into the coolness of March; and if, on the contrary, the hoar-frost troubles you at Besharrai, a day's travel will bring you into the midst of blooming May;" or, as an Arabic poet has it, "Lebanon bears winter on its head, spring on its shoulders, autumn on its lap, and summer at its foot." The dense population assembled in the great mercantile towns greatly contributed to augment by artificial means the natural fertility of the soil. The population of the country is at present very much reduced, but there are still found aqueducts and artificial vineyards formed of mould carried up to the terraces of the native rock. Ammianus Marcellinus says (14:8), "Phoenicia is a charming and beautiful country, adorned with large and elegant cities." Even now this country is among the  most fertile in Western Asia. It produces wheat, rye, and barley, and, besides the more ordinary fruits, also apricots, peaches, pomegranates, almonds, citrons, oranges, figs, dates, sugar-cane, and grapes, which furnish an excellent wine. In addition to these products, it yields cotton, silk, and tobacco. The country is also adorned by the variegated flowers of oleander and cactus. The higher regions are distinguished from the bare mountains of Palestine by being covered with oaks, pines, cypress-trees, acacias, and tamarisks; and above all by majestic cedars, of which there are still a few very old trees, whose stems measure from thirty to forty feet in circumference. The inhabitants of Sur still carry on a profitable traffic with the produce of Mount Lebanon, namely, in wood and charcoal. Phoenicia produces also flocks of sheep and goats; and innumerable swarms of bees supply excellent honey. In the forests there are bears, wolves, panthers, and jackals. The sea furnishes great quantities of fish, so that Sidon, the most ancient among the Phoenician towns, derived its name from fishing.

II. The People. —

1. Respecting the ethnography of the Phoenicians, we have only to observe that the opinions are as much divided on the subject as ever. According to Gen 10:15, Canaan had eleven "sons" ("Canaan begat Sidon his first-born, and Heth, and the Jebusite, and the Amorite, and the Girgasite, and the Hivite, and the Arkite, and the Sinite, and the Arvadite, and the Zemarite, and the Hamathite; and afterwards were the families of the Canaanites spread abroad"), six of whom had settled in the north of Palestine; and although all his descendants are sometimes included, both by classical writers and the Sept. (e.g. in Jos 5:1; Jos 5:12), in the name of Φοίνικες, yet in general the term chiefly applies to the inhabitants of the north. Scripture speaks of them as descendants of primeval giants (Autochthons) who had inhabited Canaan since the flood-that is, from times immemorial. Considering the careful attention paid by the Biblical writers to the early history of Palestine, and the close contact between the Phoenicians and Israelites, it would appear as if all traditions of a time anterior to their sojourn in that land had been long lost. Gen 10:6, on the other hand, calls Canaan a descendant of Ham — a statement which, unless explained to refer to their darker skins, would seem to war against their being indigenous inhabitants of Palestine, or a Shemitic population, an assumption much favored by their language. Herodotus, however, makes them, both on their own statements and by accounts  preserved in Persian historians, immigrants from "the Erythreean Sea;" and Justin backs the notion of immigration by recording that the Tyrian nation was founded by the Phoenicians, and that these, being forced by an earthquake to leave their native land, first settled on the Assyrian lake (Dead Sea or lake of Gennesareth), and subsequently on a shore near the sea, where they founded a city called Sidon. The locality of the "Erythreean Sea," however, is a moot point still. It is taken by different investigators to stand either for the Arabian or Persian Gulf; the latter view being apparently favored by the occurrence of Phoenician names borne by some of its islands (Strabo) — though these may have been given them by late Phoenician colonists. Some have seen in them the Hyksos driven to Syria. Without entering any further into these most difficult, and, in the absence of all trustworthy information, more than vague speculations, so much appears certain, that many immigrations of Shemitic branches into Phoenicia, at different periods and from different parts, must have taken place, and that these gradually settled into the highly civilized nationality which we find constituted as early as the time of Abraham (Gen 12:6, או = then, already; comp. Aben-Ezra, ad loc., and Spinoza, Tract. Theol.Pol. chapter 8). It would be extremely vain to venture an opinion on the individuality of the different tribes that, wave-like, rushed into the country from various sides, at probably widely distant dates. The only apparently valuable tradition on the subject seems contained in the above- quoted passage of Gen 10:15-18. But there is one point which can be proved to be in the highest degree probable, and which has peculiar interest as bearing on the Jews, viz. that the Phoenicians were of the same race as the Canaanites. This remarkable fact, which, taken in connection with the language of the Phoenicians, leads to some interesting results, is rendered probable by the following circumstances:

1st. The native name of Phoenicia, as already pointed out, was Canaan, a name signifying "lowland." This was well given to the narrow slip of plain between the Lebanon and the Mediterranean Sea, in contrast to the elevated mountain range adjoining; but it would have been inappropriate to that part of Palestine conquered by the Israelites, which was undoubtedly a hill-country (see Movers, Das Phoenizische Alterthum, 1:5); so that, when it is known that the Israelites at the time of their invasion found in Palestine a powerful tribe called the Canaanites, and from them called Palestine, the land of Canaan, it is obviously suggested that the Canaanites came originally from the neighboring plain, called Canaan along the sea-coast.

2d. This is further confirmed through the name in Africa whereby the Carthaginian Phoenicians called themselves, as attested by Augustine, who states that the peasants in his part of Africa, if asked of what race they were, would answer, in Punic or Phoenician, "Canaanites" (Opera Omnia, 4:1235; Exposit. Epist. ad Rom. § 13).

3d. The conclusion thus suggested is strongly supported by the tradition that the names of persons and places in the land of Canaan — not only when the Israelites invaded it, but likewise previously, when "there were yet but a few of them," and Abraham is said to have visited it-were Phoenician or Hebrew: such, for example, as Abimelek, "father of the king" (Gen 20:2); Melchizedek, "king of righteousness" (Gen 14:18); Kirjath-sepher, "city of the book" (Jos 15:15). As above observed, in Greek writers also occurs the name χνά for Phcenicia (comp. Gesenii Thesaurus Linguae Hebraicae [Leips. 1839], 2:696, and Gesenii Monumenta Phoenicia, page 570 sq.). The dialect of the Israelites perhaps resembled more the Aramaean, and that of the Phoenicians more the Arabic; but this difference was nearly effaced when both nations resided in the same country, and had frequent intercourse with each other. Concerning the original country of the Phoenicians and their immigration into Canaan, comp. especially Bertheau, Zur Geschichte der Israeliten (Gottingen, 1840), pages 152-186, and Lengerke, Kanaan, Volks- und Religionsgeschichte Israels (Kinigsberg, 1844), 1:182 sq.

2. Government. — Two principal divisions existed anciently among these Canaanites: these were those of the interior of Palestine, and the tribes inhabiting the sea-coast, Phoenicia proper. By degrees three special tribes, more powerful than the rest, formed, as it were, the nucleus around which the multitude of minor ones gathered and became one nationality, viz. the inhabitants of Sidon, of Tyre, and of Aradus. Three principal elements are to be distinguished, according to classical evidence (Cato, comp. Serv. ad En. 4:682), in the constitution of Phoenician states: 1. The aristocracy, consisting of certain families of noble lineage, which were divided into tribes (שבט), families (משפחה, Phoen. חבין), and gentes (בית אבות), the last generally of the number of 300 in each state or colony. Out of the "tribes" were elected thirty principes (Phoen. רב), who formed a supreme senate; besides which there existed another larger representative assembly of 300 members, chosen from the gentes. 2. The lower estates of the people, or "plebs" itself, who do not seem to have had their recognised  special representatives, but by constant opposition, which sometimes broke out in open violence, held the nobles in check. 3. The kingdom, at first hereditary, afterwards became elective. Nor must the priesthood be forgotten; one of the most powerful elements in the Phoenician commonwealth, and which in some provinces even assumed, in the person of the highpriest, the supreme rule. There was a kind of federal union between the different states, which, according to their importance, sent either their kings or their judges, at the head of a large number of their senators, to the general councils of the nation, held at stated periods either at Sidon or Tyre. The colonies were governed much as the home-country, except that local affairs and the executive were intrusted to two (annual, as it would seem) judges (שופטים, suffetes) elected by the senate — an institution which for some time also replaced the monarchical form in Tyre. When Tripolis was founded by Tyre, Sidon, and Aradus, as a place of joint meeting for their hegemony, every one of these cities sent 100 senators to watch her special interests at the common meeting; and the senate of Sidon seems, in the 4th century B.C., at least, to have consisted of 500 to 600 elders, some of whom were probably selected more for their wealth than for their noble lineage. The king sometimes combined in his person the office of highpriest. The turbulent seething mass of the people, consisting of the poorer families of Phoenician descent, the immigrants of neighboring tribes, the strangers, and the whole incongruous mass of workmen, tradespeople, sailors, that must have abounded in a commercial and maritime nation like the Phoenicians, and out of whose midst must have arisen at times influential men enough — was governed, as far as we can learn, as "constitutionally" as possible. The unruly spirits were got rid of in Roman fashion somehow in the colonies, or were made silent by important places being intrusted to their care, under strict supervision from home. Only once or twice do we hear of violent popular outbreaks, in consequence of one of which it was mockingly said that Phoenicia had lost all her aristocracy, and what existed of Phoenicians was of the lowest birth, the offspring of slaves. As the wealth of all the world accumulated more and more in the Phoenician ports, luxury) and too great a desire to rest and enjoy their wealth in peace, induced the dauntless old pirates to intrust the guard of their cities to the mariners and mercenary soldiers, to Libyans and Lydians — "they of Persia and of Lud and of Phut," as Ezekiel has it; although the wild resistance which this small territory offered in her single towns to the enormous armies of Assyria, Babylonia and Greece shows that the old spirit had not died out. The smaller states were sometimes so  much oppressed by Tyre that they preferred rather to submit to external enemies (comp. Heeren, Ideen, etc., page 15 sq.; Beck, Anleitung zur genaueren Kenntniss der Welt- und Volkergeschichte, page 252 sq., and 581 sq.).

3. History. — One of the most powerful and important nations of antiquity, Phoenicia has yet left but poor information regarding her history. According to Josephus, every city in Phoenicia had its collection of registers and public documents (comp. Targum to Kirjath-Jearim, Jdg 1:11; Jdg 1:15). Out of these, Menander of Ephesus, and Dias, a Phoenician, compiled two histories of Tyre, a few fragments of which have survived (comp. Josephus, Contra Rev 1:17-18; Ant. 8:5, 3; 13:1 sq.; 9:14, 2; Theophil. Ad Autol. 3:22; Syncellus, Chron. page 182). Sanchoniatho is said to have written a history of Phoenicia and Egypt, which was recast by Philo of Byblus, under the reign of Hadrian, and from his work Porphyrius (4th century A.D.) took some cosmogonical quotations, which found their way into Eusebius (Praep. Evang. 1:10). Later Phoenician historians' works (Theodotus, Hesycrates, Moschos, mentioned as authors on Phoenicia by Tatianus, Contra Grcecos, § 37) are likewise lost. Gesenlius mentions, in his Monumenta Phoenicia (page 363 sq.), some later I;hoenician authors, who do not touch upon historical subjects. Thus nothing remains but a few casual notices in the Bible, some of the Church fathers, and classical writers (Josephus, Syncellus, Herodotus, Diodorus, Justin), which happen to throw some light upon the history of that long- lost commonwealth. A great part of this history, however, being identical with that of the cities mentioned, in which by turns the hegemony was vested, fuller information will be found under their special headings. The names of the kings from Hiram to Pygmalion are preserved by Josephus (Apion, 1:18) in a fragment from the history of Tyre by Menander of Ephesus. We give them, with the computations of the reigns by Movers (ut sup. II, 1:140, 143, 149), Duncker (Gesch. des A lterthums [3d ed. Berl. 1863-7], 1:526 sq.), and Hitzig (Urgesch. und Mythol. der Philistber, page 191). See also Herzog, Encyklop. 11:620 sq.
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Astartus....12 years918-907953-941969-957Astaryimus.9 years906-898941-932957-948Pheles......8 monthsIthobal ....32 (12) years897-866931-898948-916Balezorus..6 (8, 18) years865-858898-890916-910Myttonus...9 (25, 12) years857-833890-861910-901Pygmalion.47 (40,48) years832-785861-813900-853Broadly speaking, we may begin to date Phoenician history from the time when Sidon first assumed the rule, or about B.C. 1500. Up to that time it was chiefly the development of the immense internal resources, and the commencement of that gigantic trade that was destined soon to overspread the whole of the then known world, which seem to have occupied the attention of the early and peaceful settlers. The symbolical representative of their political history during that period is El, or Belitan, builder of cities, supreme and happy ruler of men. The conquest of Canaan by the Israelites marks a new epoch, of which lists of kings were still extant in late Greek times. We now hear first of Sidonian colonies, while the manufactures and commerce of the country seem to have reached a high renown throughout the neighboring lands. The Israelites drove out Sidonian settlers from Laish, near the sources of the Jordan. Somewhat later (beginning of 13th century), Sidonian colonization spread farther west, founding the (island) city of Tyre, and Citium and Hippo on the coast of Africa. About 1209, however, Sidon was defeated by the king of Askalon, and Tyre, assuming the ascendency, ushered in a third period, during which Phoenicia reached the summit of her greatness. At this time, chiefly under the brilliant reign of Hiram, we hear also of a close alliance with the Israelites, which eventually led to common commercial enterprises at sea. After Hiram's death, however, political dissensions began to undermine the unparalleled peace and power of the country. His four sons ruled, with certain interruptions, for short periods, and the crown was then assumed by Ethbaal, the father of Jezebel. His grandson, Mattan, left the throne to his two children, Pygmialion and Dido (Elissa). The latter, having been excluded from power by her brother, left the country, together with some of the aristocratic families, and founded Carthage (New-Town), about B.C. 813. Of the century that followed, little further is known save  occasional allusions in Joel and Amos, which tell of the piratical commerce of Tyrians and Sidonians. Assyrian, Chaldsean, Egyptian invasions followed each other in turns during the last phase of Phoenician history, dating from the 8th century, and soon reduced the flourishing country to insignificance.

Deeds of prowess, such as the thirteen years' siege sustained by Tyre against overwhelming forces, could not save the doomed country. Her fleet destroyed, her colonies wrested from her or in a state of open rebellion, torn by inner factions, Phoenicia was ultimately (together with what had been once Nebuchadnezzar's empire) embodied with Persia B.C. 538. Once more, however, exasperated by the enormous taxes imposed upon them, chiefly during the Greek war, together with other galling measures issued by the successive satraps, the Phoenicians, under the leadership of Sidon, took part in the revolution of Egypt against Artaxerxes Mnlemon and Ochus, about the mnide die of the 4th century B.C., which ended very unhappily for them. Sidon, the only city that refused to submit at once at the approach of the Persian army, was conquered, the citizens themselves setting fire to it, and more than 40,000 people perished in the flames. Although rebuilt and repeopled shortly afterwards, it yet never again reached its ancient grandeur, and to Tvre belonged the hegemony, until she, too, had to submit, after a seven years' siege, to Alexander, who through the battle on the Issus (B.C. 333) had made all Phoenicia his as part and parcel of the gigantic Persian empire. Under Antiochus the Great, all except Sidon became subject to Seleucidian sway. Pompey, incorporating Phoenicia with Syria (B.C. 65), made it a Roman province. During the civil wars of Rome, when Cassius divided Syria into small provinces, and sold them separately, Tyre again became for a short period a principality, with a king of its own. Cleopatra in her turn received Phoenicia as a present from Antony. What shadow of independence was still left to the two ancient cities was taken from them by Augustus (A.D. 20). Tyre, however, retained much of her previous importance as an emporium and a manufacturing place through the various vicissitudes of Syrian history during the sixteen centuries that followed, until the Ottoman Turks conquered the country, and the opening up of the New World on the one hand, and of a new route to Asia on the other, destroyed the last remnant of the primitive grandeur of one of the most mighty empires of the ancient world, and one which has contributed one of the largest shares to the civilization of all mankind.

4. Occupations. — Commerce and colonization were the elements by which this grandeur was chiefly accomplished. Regarding the former, we have already hinted at the overflowing wealth and almost unparalleled variety of home products which this small country furnished forth, and which, far too abundant for their own consumption, easily suggested the idea of exportation and traffic of exchange. Their happy maritime position further enabled them to do that which Egypt and Assyria, with all their perfection of industry and art, were debarred from doing; partly, it is true, through their isolated habits and narrow laws, but chiefly by the natural limits of their countries. To Phoenicia alone it was given to supply the link that was to connect the East with the West, or at least with Europe and Western Africa. Communicating by means of Arabia and the Persian Gulf with India and the coast of Africa towards the equator; and on the north, along the Euxine, with the borders of Scythia, beyond the Strait of Gibraltar, with Britannia, if not with the Baltic, their commerce divides itself into different great branches according to those natural highways. From the countries on the Persian Gulf and the Red Sea, the coasts of Arabia, Africa, and India, they exported spice, precious stones, myrrh, frankincense, gold, ivory, ebony, steel, and iron, and from Egypt embroidered linen and corn. In exchange they brought not only their own raw produce and manufactures, but gums and resins for embalming, also wine and spices. From Mesopotamia and Syria came the emeralds and corals of the Red Sea; from Babylon the manifold embroideries; wine and fine wool from Aleppo and the Mesopotamian plains; from Judaea the finest wheat, grape-honey, oil, and balm. Another remote region, Armenia, furnished troops of riding and chariot horses and mules; and this same country, or, rather, the south-eastern coast of the Euxine, further furnished the Phoenician emporiums with slaves of a superior market-value-for pirating and slave-dealing went hand in hand with their maritime calling- with copper, lead, brass (or ichalcum), and tunnies, which they also fetched, together with conger-eels, from the Atlantic coast. Their extensive early commerce with Greece is frequently alluded to in Homer, and is further shown by the remarkable fact of the abundance of Shemitic or Phoenician words in Greek for such things as precious stones, fine garments, vessels, spices, and Eastern plants in general, musical instruments, weights and measures, etc. (comp. μύῤῥα, מר; κίνναμον, קנמון; κάννα, קנה; λίβανος , לבנה; χαλβάνη, galbanum, : חלבנה; νάρδος, נרד; σάμφειρος שפיר; ἴασπις, ישפה; βύσσος, בווֹ;  κάρπασος, כרפס; νάβλα, נבל; τύμπανον, ת; σαμβύκη, סבכא; κύπρος, כפר; ὕσσωπος, אזוב; κιβώρυον, כפור; σάκκος, שק; χάρτς,; δέλτος, חדט; ἀῤῥαβών, ערבון; μνᾶ, מנה; κάβος, קב; δραχμή, דרכמון; κόρος, כר, etc.). Beyond the Strait, along the north and west coast of Africa, they received skins of deer, lions, panthers, domestic cattle, elephants' skins and teeth, Egyptian alabaster, castrated swine, Attic pottery and cups, probably also gold. Yet the most fabulously rich mines of metalssuch as silver, iron, lead, tin — they found in Tartessus. So extensive and proverbial was this commerce that we enumerate its elements in detail.

The position of Phoenicia, as we have seen, was most favorable for the exchange of the produce of the East and West. Persians, Lydians, and Lycians frequently served as mercenaries in the Phoenician armies (Eze 27:10-11). Phoenicia exported wine to Egypt (Herod. 3:5, 6). Purple garments were best manufactured in Tyre (Amati, De Restitutione Purpurarunm, 3d ed. Casenee, 1784). Glass was made in Sidon and Sarepta (comp. Heeren, page 86 sq.; Beck, page 593 sq.). In Phoenicia was exchanged the produce of all known countries. After David had vanquished the Edomites and conquered the coasts of the Red Sea, king Hiram of Tyre entered into a confederacy with Solomon, by which he insured for his people the right of navigation to India. The combined fleet of the Israelites and Phoenicians sailed from the seaports of Ezion-geber and Elath. These ports were situated on the eastern branch of the Red Sea, the Sinus Elaniticus, or Gulf of Akabah. Israelitish-Phoenician mercantile expeditions proceeded to Ophir, perhaps Abhira, situated at the mouth of the Indus (comp. Lassen, Indische Alterthumskunde [Bonn, 1844], 1:537 sq.). It seems, however, that the Indian coasts in general were also called Ophir. Three years were required in order to accomplish a mercantile expedition to Ophir and to return with cargoes of gold, algum-wood, ivory, silver, monkeys, peacocks, and other Indian produce.

Some names of these products are Indian transferred into Hebrew, as אלמגים, almuggim, Sanscr. valgu, or, according to the Decanic pronunciation, valgum; שןאּבּים, shen-habbim (ivory), Sanscr. קו; ' koph (ape), Sanscr. kapi; תוכיים, tukkiyim (peacock), Sanscr. cikhi, according to the Decanic pronunciation (comp. 1Ki 9:27; 1Ki 10:11; 1Ki 10:22). SEE OPHIR. It seems,  however, that these mercantile expeditions to India were soon given up, probably on account of the great difficulty of navigating the Red Sea. King Jehoshaphat endeavored to recommence these expeditions, but his fleet was wrecked at Ezion-geber (1Ki 22:48). The names of mercantile establishments on the coasts of Arabia along the Persian Gulf have partly been preserved to the present day. In these places the Phoenicians exchanged the produce of the West for that of India, Arabia, and Ethiopia. Arabia especially furnished incense, gold, and precious stones. The Midianites (Gen 37:28) and the Edomites (Eze 27:16) effected the transit by their caravans. The fortified Idumaean town Petra probably contained the storehouses in which the produce of southern countries was collected. From Egypt the Phoenicians exported especially byssus (Eze 27:7) for wine. According to an ancient tradition, the tyrant of Thebes, Busiris, having soiled his hands with the blood of all foreigners, was killed by the Tyrian Hercules. This indicates that Phoenician colonists established themselves and their civilization successfully in Upper Egypt, where all strangers had usually been persecuted. At a later period Memphis was the place where, most of the Phoenicians in Egypt were established. Phoenician inscriptions found in Egypt prove that even under the Ptolemies the intimate connection between Phoenicia and Egypt still existed (comp. Gesenii Monumenta Phoenicia, 13:224 sq.). From Palestine the Phoenicians imported, besides wheat, especially from Judaea, ivory, oil, and balm; also wool, principally from the neighboring nomadic Arabs. Damascus furnished wine (Eze 27:5-6; Eze 27:17-18; Eze 27:21), and the mountains of Syria wood. The tribes about the shores of the Caspian Sea furnished slaves and iron; for instance, the Tibaraeans (תובל, Tubal) and Moschi (משׁ,ִ Meshech). Horsemen, horses, and mules came from the Armenians (תגרמה, Togarmah) (see Heeren, pages 86-130). The treasures of the East were exported from Phoenicia by ships which sailed first to Cyprus. the mountains of which are visible from the Phoenician coast. Citium was a Phoenician colony in Cyprus, the name of which was transferred to the whole of Cyprus, and even to some neighboring islands and coasts called כתים (Gen 10:4; Isa 23:1; Isa 23:12).

Hence also חתים, the name of a Canaanitish or Phoenician tribe (Gesenii Monumenta Phoenicia, page 153). Cyprus was subject to Tyre up to the time of Alexander the Great. There are still found Phoenician inscriptions which prove the connection of Cyprus with Tyre. At Rhodes (רדנים) also are found vestiges of Phoenician influence. From Rhodes the mountains of  Crete are visible. This was of great importance for the direction of navigators, before the discovery of the compass. In Crete, and also in the Cycladic and Sporadic Isles, are the vestiges of Phoenician settlements. On the Isle of Thasos, on the southern coast of Thrace, the Phoenicians had gold-mines; and even on the southern shores of the Black Sea they had factories. However, when the Greeks became more powerful, the Phoenicians sailed more in other directions. They occupied also Sicily and the neighboring islands, but were, after the Greek colonization, confined to a few towns, Motya, Soloes, Panormus (Thucydides, 6:2). The Phoenician mercantile establishments in Sardinia and the Balearic Isles could scarcely be called colonies. Carthage was a Phoenician colony, which probably soon became important by commerce with the interior of Africa, and remained connected with Tvre by means of a common sanctuary. After Phoenicia had been vanquished by the Assyrians. Babylonians, and Persians, the settlements in Sicily, Sardinia, and Spain came into the power of Carthage. The Phoenicians had for a long period exported from Spain gold, silver, tin, iron, lead (Eze 38:13), fruit, wine, oil, wax, fish, and wool. Their chief settlement was Tarshish, תרשׁישׁ, subjection, from the root רשׁשׁ, he vanquished, subjected. The Aramaeans pronounced תרתישׁ; hence the Greek Tartessos. This was probably the name of a town situated to the west of the Pillars of Hercules (Calpe and Abyla, now Gibraltar and Ceuta), and even more west than Gades, at the mouth of the Baetis (Herod. 4:62; Scymnus Chius, 5:161 sq.). This river was also called Tartessus (Arist. Meteor. 1:13; Pausan. 6:19, 3; Strabo, 3, page 148). At a later period the town of Tartessus obtained likewise the Phoenician name Carteja, from קרת, town (Strabo, 3, page 151).

There are other names of towns in Spain which have a Phoenician derivation: Gades, גדר, septum, fence (comp. Gesenii Monumenta Phoenicia, page 304 sq., 349); Malaga (מלח), on account of much salt fish thence exported; or, according to Gesenius (id. page 312 sq., and 353), from מלאכהאּמלכה, officinaf abrorum, iron-works, or manufactory of other metals, on account of the mines to be found there; Belon, בעלה, civitas, city (id. page 311 sq., and 348). The voyage to Tarshish was the most important of those undertaken by the Phoenicians. Hence it was that their largest vessels were all called ships of Tarshish, although they sailed in other directions (1Ki 10:22). It appears also that the Phoenicians exported tin from the British Isles, and amber from the coasts of Prussia. Their voyages on the western  coasts of Africa seem to have been merely voyages of discovery, without permanent results. The Spanish colonies were probably the principal sources of Phoenician wealth, and were founded at a very remote period. The migration of the Phoenician, Cadmus, into Bceotia likewise belongs to the earlier period of Phoenician colonization. Homer seems to know little of the Sidonian commerce; which fact may be explained by supposing that the Phoenicians avoided all collision and competition with the increasing power of the Greeks, and preferred to direct their voyages into countries where such compe tition seemed to be improbable. Herodotus describes the Phoenicians as beginning soon after their settlement to occupy themselves in distant voyages (1:1). From the construction of rude rafts, they must speedily have reached to a style of substantial ship-building. Their commercial vessels are represented either as long in shape, and fitted both for sailing and being rowed with fifty oars — “ships of Tarshish;" or as rounder in form, and more capacious in stowage, but slower in speed- tubs or coasting-vessels — bearers of cargo on short voyages. Xenophon (Economics, 8) passes a high eulogy on a Phoenician ship — "the greatest quantity of tackling was disposed separately in the smallest stowage."

Their merchantmen also carried arms for defence, and had figures on their prows, which the Greeks named πάταικοι. They steered by the Cynosure, or the last star in Ursa Minor; and they could cast reckonings, from the combined application of astronomy and arithmetic (Strabo, 16:2, 24). This nautical application of astronomy is ascribed by Callimachus to Thales, a Phcenician by descent (Frag. ed. Blomfield, page 213; Diog. Laert. Thales). Lebanon supplied them with abundance of timber, and Cyprus gave them all necessary equipments, from the keel to the topsails — "a fundamento ipso carinee ad supremos ipsos carbasos" (Amm. Marcell. 14:8-14). These daring Phoenician navigators in the reign of Pharaoh — Necho circumnavigated Africa — departing from the Red Sea and returning by the Strait of Gibraltar. They reported that in sailing round Libya they had the sun on their right hand — a story of which Herodotus says, "I, for my part, do not believe them," and yet it is the positive proof that they had gone round the Cape (Herod. 4:42). Diodorus speaks also of Phoenician mariners — being driven westwards beyond the Pillars of Hercules into the ocean, and reaching at length a very fertile and beautiful island — "a dwelling of gods rather than of men" — one probably of the Azores or Canary Islands. The Phoenicians furnished to Xerxes 300 ships, but they were defeated at Salamis. It is said that of all the nations employed in digging the famous canal across the isthmus of Athos, they alone had  sufficient engineering skill to begin its banks on their section at a slope, and thus prevent caving in (7:23). The remote periods of Phoenician commerce and colonization are wrapped in myths. Phoenician ships may have first carried the produce of Assyria and Egypt but their own wares and manufactures were soon largely exported by them (Ezekiel 28). The commerce of Tyre reached through the world (Strabo, 3:5, 11).

There was also a great trade in the tunny fisheries, and the Tyrians sold fish in Jerusalem (Neh 13:16). Phoenicia excelled in the manufacture of the purple dye extracted from the shell-fish murex, so abundant on parts of its coasts. This color in its richest hue was at length appropriated to imperial use, and the silk so dyed was of extraordinary value. The glass of Sidon was no less famous than the Tyrian dye — the fine white sand used for the process being very abundant near Mount Carmel. Glass has been found in Nineveh, and glass-blowing is figured at Beni-Hassan in Egypt. The art might have come from Egypt, but the discovery in Phoenicia is represented as accidental. The pillar of emerald shining brightly in the night, which Herodotus speaks of as being in the temple of Hercules, was probably a hollow cylinder of glass with a lamp within it (Kenrick, Phenicia, page 249). Phoenicia produced also drinking-cups of silver and gold. Homer describes Sidon as abounding in works of brass. Its building- stone was not of very good quality, but cedar-wood was largely employed. When stone was used the joints were bevelled — a practice which also characterizes Hebrew architecture, and gives it a panelled appearance. The mining operations of the Phoenicians were also celebrated. Herodotus says they turned a mountain over ἐν τῇ ζητήσει — in the search for gold. Mines were wrought in the various colonies — in the Grecian islands and in Spain — by processes much the same as those employed in more modern times. The marine knowledge and experience of Phoenicia led to the plantation of numerous colonies in Cyprus, Rhodes, Cilicia, and the islands of the AEgean-the Cyclades and Sporades (Thucyd. 1:8) — in Sicily, in Sardinia, the Balearic Islands, and in Spain. Strabo says that the Phoenicians possessed the best parts of Iberia before the days of Homer (3:22, 14). One principal colony was in Northern Africa, and Strabo asserts that they occupied the middle part of Africa soon after the Trojan war.

The story of Dido and the foundation of Carthage is well known, the event being placed by some in B.C. 813. Byrsa, the name of the hill on which the city was built, denotes a fortress, being בָּצְרָה. (Bozrah), the name also of the Idumaean capital; though its Greek form, Βύρσα, gave rise to the story about the purchase of as much land as a hide would measure. Carthage  means "new town" (קרת חדשה), and Punici is only another spelling of Phuonici. Intercourse with many strange and untutored races led the Phoenicians to indulge in fictions, and love of gain taught them mercantile deceits and stratagems. "Phoenician figment" — ψεῦσμα φοινικικόν — or a traveller's tale, was proverbial in former times, likefides Punica at a later period (Strabo, 12, page 55). The Etymologium Magnum bluntly φοινικικόν by τὸ ψεῦδος, the lie. In the Odyssey they are described as "crafty" ναυσίκλυτοι (Odyss. 13:415), or as "crafty and wicked." As a trading nation they were ready sometimes to take advantage of the ignorant and savage tribes with which they bartered, and they cared nothing for law or right on the high seas, where no power could control or punish; so that Ulysses uses the phrase Φοίνιξ ἀνὴρ ἀρατήλια εἰδὼς τρώκτης, "a Phoenician man knowing deceitful things — crafty" (id. 14:285). The term "Canaan," "Canaanite," or "man of Canaan," the native name of the Phoenician, is sometimes rendered "merchant" in the English version (Isa 23:8; Zep 1:11; Job 41:6; Pro 31:24; Zec 14:21; Hos 12:7; Eze 17:4). "Phoenician" and "merchant" were thus interchangeable terms; so that Φοῖνιξ γίνομαι means, "I become a trader." But the phrase seems to have sunk in moral meaning, and trader was but another name for a hucksterer, or a pedler going from house to house, as in Pro 31:24. Nay, the prophet Hosea (12:7) says, "He is a Canaanite," or "Phenician," or "as for Canaan, the balances of deceit are in his hand: he loveth to oppress. And Ephraim said, Yet am I become rich, I have found me out substance." A common proverb expressive of fraud matching fraud was Σύροι πρὸς Φοίνικας. No coined money of Phoenicia is extant prior to its subjugation by the Greeks. The standard seems to have been the same as the Jewish; the shekel being equal to the Attic tetradrachm; and the zuz, which occurs on the tablet of Marseilles, being of the value of a denarius. On the same tablet keseph (silver) occurs, with the probable ellipse of "shekel," as in Hebrew. Foreign silver money (זר) is also there referred to. Among the antiquities dug up in Nineveh are several bronze weights in the form of lions; having both cuneiform legends with the name of Sennacherib, and also Phoenician or cursive Shemitic inscriptions (Layard, Nin. and Bab. page 601). The cor was a Phoenician measure, the same as the Hebrew chomer, and holding ten Attic metretee.each metretes being equal to about ten and a half gallons. The arithmetical notation was carried out by making simple strokes for the units; 10 was a horizontal stroke or a semicircle, and 100  was a special sign, the unit strokes added to it denoting additional hundreds (Gesenii Monumenta Phoenicia, page 85).

It appears almost incredible how, with the comparatively small knowledge of natural science which we must attribute to them, the Phoenicians could thus on theirfrail rafts traverse the wide seas almost from one end of the globe to the other, with apparently no more difficulty than their inland caravans, their chapmen and dealers, found in traversing the neighboring countries. Yet it must not, on the other hand, be forgotten that theirs appears to have been an uncommon knowledge of astronomy and physical geography — witness their almost scientifically planned voyage of discovery under Hiram — and that, above all, an extraordinary amount of practical sense, of boldness, shrewdness, unscrupulousness, untiring energy, and happy genius, went far to replace some of the safe contrivances with which modern discoveries have made our mariners familiar. These qualities also made and kept them the unrivalled masters of ancient commerce and navigation. They were, moreover, known rather to destroy their own ships and endanger their lives than let others see their secret way and enterprise; and it would be very surprising if theirs had not been also the greatest discoveries, the greatest riches and splendor and power for many a long century, though they owned but a small strip of country at home. Well might Tyre once say, "I am of perfect beauty" (Eze 27:3), and the prophet address Sidon, "Behold, thou art wiser than Daniel, there is no secret they can hide from thee: with thy wisdom and thine understanding thou hast gotten thee riches, and hast gotten gold and silver into thy treasures: by thy great wisdom and by thy traffic hast thou increased thy riches, and thine heart is lifted up because of thy riches" (28:3-5). There can, indeed, not be fancied a fuller and more graphic account of the state of Phoenicia, especially as regards her commercial relations, than the two chapters of Ezekiel (27 and 28) containing the lamentation on Tyre: which, indeed, form our chief information onl this point.

In regard to Phoenician trade, as connected with the Israelites, the following points are worthy of notice.

(1.) Up to the time of David, not one of the twelve tribes seems to have possessed a single harbor on the sea-coast: it was impossible, therefore, that they could become a commercial people. It is true that according to Jdg 1:31, combined with Jos 19:26, Accho or Acre, with its  excellent harbor, had been assigned to the tribe of Asher; but from the same passage in Judges it seems certain that the tribe of Asher did not really obtain the possession of Acre, which continued to be held by the Canaanites. However wistfully, therefore, the Israelites might regard the wealth accruing to their neighbors the Phoenicians from trade, to vie with them in this respect was out of the question. But from the time that David had conquered Edom, an opening for trade was afforded to the Israelites. The command of Ezion-geber, near Elath, in the land of Edom, enabled them to engage in the navigation of the Red Sea. As they were novices, however, at sailing, as the navigation of the Red Sea, owing to its currents, winds, and rocks, is dangerous even to modern sailors, and as the Phoenicians, during the period of the independence of Edom, were probably allowed to trade from Ezion-geber, it was politic in Solomon to permit the Phoenicians of Tyre to have docks and build ships at Ezion- geber on condition that his sailors and vessels might have the benefit of their experience. The results seem to have been strikingly successful. The Jews and Phoenicians made profitable voyages to Ophir in Arabia or India, whence gold was imported into Judaea in large quantities; and once in three years still longer voyages were made, by vessels which may possibly have touched at Ophir, though their imports were not only gold, but likewise silver, ivory, apes, and peacocks (1Ki 10:22). SEE TARSHISH.

There seems at the same time to have been a great direct trade with the Phoenicians for cedar-wood (1Ki 10:27), and generally the wealth of the kingdom reached an unprecedented point. If the union of the tribes had been maintained, the whole sea-coast of Palestine would have afforded additional sources of revenue through trade; and perhaps even ultimately the "great plain of Sidon" itself might have formed part of the united empire. But if any possibilities of this kind existed, they were destroyed by the disastrous secession of the ten tribes; a heavy blow from which the Hebrew race has never yet recovered during a period of nearly 3000 years.

(2.) After the division into two kingdoms, the curtain falls on any commercial relation between the Israelites and Phoenicians until a relation is brought to notice, by no means brotherly, as in the fleets which navigated the Red Sea, nor friendly, as between buyers and sellers, but humiliating and exasperating, as between the buvers and the bought. The relation is meant which existed between the two nations when Israelites were sold as slaves by Phoenicians. It was a custom in antiquity, when one nation went to war against another, for merchants to be present in one or other of the  hostile camps, in order to purchase prisoners of war as slaves. Thus at the time of the Maccabees, when a large army was sent by Lysias to invade and subdue the land of Judah, it is related that "the merchants of the country, hearing the fame of them, took silver and gold very much with servants, and came into the camp to buy the children of Israel for slaves" (1Ma 3:41); and when it is related that at the capture of Jerusalem by Antiochus Epiphanes, the enormous number of 40,000 men were slain in battle, it is added that there were "no fewer sold than slain" (2Ma 5:14; Credner's Joel, page 240). Now this practice, which is thus illustrated by details at a much later period. undoubtedly prevailed in earlier times (Odyssey, 15:427; Herod. 1:1), and is alluded to in a threatening manner against the Phoenicians by the prophets (Joe 3:4, and Amo 1:9-10), about B.C. 800. The circumstances which led to this state of things may be thus explained. After the division of the two kingdoms there is no trace of any friendly relations between the kingdom of Judah and the Phoenicians: the interest of the latter rather led them to cultivate the friendship of the kingdom of Israel; and the Israelitish king, Ahab, had a Sidonian princess as his wife (1Ki 16:31). Now, not improbably in consequence of these relations, when Jehoshaphat, king of Judah, endeavored to restore the trade of the Jews in the Red Sea, and for this purpose built large ships at Ezion-geber to go to Ophir for gold, he did not admit the Phoenicians to any participation in the venture, and when king Ahaziah, Ahab's son, asked to have a share in it, his request was distinctly refused (22:48,49). That attempt to renew the trade of the Jews in the Red Sea failed, and in the reign of Jehoram, Jehoshaphat's son, Edom revolted from Judah and established its independence; so that if the Phoenicians wished to despatch trading-vessels from Ezion-geber, Edom was the power which it was mainly their interest to conciliate, and not Judah. Under these circumstances the Phoenicians seem, not only to have purchased and to have sold again as slaves, and probably in some instances to have kidnapped inhabitants of Judah, but even to have sold them to their enemies the Edomites (Joel, Amos, as above). This was regarded with reason as a departure from the old brotherly covenant, when Hiram was a great lover of David, and subsequently had the most friendly commercial relations with David's son; and this may be considered as the original foundation of the hostility of the Hebrew prophets towards Phoenician Tyre (Isaiah 23; Ezekiel 28).

(3.) The only other notice in the Old Testament of trade between the Phoenicians and the Israelites is in the account given by the prophet Ezekiel of the trade of Tyre (Eze 27:17). While this account supplies valuable information respecting the various commercial dealings of that most illustrious of Phoenician cities, SEE TYRE, it likewise makes direct mention of the exports to it from Palestine. These were wheat, honey (i.e., sirup of grapes), oil, and balm. The export of wheat deserves attention [concerning the other exports, SEE BALM; SEE HONEY; SEE OIL, ] because it shows how important it must have been to the Phoenicians to maintain friendly relations with their Hebrew neighbors, and especially with the adjoining kingdom of Israel. The wheat is called wheat of Minnith (q.v.), which was a town of the Ammonites, on the other side of the Jordan, only once mentioned elsewhere in the Bible: and it is not certain whether Minnith was a great inland emporium, where large purchases of corn were made, or whether the wheat in its neighborhood was peculiarly good, and gave its name to all wheat of a certain fineness in quality. Still, whatever may be the correct explanation respecting Minnith, the only countries specified for exports of wheat are Judah and Israel, and it was through the territory of Israel that the wheat would be imported into Phoenicia. It is suggested by Heeren (in his Historical Researches, 2:117) that the fact of Palestine being thus, as it were, the granary of Phoenicia, explains in the clearest manner the lasting peace that prevailed between the two countries. He observes that with many of the other adjoining nations the Jews lived in a state of almost continual warfare; but that they never once engaged in hostilities with their nearest neighbors the Phoenicians. The fact itself is certainly worthy of special notice; and is the more remarkable, as there were not wanting tempting occasions for the interference of the Phoenicians in Palestine if they desired it.

When Elijah at the brook Kishon, at the distance of not more than thirty miles in a straight line from Tyre, put to death 450 prophets of Baal (1Ki 18:40), we can well conceive the agitation and anger which such a deed must have produced at Tyre. At Sidon, more especially, which was only twenty miles farther distant from the scene of slaughter, the first impulse of the inhabitants must have been to march forth at once in battle array to strengthen the hands of Jezebel, their own princess, in behalf of Baal, their Phoenician god. When again afterwards, by means of falsehood and treachery, Jehu was enabled to massacre the worshippers of Baal in the land of Israel, we cannot doubt that the intelligence was received in Tyre, Sidon, and the other cities of Phoenicia, with a similar burst of horror and  indignation to that with which the news of the massacre on St. Bartholomew's day was received in all Protestant countries; and there must have been an intense desire in the Phoenicians, if they had the power, to invade the territories of Israel without delay and inflict signal chastisement on Jehu (2Ki 10:18-28). The fact that Israel was their granary would undoubtedly have been an element in restraining the Phoenicians, even on occasions such as these; but probably still deeper motives were likewise at work. It seems to have been part of the settled policy of the Phoenician cities to avoid attempts to make conquests on the continent of Asia. For this there were excellent reasons in the position of their small territory, which, with the range of Lebanon on one side as a barrier, and the sea on the other, was easily defensible by a wealthy power having command of the sea, against second or third rate powers, but for the same reason was not well situated for offensive war on the land side. It mav be added that a pacific policy was their manifest interest as a commercial nation, unless by war they were morally certain to obtain an important accession of territory, or unless a warlike policy was an absolute necessity to prevent the formidable preponderance of any one great neighbor. At last, indeed, they even carried their system of non-intervention in continental wars too far, if it would have been possible for them by any alliances in Syria and Coele-Syria to prevent the establishment on the other side of the Lebanon of one great empire. For from that moment their ultimate doom was certain, and it was merely a question of time as to the arrival of the fatal hour when they would lose their independence. But too little is known of the details of their history to warrant an opinion as to whether they might at any time by any course of policy have raised up a barrier against the empire of the Assyrians or Chaldees. SEE COMMERCE.

The impulse given to industry and the arts by this almost unparalleled extension of the commercial sphere of the Phoenicians was enormous. Originally exporters or traders only for the wares of Egypt and Assyria, they soon began to manufacture these wares themselves, and drew the whole world into their circle of commerce. As to the early and most extensive commercial intercourse between Phoenicia and Greece and her colonies, nothing can be more striking than the circumstance of nearly all the Greek names for the principal objects of Oriental commerce being Phoenician, or rather Shemitic; identical, almost, with the terms found in the Old Testament. The descriptions of the abundance of precious metals  verge on the fabulous. Thus, the Phoenicians are supposed to have made even their anchors of silver, when they first discovered the mines, not knowing how to stow away all the silver in their vessel. What must have been the state of these mines is clear from the fact that even in the Roman time 40,000 men were constantly employed as miners, and the state received a clear revenue of 20,500 drachms daily. The "Fortunate Islands," which, according to Diodorus, they discovered after many days' sailing along the coast of Africa, beyond the Pillars of Hercules, and which, to judge from the name Purpurariae given to some islands off the coast of Mauritania, would seem to have been the Canaries, yielded them the shell- fish purpura, so useful for their dyeing manufactories. Besides their wholesale commerce carried on by fleets and caravans, they also appear to have' gone about the interior of Syria and Palestine, retailing their home or foreign produce.

What degree of perfection they had reached in metallurgy may be seen in the minute description of the mining process contained in Job (Job 28:1-11), probably derived from mines which they worked in the Lebanon, Cyprus, Thasos, Iberia, Tartessus, and wherever a trace of metal was found. That they had acquired a high standing in what we should call the fine arts may be gathered from the fact that not only architects, but skilful workers of all kinds, for the adornment and embellishment of the Temple, were sent for by Solomon when he intended to fulfil the task his father David had set himself, in all the magnificence and splendor worthy of his golden reign. Their sculptures — what there has been found of them-do not, it is true. give us a very high notion of their artistic perfection; but, for all we know, these may be only the archaic beginnings, or the remnants of a corrupt age or unskilful hands. Better things may come to light any day. There certainly exist some exceedingly skilful engravings of theirs on gems among the Assyrian remnants.

We further know (comp. the gold-edged silver bowl, for instance, given to Telemachus by Menelaos, which had been previously given to Hephaestos by the king of the Sidonians; the silver vase offered by Achilles as a prize at the funeral games for Patroclus; the columns and the magnificent vessels cast for the Temple of Jerusalem by Tyrian artists, and the like) that they manufactured all kinds of beautiful vessels and ornaments in gold, silver, and ivory, and knew how to extract perfumes from the lily and cypress; but, as in every other respect, they must in this province also be declared to have been only the skilful appropriators of the knowledge of others, of which, however, they made use with a diligence and perseverance entirely unparalleled.  In broadly recapitulating the routes their vessels took around the earth, we have indicated the line of their colonization. We cannot do more in this place than hint at the wanderings of Baal (q.v.), Astarte (q.v.), and Melkarth (q.v.), as the principal allegories in which the myth couched the primitive traditions of their settlements abroad. The whole of the Mediterranean, with its islands and coast, had been made theirs by rapid strides. Commencing with neighboring Cyprus, they proceeded to Cythium, to Rhodes, Crete, the Cycladic and Sporadic Isles, Cilicia, Lycia, and Caria, Chios, Samos, Tenedos, Bithynia, the Euxine, Samothrace, Lemnos, Thasos (whither they had come "in search of Europa"), Boeotia, and Euboea. More difficult was the occupation of Sicily and the neighboring islands, where Motya, Machanetti, Panormus, and other cities, testify to their successful settlements. Thence also, by way of Malta, they sailed to Africa, and founded Carthage, which afterwards possessed herself of all the colonies in Sicily, Sardinia, and Spain. In Sardinia and the Balearic Islands they had commercial establishments at Caralis (Cagliari), Minorca, Iviza, Elba. Spain was one of their earliest and principal settlements, where they founded Cadiz, Malago, Belon, Abdarach, and other cities. It is also more than probable, although we have no distinct evidence on the point, that they had colonies in the tin districts of Cornwall and the Scilly Isles, as also on the Baltic. They settled, further, both on the north-west coast of Africa (Mauritania, Cerne), and on its north coast (Hippo, Utica, Leptis, Hadrumetum). How far Phcenicians may have had a more than temporary sojourn in India (Ophir =? Abhira), whither they went by way of the Red Sea, we are unable to determine at present.

5. Religion. — The same lack of genuine and authentic information, of which we have spoken before, baffles our endeavors to arrive at anything like a proper understanding of the real character of the religion of the Phcenicians. The mutilated scraps contained in classical writers can be of as little use for its full reconstruction as the uncertain allusions of the Bible. As to Sanchoniatho. extracts of whose Phoenician writings (in Philo of Byblus's Greek version) are, as has been mentioned above, supposed to have survived in Eusebius, all that can be said regarding them is that we have more than ample reasons to suspect both the author, the translator, and the Church father, not of wilful misinterpretation, but of a certain want of candor in doing that full and fair justice to both sides which we expect from a historian of our day. A few broken votive and sacrificial stones, a few coins and unshapely images, make up the rest of our sources of  information for the present. A few years hence, however, we may, if our excavations are carried on with unflagging zeal, and are as successful as they have been of late years, have as ample a supply to work upon as we have now respecting the once-hardly fifteen years ago-much more unknown land of Nebuchadnezzar and Sennacherib, if not with respect even to Greece and Rome. It will be sufficient here to indicate that Phoenician, like Canaanitic religion, in general consisted in a worship of the powers of nature under their favorable or creative (=female), and unfavorable or destroying, yet also begetting ( =male) aspects. Still more concretely were these represented in the different phases of life, as child (Adonis), youth (Esmun), man (Baal-Hercules), or old man (Belitan); again, as kings (Moloch) or queens (Astarte), and other characters most fitting to the idea symbolized in them.

Their chief (visible) representatives — the sun, the moon, the planets, and the elements were revered as supreme deities, who, at the same time, were also the special Numina of particular tribes; places, and seasons, and some of their general designations, such as King (מל)ִ, Lord (אדון), Almighty (אל), etc., are also found in the Bible. To the supreme class of deities (ועליונות עליונים:) belong Baal and Astarte, with their different attributes and ramifications, e.g. Baalsamim, בעל שמיםΖεύς Ο᾿λύμπιος, Optimus Maximus, Baalitan, Baal Ram, Baal Mon; Baal Melkarth, מל ִקרתא, king of the city (Tyre); Astarte=Tanith, תנת, generally with the epithet רבת, the great one, who appears identical with the Egypto-Persian warand moon-goddess Tanaith. Corresponding to this triad in the Syro-Sidonian worship, we meet in Northern Phoenicia with the two Sidonian tribes: El (אל) or Kronos, the founder of Byblus and Berytus; Baaltis (בעלתי, my lady) Aphrodite (Astronoe, Beruth); and Adonis (Gauas, Eljun, Esmun, etc.). Besides other well-known deities, such as Moloch and Dagon (Derketo, Atergatis) — for all of which we refer to the special articles treating of them — we find a certain mysterious number of minor gods, variously denominated the strong ones (Kabiri), or the children of the Just One (Zadik, כביר צדיק), the principal patrons of the seafarers, worshipped alike by all the Phoenician tribes (Dioscuri, Paetaci: Chusor- Phtha [Chusartis], Astarte, Cadmus [קדם] or Taaut, Adod, and principally Esmun [ אשמן=JEsculapius]). These, together with the infernal oi Chthonic deities, Muth ( מות=death), further a goddess known only to us as " Persephone" (daughter of Jephta with the Samaritan Sichemites), or  Dido ( נדידה=the wandering one), or generally Elothi= my lady, my goddess, etc., are, as far as we know at present, the chief representatives of the Pheenician Pantheon, which, be it observed by the way, appears to have been almost as catholic in the reception of foreign deities as that of imperial Rome. Like the Greeks, and after them the Romans, the Phoenicians also deified certain natural phenomena and "elements" (sun, moon, stars, water, fire, earth, air), personal attributes, abstract ideas, allegories, the seasons of life, of the year, of the day, trades and professions, and even animals; probably as symbols only at first. The serpent (Agathodaemon, Esmun, Typhon), the bull (Ashteroth-Karnaim), the lion, the ass (symbol of Shemitic Baal-worship), the dog, fishes, doves, goats, etc., are found either representing divinities, or merely sacred to them. Anything like an investigation into the various phases of Phoenician mythology, which, stretching from the remotest prehistoric days far into the first Christian centuries, must needs contain the most contradictory, apparently irreconcilable, elements and data, lies beyond the scope of this article. We shall only mention that Sanchoniatho distinguishes — a sure sign of the consciousness on the part of native writers of the hopeless confusion in the religious notions and traditions of their time — three periods or aeras, with distinct circles of deities of special classes and families. The first period contains twelve families of gods. In the second three dynasties follow each other, and there are twenty-two supreme deities (according to the letters of the Phoenician alphabet), at the head of whom stands El or Kronos, etc., as follows:

א, El, Kronos. בBaityl. ט, Astarte. ע, Apollo. גDagon. י, Rhea. פ, Pontos. ד, Atlas. כ, Baaltis. צ, Typhon. ה, Persephone. ל, Heimarmeue. ק, Nereus. ו, Athene. מ, Hora. ר, Sido. ז, Zeus Demarus. נ, Kronos. ש, Poseidon. ח, Sadid. ס, Zeus Belus. ת, Hadod.

Of the third period only fragments of Sanchoniatho have come down, but it would appear as if Zeus Belus had in this assumed the chief rank, equal to Kronos of the second period. These gods and goddesses were propitiated in various ways, but chiefly by sacrifices, which consisted on certain  occasions of first-born male children (העביר למול)ִ. Prostitution (זקדש) in honor of Astarte was considered another praiseworthy act. Among the rites of sacrifice and expiation must also be enumerated circumcision, which was not practiced with all the Phoenician tribes, but seems to have been a ceremony peculiar to the worshippers of El, the special deity of Berytus and Byblus. Whether, however, as has been held, it is to be considered analogous to this prostitution of virgins in the service of Astarte, we shall not here investigate. The country abounded with places of worship, for every grove and every height, every river and every well, were adapted for the purpose, if it could be fancied a dwelling-place for some deity. SEE IDOLATRY.

Nor were special buildings (sanctuaries, temples), with all their accessories of arks and priests, wells and fires, wanting; as indeed the Phoenicians are supposed to have been the first who erected such permanent sanctuaries. Their construction was in accordance with their destination, which was not to be houses of prayer, but the seat of honor of the special deity. They were divided into two parts, the first of which contained the statues and symbols which were the objects of public worship. The second, the Adyton, on the other hand, contained such symbols which were not to be seen constantly, but were reserved for certain special festive occasions; besides the holy arks with their mystical contents, and the holy vehicles upon which these sacred objects were carried about. The walls were covered with the symbolical representations of the deities; and in this place also the priests kept their archives. Something of the abhorrence of all visible representations of the Deity which seems in the first stages of their existence to have filled the minds of all Shemitic nations — an abhorrence erroneously taken of late to indicate their monotheistic propensity (comp. Renan's and Munk's Inaugural Lectures) — is also noticeable with the Phoenicians, whose gods were legion. No paintings, statues, or other likenesses of deities are recorded as found in the ancient temples of Gades, Tyre, Samaria, Paphos, etc. There were, however, certain symbolical columns of wood, אשרים(for the female Numen, Astarte), of stone, מצבות(for Baal), of gold or emerald (חמנים), together with phallic representations, found in and before the Phoenician sanctuaries. Another kind of divine mementos, as it were, were the Betylia (בית אל), probably meteors, for which a fetich-like reverence was shown, and which were called by the names of Father, Mighty Father (אדרי אב אב), and at the time of Augustine there were still a number of priests engaged in Punic Africa to wait upon these idols and to elicit  oracles from them (Eucaddirs). Among the principal festivals, with some of which, as with those of the Hebrews, were connected pilgrimages -from the farthest colonies even are the "awakening" and the "self-destruction by fire" of Hercules, a certain festival of "staves," a vintage-feast in honor of the Tyrian Bacchus, and certain others in honor of Astarte, celebrating her disappearance, flight, and wanderings, the Adonia, etc. An account of the different Phoenician gods named in the Bible will be found elsewhere (SEE ASHERAH; SEE ASHTAROTH; SEE BAAL, etc.), but it will be proper here to point out certain effects which the circumstance of their being worshipped in Phoenicia produced upon the Hebrews.

(1.) In the first place, their worship was a constant temptation to polytheism and idolatry. It is the general tendency of trade, by making merchants acquainted with different countries and various modes of thought, to enlarge the mind, to promote the increase of knowledge, and, in addition, by the wealth which it diffuses, to afford opportunities in various ways for intellectual culture. It can scarcely be doubted that, owing to these circumstances, the Phoenicians, as a great commercial people, were more generally intelligent, and as we should now say civilized, than the inland agricultural population of Palestine. When the simple-minded Jews, therefore, came in contact with a people more versatile and, apparently, more enlightened than themselves, but who nevertheless, either in a philosophical or in a popular form, admitted a system of polytheism, an influence would be exerted on Jewish minds, tending to make them regard their exclusive devotion to their own one God, Jehovah, however transcendent his attributes, as unsocial and morose. It is in some such way that we must account for the astonishing fact that Solomon himself, the wisest of the Hebrew race, to whom Jehovah is expressly stated to have appeared twiceonce, not long after his marriage with an Egyptian princess, on the night after his sacrificing 1000 burntofferings on the high place of Gibeon, and the second time after the consecration of the Temple-should have been so far beguiled by his wives in his old age as to become a Polytheist, worshipping, among other deities, the Phoenician or Sidonian goddess Ashtoreth (1Ki 3:1-5; 1Ki 9:2; 1Ki 11:1-5). This is not for a moment to be so interpreted as if he ever ceased to worship Jehovah, to whom he had erected the magnificent Temple, which in history is so generally connected with Solomon's name. Probably, according to his. own erroneous conceptions, he never ceased to regard himself as a loyal worshipper of Jehovah, but he at the same time deemed this not  incompatible with sacrificing at the altars of other gods likewise. Still the fact remains that Solomon, who by his Temple in its ultimate results did so much for establishing the doctrine of one only God, became himself a practical Polytheist. If this was the case with him, polytheism in other sovereigns of inferior excellence can excite no surprise. With such an example before him, it is no wonder that Ahab, an essentially bad man, should after his marriage with a Sidonian princess not only openly tolerate, but encourage the worship of Baal; though it is to be remembered even in him that he did not disavow the authority of Jehovah, but, when rebuked by his great antagonist Elijah, he rent his clothes and put sackcloth on his flesh, and showed other signs of contrition evidently deemed sincere (1Ki 16:31; 1Ki 21:27-29). Finally, it is to be observed generally that although, before the reformation of Josiah (2 Kings 23), polytheism prevailed in Judah as well as Israel, yet it seems to have been more intense and universal in Israel, as might have been expected from its greater proximity to Phoenicia; and Israel is sometimes spoken of as if it had set the bad example to Judah (2Ki 17:19; Jer 3:8); though, considering the example of Solomon, this cannot be accepted as a strict historical statement.

(2.) The Phoenician religion was likewise in other respects deleterious to the inhabitants of Palestine, being in some points essentially demoralizing. For example, it sanctioned the dreadful superstition of burning children as sacrifices to a Phoenician god. "They have built also," says Jeremiah, in the name of Jehovah (Jer 19:5), "the high places of Baal, to burn their sons with fire for burnt-offerings unto Baal, which I commanded not, nor spake it, neither came it into my mind" (comp. Jer 32:35). This horrible custom was probably in its origin founded on the idea of sacrificing to a god what was most valuable in the eyes of the suppliant; but it could not exist without having a tendency to stifle natural feelings of affection, and to harden the heart. It could scarcely have been first adopted otherwise than in the infancy of the Phcenician race; but grown-up men and grown-up nations, with their moral feelings in other respects cultivated, are often the slaves in particular points of an early implanted superstition, and it is worthy of note that, more than two hundred and fifty years after the death of Jeremiah, the Carthaginians, when their city was besieged by Agathocles, offered as burntsacrifices to the planet Saturn, at the public expense, two hundred boys of the highest aristocracy; and, subsequently, when they had obtained a victory, sacrificed the most beautiful captives in  the like manner (Diod. 20:14, 65). If such things were possible among the Carthaginians at a period so much later, it is easily conceivable how common the practice of sacrificing children may have been at the time of Jeremiah among the Phoenicians generally; and if this were so, it would have been certain to prevail among the Israelites who worshipped the same Phoenician gods; especially as, owing to the intermarriages of their forefathers with Canaanites, there were probably few Israelites who may not have had some Phoenician blood in their veins (Jdg 3:5). Again, parts of the Phoenician religion, especially the worship of Astarte, tended to encourage dissoluteness in the relations of the sexes, and even to sanctify impurities of the most abominable description. Connected with her temples and images there were male and female prostitutes. whose polluted gains formed part of the sacred fund appropriated to the service of the goddess; and, to complete the deification of immorality, they were even known by the name of the "consecrated." Nothing can show more clearly how deeply this baneful example had eaten into the hearts and habits of the people, notwithstanding positive prohibitions and the repeated denunciations of the Hebrew prophets, than the almost incredible fact that, previous to the reformation of Josiah, this class of persons was allowed to have houses or tents close to the temple of Jehovah, whose treasury was perhaps even replenished by their gains (2Ki 23:7; Deu 23:17-18; 1Ki 14:24; 1Ki 15:12; 1Ki 22:46; Hos 4:14; Job 36:14; comp. Lucian, Lucius, c. 35; De Dea Syrd, c. 27, 51; Gesenius, Thesuarus, s.v. קָדֵשׁ, page 1196; Movers, Phon. 1:678, etc.; Spencer, De Legibus Hebraeorum, 1:561).

A few words may be added here on Phoenician theogony and cosmogony, which, as far as they are known to us, give evidence of the enormous amount of thought bestowed by the thinkers of that people on the enigma of creation. The Deity was, in accordance with the antique mind, presupposed. Speculation never questioned its eternal existence, the original quality of each of its two principal — male and female — sides, and the way in which, out of their union, sprang the universe. According to the system of Eudemus, Time, Desire, and Mist formed the first triad of existence; and from the embrace of the last two sprang air and "motion of air," out of which again was produced the mundane egg. The cosmogony, according to Sanchoniatho on the other hand, assumes, in the beginning of all things, a gloomy and agitated air, and a turbid chaos of thickest darkness, which for a long course of ages was without limits. The wind  becoming enamoured with its own essence, Mot sprang into being, as a kind of thick, putrid fluid, which contained all germs. The first beings created from this were without intellect; and from them, again, came intellectual beings, Zopha-Semin (צופי שמים), watchmen, or beholders of the heavens. "And it began to shine Mot, also the sun and the moon, the stars and the great planets. The glowing sun, heating sea and earth, raised vapors, which produced clouds and winds, lightning and thunder, and at their crash the beings began to awake in terror, and male and female moved on land and sea." The wind Kolpia further produced with Baau ( בֹּהוּof Genesis) Aion and Protogonos, the first mortals. Aion first discovered the art of nutriment from fruit-trees; and their children, Genos and Genea, who dwelt in Phcenicia, first worshipped Baalsamin, or the sun. Genos begat Light, Fire, and Flame, out of whom came giants, Cassius, Libanus, Antilibanus, and Brathys. Their sons invented the art of constructing huts of reeds and meshes and the papyrus, and the art of making coverings for the body out of the skins of wild beasts. After them came the inventors of hunting and fishing, the discoverers of iron, of the art of navigation, etc. One of their descendants was Elyon (probably the Goda whose priest was Melchisedec, Gen 14:18, etc.; Abraham, in his reply to the king of Sodom, emphatically adds "Jehovah" to El-Elyon), who with his wife Beruth begat an Autochthon, afterwards called Uranos (heaven), and his sister Ge (earth). They had issue four sons, Ibis, Betylus, Dagon, and Atlas; and three daughters, Astarte, Rhea, and Dione. Chronos deposed his father, subsequently killed him, and travelled about in the world. He then assigned the whole of Phoenicia to Astarte, to Athene he gave Attica, and to Taut Egypt. The country being involved in war, he offered up his two sons, Jeud and Muth (מות, Pluto), in expiation. He afterwards bestowed the city of Byblus upon the goddess Baaltis (Dione), and Berytus upon Poseidon and the Kabiri. Taut made the first images of the countenances of the gods Chronos and Dagon, and formed the sacred characters of the other elements; and the Kabiri, the seven sons of Sydyc, and their eighth brother Asklepios, first set them down in memory. "Thabion," Eusebius (Pr. Ev. 1:10) continues, "the first hierophant, allegorized these things subsequently, and, mixing the facts with physical and mundane phenomena, he delivered them down to those that celebrated orgia, and to the prophets who presided over the mysteries, and to their successors, one of whom was Isiris, the inventor of three letters, the brother of Chna, the first Phoenician."

6. Language. — The most important intellectual invention of man, that of letters, was universally asserted by the Greeks and Romans to have been communicated by the Phoenicians to the Greeks. The earliest written statement on the subject is in Herodotus (5:57, 58), who incidentally, in giving an account of Harmodius and Aristogeiton, says that they were by race Gephyraeans; and that he had ascertained by inquiry that the Gephyraeans were Phoenicians, among those Phoenicians who came over with Cadmus into Bceotia, and instructing the Greeks in many other arts and sciences, taught them likewise letters. It was an easy step from this to believe, as many of the ancients believed, that the Phoenicians invented letters (Lucan, Pharsal. 3:220, 221). This belief, however, was not universal; and Pliny the Elder expresses his own opinion that they were of Assyrian origin, while he relates the opinion of Gellius that they were invented by the Egyptians, and of others that they were invented by the Syrians (Nat. Hist. 7:57). Now, as Phoenician has been shown to be nearly the same language as Hebrew, the question arises whether Hebrew throws any light on the time or the mode of the invention of letters, on the question of who invented them, or on the universal belief of antiquity that the knowledge of them was communicated to the Greeks by the Phoenicians. The answer is as follows: Hebrew literature is as silent as Greek literature respecting the precise date of the invention of letters, and the name of the inventor or inventors; but the names of the letters in the Hebrew alphabet are in accordance with the belief that the Phoenicians communicated the knowledge of letters to the Greeks: for many of the names of letters in the Greek alphabet, though without meaning in the Greek, have a meaning in the corresponding letters of Hebrew. For example: the first four letters of the Greek alphabet, Alpha, Beta, Gamma, Delta, are not to be explained through the Greek language; but the corresponding first four letters of the Hebrew alphabet, viz. Aleph, Beth, Gimel, Daleth, being essentially the same words, are to be explained in Hebrew. Thus in Hebrew Aleph or Eleph means an ox; Beth or Bayith a house; Gamal, a camel; and Deleth a door. The same is essentially, though not always so clearly, the case with almost all the sixteen earliest Greek letters said to have been brought over from Phoenicia by Cadmus, Α Β Γ Δ Ε Γ Ι Κ Λ Μ Ν Ο Π Ρ Σ Τ; and called on this account Phoenician or Cadmeian letters (Herodot. l.c.; Pliny, Hist. Nat. 7:57; Jelf, Greek Gram. 1, page 2). The sixth letter, afterwards disused, and now generally known by the name of Digamma (from Dionysius, 1:20), was unquestionably the same as the Hebrew letter Vav (a hook). Moreover, as to writing, the  ancient Hebrew letters, substantially the same as Phoenician, agree closely with ancient Greek letters — a fact which, taken by itself, would not prove that the Greeks received them from the Phoenicians, as the Phoenicians might possibly have received them from the Greeks; but which, viewed in conniection with Greek traditions on the subject, and with the significance of the letters in Hebrew, seems reasonably conclusive that the letters were transported from Phoenicia into Greece. It is true that modern Hebrew writing and the later Greek writing of antiquity have not much resemblance to each other; but this is owing partly to gradual changes in the writing of Greek letters, and partly to the fact that the character in which Hebrew Bibles are now printed, called the Assyrian or square character, was not the one originally in use among the Jews, but seems to have been learned in the Babylonian captivity, and afterwards gradually adopted by them on their return to Palestine (Gesenius, Gesch. der Hebraischen Sprache und Schrift, page 156). SEE ALPHABET

As to the mode in which letters were invented, some clew is afforded by some of the early Hebrew and the Phoenician characters, which evidently aimed, although very rudely, like the drawing of very young children, to represent the object which the name of the letter signified. Thus the earliest Alpha has some vague resemblance to an ox's head, Gimel to a camel's back, Daleth to the door of a tent, Vav to a hook or peg. Again, the written letters, called respectively, Lamed (an ox-goad), Ayin (an eye), Qoph (the back of the head), Resh or Rosh (the head), and Tav (a cross), are all efforts, more or less successful, to portray the things signified by the names. It is said that this is equally true of Egyptian phonetic hieroglyphics; but, however this may be, there is no difficulty in understanding in this way the formation of an alphabet; When the idea of representing the component sounds or half-sounds of a word by figures was once conceived. But the original idea of thus representing sounds, though peculiarly felicitous, was by no means obvious, and millions of men have lived and died without its occurring to any one of them.

It may not be unimportant to observe that, although ro many letters of the Greek alphabet have a meaning in Hebrew or Phoenician, yet their Greek names are not in the Hebrew or Phoenician, but in the Aramaic form. There is a peculiar form of the noun in Aramaic called by grammarians the status emphaticus, in which. the termination a ( א)is added to a noun, modifying it according to certain laws. Originally this termination was probably  identical with the definite article "ha;" which, instead of being prefixed, was subjoined to the noun, as is the case now with the definite article in the Scandinavian languages. This form in a is found to exist in the oldest specimen of Aramaic in the Bible, Yegar sahadutha, in Gen 31:47, where sahaduth, testimony, is used by Laban in the status enmphaticus. Now it is worthy of note that the names of a considerable proportion of the "Cadmeian letters" in the Greek alphabet are in this Aramaic form. such as Alpha, Beta, Gamma, Delta, Eta, Theta, Iota, Kappa, Lambda; and although this fact by itself is not sufficient to support an elaborate theory on the subject, it seems in favor, as far as it goes, of the conjecture that when the Greeks originally received the knowledge of letters, the names by which the several letters were taught to them were Aramaic. It has been suggested, indeed, by Gesenius, that the Greeks themselves made the addition in all these cases, in order to give the words a Greek termination, as "they did with other Phoenician words, as melet, μάλθα, nebel, νάβλα." If, however, a list is examined of Phoenician words naturalized in Greek, it will not be found that the ending in a has been the favorite mode of accommodating them to the Greek language. For example, of the words specified by Bleek (Einleitung in das A.T. page 69) as having been communicated through the Phoenicians to the Greeks (see above), it is remarkable that only four end in a in Greek which have not a similar termination in Hebrew; and of these four one is a late Alexandrian translation, and two are names of musical instruments, which, very probably. may first have been communicated to Greeks, through Syrians, in Asia Minor. Under any circumstances, the proportion of the Phoenician words which end in a in Greek is too small to warrant the inference that any common practice of the Greeks in this respect will account for the seeming fact that nine out of the sixteen Cadmneian letters are in the Aramaic status emphaticus. The inference, therefore, from their endings in a remains unshaken. Still this must not be regarded in any way as proving that the alphabet was invented by those who spoke the Aramaic language. This is a wholly distinct question, and far more obscure; though much deference on the point is due to the opinion of Gesenius, who, from the internal evidence of the names of the Shemitic letters, has arrived at the conclusion that they were invented by the Phoenicians (Paliographie, page 294). The strongest argument of Gesenius against the Aramaic invention of the letters is that, although doubtless many of the names are both Aramaic and Hebrew, some of them are not Aramaic — at least not in the Hebrew signification; while the Syrians use other words to express the same ideas.  Thus אלin Aramaic means only 1000, and not an ox; the word for "door" in Aramaic is not דלת, but תרע; while the six following names of Cadmeian letters are not Aramaic: פא מִיַם יוֹד וו(Syr. פּוּם), קוֹ, תו.

As this obviously leads to the conclusion that the Hebrews adopted Phoenician as their own language, or, in other words, that what is called the Hebrew language was in fact "the language of Canaan," as a prophet called it (Isa 19:18), and this not merely poetically, but literally and in philological truth; and as this is repugnant to some preconceived notions respecting the peculiar people, the question arises whether the Israelites might not have translated Canaanitish names into Hebrew. On this hypothesis the names now existing in the Bible for persons and places in the land of Canaan would not be the original names, but merely the translations of those names. The answer to this question is,

1. That there is not the slightest direct mention, nor any indirect trace, in the Bible, of any such translation.

2. That it is contrary to the analogy of the ordinary Hebrew practice in other cases: as, for example, in reference to the names of the Assyrian monarchs (perhaps of a foreign dynasty) Pul, Tiglath-Pileser, Sennacherib, or of the Persian monarchs Darius, Ahasuerus, Artaxerxes, which remain unintelligible in Hebrew, and can only be understood through other Oriental languages.

3. That there is an absolute silence in the Bible as to there having been any difference whatever in language between the Israelites and the Canaanites, although in other cases where a difference existed that difference is somewhere alluded to, as in the case of the Egyptians (Psa 81:5; Psa 114:1), the Assyrians (Isaiah 20:6, 11), and the Chaldees (Jer 5:15). Yet in the case of the Canaanites there was stronger reason for alluding to it; and without some allusion to it, if it had existed, the narration of the conquest of Canaan under the leadership of Joshua would have been singularly imperfect.

The Phoenician language, however, certainly belonged to that family of languages which, by a name not altogether free from objection, but now generally adopted, is called "Shemitic." Under this name are included three distinct branches:

a. Arabic, to which belongs AEthiopic as all offshoot of the Southern Arabic or Himyaritic.

b. Aramaic, the vernacular language of Palestine at the time of Christ. in which the few original words of Christ which have been preserved in writing appear to have been spoken (Mat 27:46; Mar 5:41; and mark especially Mat 16:18, which is not fully significant either in Greek or Hebrew). Aramaic, as used in Christian literature, is called Syriac, and as used in the writings of the Jews has been very generally called Chaldee.

c. Hebrew, in which by far the greater part of the Old Testament was composed. Now one of the most interesting points to the Biblical student connected with Phoenician, is, that it does not belong to either of the'first two branches, but to the third; and that it is in fact so closely allied to Hebrew that Phoenician and Hebrew, though different dialects, may practically be regarded as the same language. This may be shown in the following way:

(1.) In passages which have been frequently quoted (see especially Gesenii Monumenta Scripturae Linguaeque Phoenicie, page 231), testimony is borne to the kinship of the two languages by Augustine and Jerome, in whose time Phoenician or Carthaginian was still a living language. Jerome, who was a good Hebrew scholar, after mentioning, in his Commentaries on Jeremiah (lib. 5, c. 25) that Carthage was a Phoenician colony, proceeds to state, "Unde et Poeni sermone corrupto quasi Phoeni appellantur, quorum lingua Hebreaea linguse magna ex parte confinis est." Augustine, who was a native of Africa, and a bishop there of Hippo, a Tyrian colony, has left on record a similar statement several times. In one passage he says of the two languages, "Istse linguae non multum inter se differunt" (Quaestiones in Heptateuchum, 7:16). In another passage he says, "Cognatae sunt istse linguae et vicinae, Hebraea, et Punica, et Syra" (In Joann. Tract. 15). Again, on Gen 18:9, he says of a certain mode of speaking (Gen 8:9), "Locutio est, quam propterea Hebraeam puto, quia et Punicae linguae familiarissima est, in quamulta invenimus Hebraeis verbis consonantia" (lib. 1, cap. 24). On another occasion, remarking on the word Messias, he says, "Quod verbum Punicae linguae consonum est, sicut alia Hebraea multa et poene omnia" (Contra literas Petiliani, 2, c. 104).

(2.) These statements are fully confirmed by a passage of Carthaginian preserved in the Penulus of Plautus (Acts 5, scene 1), and accompanied by a Latin translation as part of the play. There is no doubt that the Carthaginians and the Phoenicians were the same race; and the Carthaginian extract is undenliably intelligible through Hebrew to Hebrew scholars (see Bochart's Canaan; and especially Gesenii Monumenta Phaeniiie, pages 357-382, where the passage is translated with notes, and full justice is done to the previous translation of Bochart).

(3.) The close kinship of the two languages is, moreover, strikingly confirmed by very many Phoenician and Carthaginian names of places and persons, which, destitute of meaning in Greek and Latin, through which languages they have become widely known, and having sometimes in those languages occasioned false etymologies, become really significant in Hebrew. Thus through Hebrew it is known that Tyre, as Ts6r, signifies "a rock," referring doubtless to the rocky island on which the city was situated: that Sidon, as Tsidon, means "Fishing" or "Fishery," which was probably the occupation of its first settlers: that Carthage, or, as it was originally called, "Carthada," means "New Town," or “Newton:" and that Byrsa, which, as a Greek name, suggested the mythological mythus of the Bull's Hide (AEneid, 1:366, 367), was simply the citadel of Carthage — "Carthaginis arcem," as Virgil accurately termed it: the Carthaginian name of it, softened by the Greeks into Βύρσα, being merely the Hebrew word Botsrah, "citadel;" identical with the word called Bozrah in the English Version of Isa 63:1. Again, through Hebrew, the names of celebrated Carthaginians, though sometimes disfigured by Greek and Roman writers, acquire a meaning. Thus Dido is found to belong to the same root as David, “beloved;" meaning "his love" or "delight:" i.e., the love or delight either of Baal or of her husband: Hasdrubal is the man "whose help Baal is:" Hamilcar the man whom the god "Milcar graciously granted" (comp. Hananeel; θεόδωρος): and, with the substitution of Baal for El or God. the name of the renowned Hannibal is found to be identical in form and meanifig with the name of Hanniel, who is mentioned in Num 34:23 as the prince of the tribe of Manasseh: Hanniel meaning the grace of God, and Hannibal the grace of Baal.

(4.) The same conclusion arises from the examination of Phoenician inscriptions, preserved to the present day; all of which can be interpreted, with more or less certainty, through Hebrew. Some of these will be more particularly noticed below.

III. Literature. —

1. Original Remains. — With the exception of Greek and Latin, no language was so widely known and spoken throughout antiquity as the Phoenician; and monuments of it have been found, and contiuue to be found, almost all over the ancient world. We can only vaguely speculate on its early history and its various phases, so long as our materials yield so little information on that point. Its decline seems to date from the 8th century B.C., when Aramaisms crept in in overwhelming numbers. Finally, the close contact with, and the everywhere preponderating influence of the Greeks, superseded — chiefly after Alexander's time — the ancient language almost completely; and even coins with Phoenician legends occur not later than the 2d century B.C.

An important Phoenician literature seems to have been extant as late as the 1st century A.D., but it has disappeared from the face of the earth. After the second half of the 3d century the language had vanished entirely in the country itself, and Jerome, who lived in Palestine, mentions the Punic, but never the Phoenician. In the West it survived to a much later period. In Mauritania and Numidia it remained, in a corrupted form, the reigning tongue as late as the 4th century A.D.; and Augustine draws his explanations of Scripture from the Punic current in the 5th century. There was a translation of the whole Bible into Punic made for the use of the Punic churches; and in and near Tripolis it was the language of the common people up to a late period. From the 6th century, however, it rapidly died out, chiefly in consequence of the Vandals, Goths, Moors, and other foreign tribes overrunning the country, and ingrafting their own idioms upon it.

The literature of Phoenicia, in its original form, has, as we have said, perished entirely. What traces and fragments we have of it have survived in Greek translations. But from even these small remnants we can easily imagine the extreme antiquity, and the high importance and vast extent of these productions, which, at first, seem to have been chiefly of a theological or theogonical nature. Their authors are the gods themselves, and the writings are only accessible to the priests, and to those initiated in the mysteries. From the allegoridal explanations of these exalted personages sprang a new branch of sacred literature, of which those fragments of cosmogony mentioned above are derived. To the literary age of Taaut, Cadmus, Ophion, Esmun, etc., succeeded Thabion, Isiris,  Sanchoniatho, and Mochus, who founded the schools of priests and prophets. These cultivated the sciences, chiefly the occult ones, magic, and the like. Nearest to the sacred literature stands didactic poetry, somewhat related to the Orphic, whose chief representatives are Sido, Jopas, etc. The erotic poetry is characterized as of a very sensuous nature, both in Phoenicia and the colonies. Of historians are mentioned Mochus, Hypsikrates (Sanchoniatho?) Theodotus, Philostratus, Menander, and others; but these are mere Greek versions of their Phoenician names, and absolutely nothing has been preserved of their writings. Punic literature is also frequently mentioned by Greek and Roman writers. Geography, history, agriculture, were the fields chiefly cultivated by the colonists of Carthage and the West generally.

The monuments that have come down to us, and which not only have enabled us to judge for ourselves of the religion, the language, and the manners of the Phoenicians, are either original, as legends on coins and lapidary inscriptions, or at second hand, as Phoenician proper nouns and texts imbedded in the works of ancient classical or sacred writers. The principal and ever-growing source for our information, however, is the monumental inscriptions, of whose existence, till the middle of the 18th century, nothing was known. The most numerous Phoenician remnants have been discovered in the colonies. Richard Pococke first found, on the site of ancient Citium (Larnaka of today), thirty-one (not thirty-three, as generally stated) Phoenician inscriptions, which he deposited at Oxford (published by Swinton, 1750). Malta, Sardinia, Carthage, Algiers, Tripolis, Athens, Marseilles, have each yielded a considerable number, so that altogether we are now in the possession of about one hundred and twenty monuments. either votive tablets or tomb inscriptions. The latest and most remarkable are those now in the British Museum, discovered at Carthage a few years ago by N. Davis, consisting of votive tablets, a (doubtful) tombstone, and a sacrificial tariff, which completes another stone found some years ago at Marseilles of the same nature; both setting forth the amount of taxes, or rather the proportionate share the priest was entitled to receive for each sacrifice. Another exceedingly valuable (trilingual) inscription, referring to the gift of an altar vowed to Eshmun-Asklepios, has lately been discovered in Sardinia (see below). One of the most important historical monuments is the sarcophagus of Eshmanasar II, king of Sidon (son of Tennes ?), found at Tyre in 1855, the age of which has  variously been conjectured between the 11th century B.C. (Ewald) — a most incongruous guess indeed — the 7th (Hitzig), the 6th (due De Luynes), and the 4th (Levy), of which we shall add the commencement, literally translated:

"In the month of Bul, in the fourteenth year that I reigned, king Eshmanaiar, king of the Sidonians, son of king Tebuith, kingr of the Sidoilians — spake king Eshmanasar, king of the Sidonians, lsaying: Carried away before my time, in the flood of days — in dumbness ceases the soin of gods. Dead do I lie in this tonlm, in the glaeve, on the place which I havie built. 1 myself ordaiun tiat all the nobles and all the people shall not openi this place of rest; they shall not seek for treasures and not carry taway the sarcophmagus of my resting-place, and not disturb me by mounting the couch of my slumbers. If people should speak to thee [and pyersuade thee to the contralry], do not listen to them. For all the nobles and all the people who shall open this sarcophagus of the place of rest, or carry awayt the sarcophagus of my conch, or disturb me upon this resting- place, may they find no rest with the departed; may they not be buried in a tomb, and may no son and successor live after them in their place," etc. (see Thomson, Land and Book, 1:198 sq.).

The votive tablets bear the same character throughout, differing only with respect to the name of the man or woman who placed it in a certain sanctuary in accordance with his or her vow. Their material is mostly limestone or fine sandstone, rarely marble, and they vary from 5 to 15 inches in height, from 4 to 7 in width, and from 11 to 4 in thickness. Beginning in most cases with the dedication to the god or goddess, or both, thus: "[Sacred] To the god . . . [this tablet] which vowed N. son (daughter) of N. When he (she) heard my voice and blessed," or "hear my voice and bless;" etc. The sepulchral tablets generally run somewhat in this manner: "Stone erected to . . . who lived . . . years." Much yet remains to be done. Even the palaeographical side has, notwithstanding all the ready material, not been settled satisfactorily yet. One point, however, is indisputable even now. There are at least two kinds of Phoenician writing to be distinguished most clearly. The older, purer, more orthographical, and more neatly executed, is found in the inscriptions of Phoenicia herself, of Malta, Athens, Citium, and Carthage; the younger, corrupted not only with respect to the grammar and language, but also with respect to the  form of the letters, which are less carefully executed, and even exhibit some strange, probably degenerate characters, is found chiefly on the monuments of Cyprus, Cilicia, Sardinia, Africa, Spain, Numidia, and the adjacent parts.

Besides these monumental sources for the language, there are a few remnants of it embedded, as we said, in ancient non-Phoenician writings. The Old Testament alone, however, has preserved its words — proper nouns chiefly — unmutilated. Later eastern writers even, not to mention the Greeks and Romans, have corrupted the spelling to such a degree that it is often most puzzling to trace the original Shemitic words. Phoenician names occur in Suidas, Dioscorides, Apuleius, in martyrologies, calendariums, Acts of Councils, in Church fathers (Augumstine, Priscianus, Servus), etc. The only really important remnant, however, is found preserved-albeit fearfully mutilated and Latinized in Plautus's Pcellsfus, Acts 5, scene 1 of which contains, in sixteen lines, the Phoenician translation of the Latin text, with more than one hundred Phoenician words. Several 'other phrases and words are embodied in Acts 5, scenes 2 and 3 of the same play. Yet, although there is very little doubt among scholars about the greater portion of these texts, the corruption and mutilation which thev had to undergo, first at the hands of Plautus, who probably only wrote them by the ear, then at the hands of generations of ignorant scribes, have made more than one word or passage an insoluble puzzle. The first of the two specimens of Phoenician [Punic] writing subjoined is taken from one of those Carthaginian votive tablets with which the British Museum (now the wealthiest in Phoenician monuments) has lately been enriched, as mentioned before. The emblems on it are symbolical, and refer to the deities invoked. The lower part is mutilated, but easily supplied. The date is uncertain, perhaps the 2d or 3d century B.C. The second is a trilingual inscription from a base of an altar recently found at Pauli (errei, in Sardinia, and has been fully explained by Deutsch (see Transactions of the Roval Society of Literature, 1864). Its contents are briefly this: A certain Cleon, Phoenician by religion, Greek by name, Roman by nationality, a salt- farmner, yows an altar-material and weight of which are only given in Phoenician: viz. copper,. a hundred pounds in weight to EshmunAsklepios "the Healer" (the Phoenician Mearrach, clumsily transcribed Merre in Latin, and Mirre in, Greek), in consideration for a cure to be performed. The date, given in Phoenician, viz. the year of two, apparently annual,  entirely unknown judges, gives no clew to the time. Paloeographical reasons, however, would place'it in about the 1st century B.C.

2. Modern Authorities. — Among those who have more or less successfully occupied themselves with Phoenician antiquities, language, and literature, and who have also, in some instances, deciphered inscriptions, we mention Scaliger, Bochart, Pococke, Barth lemy, Swinton, Bayer,. Dutens, Hamaker, Gesenius, Movers, Munck, Judas, Bargbs, De Saulcy, Ewald, Levy, Vaux, Renan, De Luynes, De Vogud, Deutsch, and others; to whose writings, contained either in special works or scattered in Transactions of learned societies, we refer for further information on the subject of our article.

In English, see Kenrick's Phoenicia (Lond. 1855); in Latin, the second part of Bochart's Geographia Sacra, under the title "Canaan" and Gesenius's work, Scripturae Linguaeque Phoniciae Monumenta quotquot supersunt (Leips. 1837); in German, the exhaustive work of Movers, Die Phonizier und das Phonizische Alterthum (Berlin, 1841-1856, 5 volumes); Gerhard, Kunst der Phonizier (ibid. 1848); an article on the same subject by Movers, in Ersch and Gruber's Encyclopadie, and an article in the same work by Gesenius on Polaographie. See likewise Gesenius, Gesch. der Hebraischen Sprache und Schrift (Leips. 1815); Bleek, Einleitung in das Alte Testament (Berl. 1860). Phoenician inscriptions discovered since the time of Gesenius have been published by Judas, Etude demonstrative de la lanque Phenicienne et de la langue Libyque (Paris, 1847), and forty-five other inscriptions have been published by the abbe Bourgade (ibid. 1852, fol.). In 1845 a votive tablet was discovered at Marseilles, respecting which see Movers, Phonizische Texte (1847), and Judas Analyse (Par. 1857), and Etudes (ibid. 1857). On the sarcophagus of Eshmanasar, see Dietrich, Zwaei Sidonische Inschriften, nd eine alte Phonizische Konigsinschrift (Marburg, 1855), and Ewald, Erklarung der grossen Phonizischen Inschrift von Sidon (GBttingen, 1856, 4to; from the seventh volume of the Abhandlungen der Konigl. geograph. Gesellschaft zu Gottingen). Information respecting these works, and others on Phoenician inscriptions, is given by Bleek; pages 64, 65. See also Barthelemy, Monumens Pheoniciens (Paris, 1795); Hamaker, De Monumentis Punicis (Leips. 1822); Raoul-Rochette, Monumenta Phoenicia (Paris, 1828); Davis, Carthage (Lond. 1861); Wilkins, Phenicia and Israel (Lond. 1871); Renan, Mission de Phenicie (Paris, 1864).

## Phoenix[[@Headword:Phoenix]]

             the name of a mythical Egyptian bird, supposed by some to be a kind of plover, like the kibitz, often depicted with human arms, and called in hieroglyphs rekh. Others consider it to be the bennu, or nycticorax, a bird sacred to Osiris, and represented watching in the tamarisk over his coffin. The first of these representations has sometimes a star upon the head, supposed to indicate the astronomical period of its appearance. It visited Egypt after the death of its father, and entered the shrine particularly dedicated to it at Heliopolis, and there buried its parent, putting the body into an egg or case made of myrrh, and then closing up the egg. Another account is that the Phoenix, when about to die, made a nest for itself in Arabia, from which a new Phoenix sprang of itself. This bird proceeded to Heliopolis, and there burned and buried its father. But the more popularly known version is that the Phoeniix burned itself, and a new and young Phoenix sprang from the ashes. A less received version is that a worm crawled out of the body of the dead Phoenix, and became the future one. The Phoenix was, according to the most authentic accounts, supposed to visit Egypt every five hundred years; the precise period, however, was not known at Heliopolis, and was a subject of contention till its appearance. The connection of the Phoenix period with that of the Sothiac cycle, appears to be generally received by chronologists, as well as the statement of Horapollo, that it designated the soul and the inundation of the Nile. A great difference of opinion has prevailed about the Phoenix period: according to AElian, it was a cycle of 500 years; Tacitus seems to make it one of 250 years; Lepsius, a cycle of 1500 years. The Phoenix was fabled to have four times appeared in Egypt: 1, under Sesostris; 2, under Amasis, 569-525 B.C.; 3, under Ptolemy PhiIadelphus, 284246 B.C.; and lastly, 34 or 36 A.D., just prior to the death of Tiberius. The Phoenix also appears upon the coins of Constantine, 334 A.D, viz. 300 years after the death of Christ, who was considered the Phoenix by the monastic writers. It is supposed by the rabbins to be mentioned in the Bible (Job 29:18; Psa 103:5). See Herodotts, 2:73; Achilles Tatius, 3:25; Tacitus, An. 6:28; Tselzes, Chil. 5:397; Lepsius, Einleit. page 183; Archaeologia, 30:256. The East is full of fables resembling the phoenix. Thus the Simorg of the ancient Persians is said to have witnessed twelve catastrophes, and may yet see many- more. It has built its nest on Mount Kaf, and perched  upon the branches of the Yogard, or tree of life; it predicts good or evil to mortals. Similar legends are to be found connected with the Rokh of the Arabians and Semeneda of the Hindds. The Jews also have their sacred bird Tsiks. See Gardner, Faiths of the World, 2:655, 656.

## Phonascus[[@Headword:Phonascus]]

             (φωνασκός, a singing-master), a name given in the ancient Christian Church to the individual who acted as precentor (q.v.), or led the psalmody in divine service. This appellation seems to have been used first in' the 4th century, and is still employed in the Greek Church.

## Phorcus or Phorcys[[@Headword:Phorcus or Phorcys]]

             a Homeric sea-god, to whom a harbor in Ithaca was dedicated. He is said to have been the son of Pontus and Ge, and to have been the father, by his sister Ceto, of the Gorgons, the Hesperian dragon, and the Hesperides. By Hecate he was the father of Scylla.

## Phoros[[@Headword:Phoros]]

             (Φόρος), an incorrect Greek form (1Es 5:19; 1Es 9:26) of the Heb. name (Ezr 2:3; Ezr 8:3) PAROSH SEE PAROSH (q.v.).

## Phos[[@Headword:Phos]]

             (φῶς, light), and its allied term Photisma (illumination), are generally applied in the ancient Christian Church to baptism, from the great blessings supposed to arise from it. Hence baptized Christians were sometimes called φωτιζόμενοι, the enlightened, and ithe baptistery φωτιστήριον, place of enlightenment. The same terms were also applied to the Lord's Supper.Riddle, Christian Antiquities, pages 484, 485, 551. SEE ALSO BAPTISM (Names of 5.).

## Phosphorus[[@Headword:Phosphorus]]

             (φωσφόρος, light-bringer), a surname of Artemis, Eos, and Hecate. This was also the name given by the Greek poets to the planet Venus when it appeared in the morning before sunrise.

## Phota Hagia[[@Headword:Phota Hagia]]

             (φῶτα ἃγια, holy lights), a term anciently used to denote the festival of Epiphany, as being commemorative of Christ's baptism. SEE EPIPHANY.

## Photinians[[@Headword:Photinians]]

             is the name of those Christian heretics who denied Christ's divinity. They derived their views from Photinus of Sirmium (q.v.). They flourished in the 4th and part of the 5th century.

## Photinus Of Sirmium[[@Headword:Photinus Of Sirmium]]

             an Eastern ecclesiastic, noted as the founder of a heretical body, flourished near the middle of the 4th century. Of his origin and earliest history we know nothing. He was a pupil of Marcellus of Ancyra, and was for a time deacon under him. Later Photinus was made bishop of Sirmium, in Pannonia. He was a person of unusual accomplishments, and was generally respected for his learning. Even while vet connected with Marcellus, heretical tendencies were manifest in Photinus. Once advanced to the bishopric, he soon fell away from all restraint gradually abandoned orthodox associations, and suddenly changed, after having taught the people the knowledge of the true God, to those pernicious Sabellian notions for which his teacher had been condemned. According to Vincentius Xirinensis, he went even further than Macarius. and added to the impieties of Sabellius, Paulus Samosatenus, Cerinthus, and Ebion, this distinctive formula, that "Christ was not only mere man, but began to be the Christ when the Holy Ghost descended upon him in Jordan." In other words, “that Jesus Christ was born of the Holy Ghost and the Virgin Mary; that a certain divine emanation, which he called the Word, descended upon: him; and that, because of the union of the divine Word with his human nature, he was called the Son of God, and even God himself; and that the Holy Ghost was not a person, but merely a celestial virtue proceeding from the Deity." Hence, while the Oriental Church could suffer Marcellus to remain within the fold, it could not tolerate the man who would teach such extreme heresy. At a synod held at Milan in 345, the doctrine was also rejected and condemned; and while thus discarded by both the East and the West, he yet managed to retain his episcopal office until A.D. 351, when a Semi-Arian council at Sirmium removed him. For a time restored under the emperor Julian, he was soon again deposed, and  died in exile, probably near the close of the 4th century. His writings are lost. His doctrines we learn from the anathemas of those synods which sat in judgment over them. See, besides the literature quoted in the article MARCELLUS SEE MARCELLUS , Hefele, Conciliengesch. volume 1. (J.H.W.)

## Photisma[[@Headword:Photisma]]

             SEE PHOS.

## Photisterion[[@Headword:Photisterion]]

             (φωτιστήριον), a place of illumination, being a term frequently used in the ancient Christian Church to denote the baptistery, or the place of baptism, that ordinance being supposed to be attended with a divine illumination of the soul. SEE PHOS, This name might also be used for another reason, namely, because baptisteries were the places in which instruction was communicated previous to baptism, the catechumens being there taught the creed and instructed in the first rudiments of the Christian faith.

## Photius Of Constantinople (1)[[@Headword:Photius Of Constantinople (1)]]

             an Eastern ecclesiastic, tlourished in the 4th century. In the Acta Sanctorulm, Jnnii, 1:274, etc., is given an account of the martyrdom of St. Lucillianus, and several others who are said to have suffered at Byzantium, in the persecution under Aurelian. The account bears this title: Φωτίου τοῦ μακὰριωτάτου σκευοφύλακος τῶν Α῾γίων Α᾿ποστόλων καὶ λογοθέτου ἐγκώμιον εἰς τὸν ἃγιον ἱερομάρτυρα Λουκιλλιανόν; Sancti Martyris Lucilliani Encomium, auctore beatissimo Photio, Sanctorum Apostolorum Sceuophylace ac Logotheta. Of the writer Photius, nothing further appears to be known than is contained in the title, namely, that he was keeper of the sacred vessels in the great church of the Apostles at Constantinople, which was second in importance only to that of St. Sophia; and that he must be placed after the time of Constantine, by whom the church was built. The Encomium is given in the Acta Sanctorum in the original Greek, with a Commentarius praevius, a Latin version, and notes by Conradus Januingus. See Fabricius, Bibl. Garcc. 10:271, 678; Smith, Dict. of Gr. and Rom. Biog. s.v.

## Photius Of Constantinople (2)[[@Headword:Photius Of Constantinople (2)]]

             also an Eastern ecclesiastic, flourished in the 5th century as presbyter of the Church at Constantinople, and was one of the most decided and active supporters of the unfortunate heresiarch Nestorius (q.v.). When Antonius and Jacobus were sent, some:time before the Council of Ephesus, A.D. 431, to convert, by persecution, the Quartadecimans and Novatians of Asia Minor, they presented to some of their converts at Philadelphia, not the Nicene Creed, but one that contained a passage deemed heretical on the subject of the Incarnation, which excited against them Charisius, who was ceconomus of the Church at Philadelphia. In these proceedings Antonius and Jacobus were supported by Photius, who not only gave them letters at the commencement of their mission, attesting their orthodoxy, but procured the deposition of their opponent Charisius, who thereupon presented a complaint to the Council of Ephesus (Concilia, volume 3, col. 673. etc., ed. Labbe). Tillemont is disposed to ascribe to Photius the answer which was drawn up to the Epistola ad Solitarios of Cyril of Alexandria. A certain Photius, a supporter of Nestorius, was banished to Petra, about A.D. 436 (Lupus, Ad Ephesin Concil. varior. PP. Epistole, cap. 188), whom, notwithstanding the objections of Lulputs ( not. in loc.), we agree with Tillemont in idenltifyinlg with the presbyter of Constantinople (Tillemont, Memoires, 14:300, 332, 494, 607, 787).

## Photius Of Constantinople (3)[[@Headword:Photius Of Constantinople (3)]]

             one of the most eminent men whose names occur in the long series of the Byzantine annals, flourished in the 9th century. In the preparation of this article we depend very largely upon Smith, Dict. of Gr. and Rom. Biog. s.v.

Life. — The year and place of his birth, and the name of his father, appear to be unknown. His mother's name was Irene: her brother married one of the sisters of Theodora, wife of the emperor Theophilus (Theoph. Continuat. lib. 4:22); so that Photius was connected by affinity with the imperial family. We have the testimony of Nicetas David, the Paphlagonian. that his lineage was illustrious. He had at least four brothers (Mountagu, Not. ad Epistol. Photii, page 138), one of whom, the eldest, enjoyed the dignity of patrician. Photius himself, in speaking of his father and mother, celebrates their crown of martyrdom, and the patient spirit by which they were adorned, during the reign of Theophilus or some other of  the iconoclastic emperors. This is the more likely, as Photius elsewhere (Epistol. 2, Encycl. § 42, and Epistol. ad Nicol.,Papam) claims as his relative Tarasius (probably great-uncle), partriarch of Coistantinople, who was one of the great champions of image worship, which shows the side taken by his family in the controversy. The ability of Photius would have adorned any lineage, and his capacious minid was cultivated, as the testimony even of his opponents and his extant works show, with great diligence. "He was accounted," says Nicetas David, the biographer and panegyrist of his competitor Ignatius, "to be of all men most eminent for his secular acquirements, and his understanding of political affairs. For so superior were his attainments in grammar and poetry, in rhetoric and philosophy, yea, even in medicine, and in almost all the branches of knowledge beyond the limits of theology, that he not only appeared to excel all the men of his own day, but even to bear comparison with the ancients. For all things combined in his favor: natural adaptation, diligence, wealth, which enabled him to form a comprehensive library; and more than all these, the love of glory, which induced him to pass whole nights without sleep, that he might have time for reading. And when the time came (which ought never to have arrived) for him to intrude himself into the Church, he became a most diligent reader of theological works? (Vita Ignatii apud Conci. volume 8, ed. Labbe). It must not, however, be supposed that Photius had wholly neglected the study of theology before his entrance on an ecclesiastical life: so far was this from being the case, that he had read and carefully analyzed, as his Bibliotheca attests, the chief works of the Greek ecclesiastical writers of all ages, so that his attainments in sacred literature might have shamed many a professional divine.

Thus highly connected, and with a mind so richly endowed and highly cultivated, Photius obtained high advancement at the Byzantine court. He held the dignity of a proto-a-secretis, or chief-justice (Codin. De Officiis CP. page 36. ed. Bonn); and, if we trust the statement of Nicetas David (1. c.), of protospatharius, a name originally denoting the chief sword-bearer or captain of the guards, but which became, in later times, a merely nominal office (Codin. ibid. page 33). To these dignities may be added, on the authority of Anastasiis Bibliothecarius (Conail. Octavi Hist. apud Concil. ol. 8:col. 962, ed. Labbd), that of senator; but this is, perhaps, only another title for the office ofprotoa-secretis (Gretser. et Goar. Not. in Codin. page 242). Besides these official duties at the capital, he was also occasionally employed on missions abroad; and it was during an embassy "to the Assyrians" (a vague and unsuitable term, denoting apparently the court of  the caliphs, or of some of the other powers of Upper Asia) that he read the works enumerated in his Bibliotheca, and wrote the critical notices of them which that work contains — a striking instance of the energy and diligence with which he continued to cultivate literature in the midst of his secular duties and when away from home. Of the date of this embassy, while engaged in which he must have resided several years at the Assyrian court, as well of the other incidents of his life before his elevation to the patriarchate of Constantinople, we have no knowledge. He could hardly have been a young man at the time he became patriarch.

The patriarchal throne of Constantinople was occupied in the middle of the 9th century by Ignatius (s.v.), who had the misfortune to incur the enmity of some few bishops and'monks, and also of Bardas, who was allpowerful at the court of his nephew Michael, then a minor. Ignatius had excommunicated Bardas on a charge of incest, and Bardas, in retaliation, caused the patriarch's deposition, and the election of Photius in his place. Though a layman, and, according to some statements, under excommunication for supporting Gregory, less than a week sufficed, according to Nicetas David (ibid.), for the rapid passage of Photius through all the needful subordinate gradations: the first day witnessed his conversion from a layman to a monk; the second day he was made reader; the third day subdeacon; the fourth, deacon; the fifth, presbyter; and the sixth (Christmas-day, A.D. 858) beheld his promotion to the patriarchate, the highest ecclesiastical dignity in the empire. Nicetas (ibid.) states that his office was irregullarlv committed to him by secular hands. Photius himnself, however, in his apologetic epistle to pope Nicholas I (apud Baron. Annal. ad ann. 859, § 61, etc.), states that the patriarchate was pressed uponu his acceptanice by a numerous assembly of the metropolitans, and of the other, clergy of his patriarchate; nor is it likely that the Byzantine court would fail to secure a sufficient number of subservient bishops to give to the appointment every possible appearance of regularity. A consciousness that the whole transaction was violent and indefensible, whatever care might be taken to give it the appearance of regularity, made it desirable for the victorious party to obtain from the deposed patriarch a resignation of his office; but Ignatius was a man of too lofty a spirit to consent to his own degradation. Photius, however, retained'his high dignity; the secular power was on his side; the clergy of the patriarchate, in successive councils (A.D. 858, 859), confirmed his appointment, though we are told by Nicetas David that 'the metropolitans  exacted from him a written engage:ment that he would treat his deposed rival with filial reverence, and follow his advice; and even the legates of the Holy See were induced to side with him, a subserviency for which they were afterwards deposed by pope Nicholas I. The engagement to treat Ignatius with kindness was not kept; in such a struggle its observance could hardly be expected; but how far the severities inflicted on him are to be ascribed to Photius cannot now be determined.

The critical position of the latter would be likely to aggravate any disposition which he might feel to treat his rival harshly; for Nicholas, in a council at Rome (A.D. 862), embraced the side of Ignatius, and anathematized Photius and his adherents; various enemies rose up against him among the civil officers as well as the clergy of the empire; and the minds of many, including, if we may trust Nicetas (ibid.), the kindred and: friends of Photius him.self, were shocked by the treatment of the unhappy Ignatius. To add to Photius's troubles, the Caesar Bardas appears to have had disputes with him, either influenced by the natural jealousy between the secular and ecclesiastical powers, or, perhaps, disappointed at not finding in Photius the subserviency he had anticipated. The letters of Photius addressed to Bardas (Epistole, 3, 6, 8) contain abundant complaints of the diminution of his authority, of the ill-treatment of those for whom he was interested, and of the inefficacy of his own intercessions and complaints. However, the opposition :among his own clergy was gradually weakened, until only five bishops remained who supported the cause of Ignatius. Yet, notwithstanding these defections from the deposed patriarch, Photius labored zealously for a restoration of friendly feelings between himself and the Western patriarch. Nicholas, however, spurned all advances, and in A.D. 863 anathematized and deposed Photius anew. Of course the Roman patriarchate, failing to secure the aid of the Eastern emperor, could not give practical effect to the deposition, and Photius remained in his place. In order to retaliate on Rome, he now assembled a council of the Eastern clergy at Constantinople (A.D. 867), in which the question was removed from the region of a personal dispute between the bishops to a controversy of doctrine and discipline between the churches of the East and West themselves. In this council Photius first brought forward distinctly certain grounds of difference between the churches, which, although considerably modified, afterwards led to their final separation. In all these doctrinal differences, the council condemned the Western Church, excommunicated Nicholas and his abettors, and withdrew from the communion of the see of  Rome. The charge of heresy against the Church of Rome in general was embraced in the following articles:

1. That the Church of Rome kept the Sabbath as a fast;

2. That it permitted milk and cheese in the first week of Lent;

3. That it prohibited the marriage of priests;

4. That it con fined the rite of anointing persons baptized to the bishops alone;

5. That it had corrupted the Nicene Creed by the addition of the words filioque.

As neither party had the secular power wherewith to carry its sentence into effect, the separation of the Eastern' and Western churches became simply a schism, and as such lasted until the actual deposition of Photius, A.D. 869.

Of the conduct which controlled Photius as patriarch, in matters not connected with the struggle to maintain his position, it is not easy to judge. That he aided Bardas, who was elevated to the dignity of Caesar, in his efforts for the revival of learning, perhaps suggested those efforts to him, is highly probable from his indisputable love of literature (Theoph. Contin. De Mich. Theophili 1ilio, c. 26). That he possessed many kindly dispositions is indicated by his letters. The charges of the forgery of letters, and of cruelty in his struggles with the party of Ignatius, are, there is reason to believe, too true; but as almost all the original sources of information respecting his character and conduct are from parties hostile to his claims, we cannot confidently receive their charges as true in all their extent. The murder of Caesar Bardas (A.D. 866 or 867), by the emperor's order, was speedily followed by the assassination of Michael himself (A.D. 867), and the accession of his colleague and murderer, Basil I (the Macedonian). Photius had consecrated Basil as the colleague of Michael; but after the murder of the latter he refused to admit him to the communnion, reproaching him as a robber and a murderer, and unworthy to partake of the sacred elements. Photius was for this offence immediately banished to a monastery, and Ignatius restored: various papers which the servants of Photius were about to conceal in a neighboring reed-bed were seized, and afterwards produced against Photius, first in the senate of Constantinople, and afterwards at the council held against him. This hasty  change in the occupants of the patriarchate had been too obviously the result of the change of the imperial dynasty to be sufficient of itself. But the imperial power had now the same interest as the Western Church in the deposition of Photiuls.

A council (recognised by the Romish Church as the eighth oecumenical or fourth Constantinopolitan) was therefore summoned, A.D. 869, at which the deposition of Photius and the restoration of Ignatius were confirmed. The cause was in fact prejudged by the circumstance that Ignatius took his place as patriarch at the commencement of the council. Photius, who appeared before the council, and his partisans were anathematized and stigmatized with the most opprobrious epithets. He subsequently acquired the favor of Basil, but by what means is uncertain; for we can hardly give credence to the strange tale related by Nicetas (ibid.), who ascribes it to the forgery and interpretation by Photius of a certain genealogical document containing a prophecy of Basil's exaltation. It is certain, however, not only that he gained the favor of the emperor, but that he soon acquired a complete ascendency over him; he was appointed tutor to the sons of Basil, had apartments in the palace assigned to him; and on the death of Ignatius, about A.D. 877, was immediately restored to the patriarchal throne. With writers of the Ignatian party and of the Romish Church this restoration is, of course, nothing less than a new irruption of the wolf into the sheepfold. According to Nicetas, he commenced his patriarchate by beating, banishing, and in various ways afflicting the servants and household of his defunct rival, and by using ten thousand arts against those who objected to his restoration as uncanonical and irregular. Some he bribed by gifts and honors, and by translation to wealthier or more eligible sees than those they occupied; others he terrified by reproaches and accusations, which, on their embracing his party, were speedily and altogether dropped. That, in the corrupt state of the Byzantine empire and Church, something of this must have happened at such a crisis, there can be little doubt; though there can be as little doubt that these statements are much exaggerated. It is probable that one great purpose of Basil in restoring Photius to the patriarchate was to do away with divisions in the Church, for it is not to be supposed that Photius was without his partisans. But to effect this purpose he had to gain over the Western Church. Nicholas had been succeeded by Hadrian II, and he by John VIII (some reckon him to be John IX), who now occupied the papal chair.

John was more pliant than Nicholas, and Basil was a more energetic prince than the dissolute Michael; the pope therefore yielded to the urgent entreaties of a prince whom it would have been dangerous to disoblige; recognised Photius as lawful patriarch, and excommunicated those who refused to hold communion with him. Pope John's yielding attitude in this case betrayed so much womanly weakness that it is, in the opinion of some, thought to have been the origin of that fable about popess Joan (q.v.), in that it obtained for him the feminine sobriquet Joanna. But the recognition was on condition that he should resign his claim to the ecclesiastical superiority of the Bulgarians, whose archbishops and bishops were claimed as subordinates by both Rome and Constantinople; and is said to have been accompanied by strong assertions of the superiority of the Roman see. The copy of the letter in which John's consent was given is a re-translation from the Greek, and is asserted by Romish writers to have been falsified by Photius and his party. It is obvious, however, that this charge remains to be proved; and that we have no more security that the truth lies on the side of Rome than on that of Constantinople. The ecclesiastical jurisdiction of Bulgaria was no new cause of dissension: it had been asserted as strongly by the pious Ignatius as by his successor (comp. Joan. VIII Papae Epistol. 78, apud Concil. page 63, etc.). Letters from the pope to the clergy of Constantinople and to Photius himself were also sent, but the extant copies of these are said to have been equally corrupted by Photius. Legates were sent by the pope, and even the copies of their Commonitorium, or letter of instruction, are also said to be falsified; but these charges need to be carefully sifted. Among the asserted additions is one in which the legates are instructed to declare the council of A.D. 869 (reputed by the Romish Church to be the eighth oecumenical or fourth Constantinopolitan), at which Photius had been deposed, to be null and void. Another council, which the Greeks assert to be the eighth cecunfenical one, but which the Romanists reject, was held at Constantinople A.D. 879. The papal legates were present, but Photius presided, and had everything his own way. The restoration of Photius and the nullity of the council of A.D. 869 were affirmed: the words "filioque" (q.v.), which formed one of the standing subjects of contention between the two churches, were ordered to be omitted from the creed, and the jurisdiction of the Bulgarian Church was referred to the emperor as a question affecting the boundaries of the empire. The pope refused to recognise the acts of the council, with the exception of the restoration of Photius, though they had been assented to by his legates, whom on their return he condemned, and then anathematized Photius afresh (Baron. Annal. Eccles. ad ann. 880, volumes 11, 13). The schism and rivalry of the churches became greater than ever, and has never since been really healed.  SEE GREEK CHURCH.

Photius, according to Nicetas (ibid.), had been assisted in regaining the favor of Basil by the monk Theodore or Santabaren; but other writers reverse the process, and ascribe to Photius the introduction of Santabaren to Basil. Photius certainly made him archbishop of Euchaita, in Pontus; and he enjoyed, during Photius's patriarchate, considerable influence with Basil. By an accusation, true or false, made by this man against Leo, the emperor's eldest surviving son and destined successor, of conspiring his father's death, Basil had been excited to imprison his son. So far, however, was Photius from joining in the designs of Santabaren, that it was chiefly upon his urgent entreaties the emperor spared the eyes of Leo, which he had intended to put out. Basil died A.D. 886, and Leo VI succeeded to the throne. He inmediately set about the ruin of Santabaren; and, forgetful of Photius's intercession, scrupled not to involve the patriarch in his fall. Andrew and Stephen, two officers of the court, whom Santabaren had formerly accused of some offence, now charged Photius and Santabaren with conspiring to depose the emperor, and to place a kinsman of Photius on the throne. The charge appears to have been utterly unfounded, but it answered the purpose. An officer of the court was sent to the church of St. Sophia, who ascended the ambo, or pulpit, and read to the assembled people articles of accusation against the patriarch. Photius was immediately led into confinement, first in a monastery, afterwards in the palace of Pegae; and Santabaren was brought in custody from Euchaita and confronted with him; the two accusers, with three other persons, were appointed to conduct the examination, a circumstance sufficient to show the nature and spirit of the whole transaction. The firmness of the prisoners, and the impossibility of proving the charge against them, provoked the emperor's rage. Santabaren was cruelly beaten, deprived of his eyes, and banished; but was afterwards recalled, and survived till the reign of Constantine Porph'rogenitus, the successor of Leo. Photius was banished to the monastery of Bordi, in Armenia (or rather in the Thema Armeniacum), where he seems to have remained till his death. He was buried in the church of a nunnery at Merdosagares. The year in which his death occurred is not ascertained. Pagi, Fabricius, and Mosheim fix it in A.D. 891; but the evidence on which their statement rests is not conclusive. He must have been an aged man when he died, for he must have been in middle age when first chosen patriarch, and he lived after that event thirty years, and probably more. He was succeeded in the patriarchate by the emperor's brother Stephen, first his pupil, then his syncellus, and one of his clergy. (Theoph. Continuat. lib.  v, c. 100; lib. 6, c. 1-5; Symeon Magister, De Basil. Maced. c. 21; De Leone Basil. 2. c. 1; Georg. Monach. De Basil. c. 24; De Leone, c. 1-7.)

The character of Photius is by no means worthy of much respect. He was an able man of the world, but not influenced by the high principles which befitted his sacred office. Yet he was probably not below the average of the statesmen and prelates of his day; and certainly was not the monster that the historians and other writers of the Romish Church, whose representations have been too readily adopted by some moderns, would make him. A writer in the Edinburgh Review, 21:329, says, "He seems to have been very learned and very wicked — a great scholar and a consummate hypocrite — not only neglecting occasions of doing good, but perverting the finest talents to the worst purposes." This is unjust; he lived in a corrupt age, and was placed in a trying position; and, without hiding or extenuating his crimes, it must be remembered that his private character remains unimpeached; the very story of his being a eunuch, which, though not having the appearance of truth, shows at least that he was not open to the charge of licentiousness; his firmness is attested by his repulse of Basil from the communion of the Church, and his mercifulness by his intercession for the ungrateful Leo. It must be borne in mind also that his history has come down to us chiefly in the representations of Ihis enemies. The principal ancient authorities have been referred to in the course of this narrative, though we have by no means cited all the places. We may add, Leo Grammaticus, Chronogralphia, pages 463-476, ed. Paris; Zonar. 16:4, 8, 11, 12; Cedren. Compend. pages 551, 569, 573, 593, ed. Paris; 2:172, 205, 213, 248, ed. Bonn; Glycas, Annal. pars 4, pages 293, 294, 297, etc., ed. Paris; pages 226, 228, 230, etc., ed. Venice; pages 544, 547, 552, ed. Bonn; Genesius, Reges, lib. 4, page 48, ed. Venice; page 100, ed. Bonn; Constantin. Maneass. Comnpend. Chron, verses 5133-5163, 5233, etc., 5309, etc.; Joel, Chronog. Compend. page 179, ed. Paris; pages 55, 56, ed. Bonn; Ephraem. De Patriarchis CP. col. 962:10,012-10,025, ed. Bonn.

Various notices and documents relating to his history generally, but especially to his conduct in reference to the schism of the churches, may be found in the Concilia, volumes 8, 9, ed. Labbe; volumes 5, 6, ed. Hardouin; volumes 15, 16, 17, ed. Mansi. Of modern writers, Baronius (Annal. Eccles. A.D. 858-886) is probably the fullest, but at the same time one of the most unjust. Hankius (De Byzantin. Rerum Scriptoribus, pars 1, c. 18) has a very ample memoir of Photius, which may be advantageously compared with that of Baronius, as its bias is in the opposite direction. See  also Dupin, Nouvelle Bibliotheque des Auteurs Ecclsiastiques, Siecle 9, page 270, 2d ed. 1698. An essay by Francesco Fontani, De Photio Nove Romnce Episcopo ejusque Scriptis Dissertatio, prefixed to the first volume of his Novae Eruditorum Delicicte (Florence, 1785, 12mo), is far more candid than most of the other works by members of the Romish Church; and is in this respect far beyond the Memoire sur le Patriarche Photius, by M. Weguelin, in the Memoires de l'Academie Royale (de Prusse) des Sciences et Belles-Lettres, annee 1777 (Berlin, 1779, 4to), page 440, etc. Shorter accounts may be found in Mosheim (Eccles. Hist. by Murdock, book 3, cent. 9, part 2, c. 3, § 27-32), and in the works cited at the close of this article. Fabricius has given a list of the councils held to determine questions arising out of the struggle of Ignatius and Photius for the patriarchate, or out of the contests of the Eastern and Western churches with regard to Photius. He has also given a list of writers respecting Photius, divided into — 1. Those hostile to Photius; and 2. Those more favorable to him. Of the historians of the lower empire, Le Beau (Bas Empire, 54, 70, 38, etc.; 71, 72:1-3) is outrageously partial, inflaming the crimes of Photius, and rejecting as untrue, or passing over without notice, the record of those incidents which are honorable to him. Gibbon (Decline and Fall, c. 53, 60), more favorable, has two separate, but brief and unsatisfactory, notices of the patriarch.

Writings. — The published works of Photius are the following:

1. Μυριόβιβλον ἢ Βιβλιοθήκη, Myriobiblon seu Bibliotheca. This is the most important and valuable of the works of Photius. It may be described as an extensive review of ancient Greek literature by a scholar of immense erudition and sound judgment. It is an extraordinary monument of literary energy, for it was written while the author was engaged in his embassy to Assyria, at the request of Photius's brother Tarasius, who was much grieved at the separation, and desired an account of the books which Photius had read in his absence. It thus conveys a pleasing impression, not only of the literary acquirements and extraordinary industry, but of the fraternal affection of the writer. It opens with a prefatory address to Tarasius, recapitulating the circumstances in which it was composed, and stating that it contained a notice of two hundred and seventy-nine volumes. The extant copies contain a notice of two hundred and eighty: the discrepancy, which is of little moment, may have originated either in the mistake of Photius himself, or in some alteration of the divisions by some transcriber. It has been doubted whether we have the work entire. An  extant analysis, by Photius, of the Historia Ecclesiastica of Philostorgius (q.v.), by which alone some knowledge of the contents of that important work has been preserved to us, is so much fuller than the brief analysis of that work contained in the present text of the Bibliotheca, as to lead to the supposition that the latter is imperfect. "It is to be lamented," says Valesius (De Critica, 1:29), "that many such abridgments and collections of extracts are now lost. If these were extant in the state in which they were completed by Photius, we should grieve less at the loss of so many ancient writers." But Leiche has shown (Diatribe in Phot. Biblioth.) that we have no just reason for suspecting that the Bibliotheca is imperfect; and that the fuller analysis of Philostorgius probably never formed part of it, but was made at a later period. The two hundred and eighty divisions of the Bibliotheca must be understood to express the number of volumes (codices) or manuscripts, and not of writers or of works: the works of some writers, e.g. of Philo Judaeus (codd. 103-105), occupy several divisions; and, on the other hand, one division (e.g. cod. 125, Justini Martysris Scripta Varia), sometimes comprehends a notice of several different works written in one codex.

The writers examined are of all classes: the greater number, however, are theologians, writers of ecclesiastical history, and of the biography of eminent churchmen; but several are secular historians, philosophers, and orators, heathen or Christian, of remote or recent times, lexicographers, and medical writers; only one or two are poets, and those on religious subjects, and there are also one or two writers of romances or love tales. There is no formal classification of these various writers; though a series of writers or writings of the same class frequently occurs, e.g. the Acta of various councils (codd. 15-20); the writers on the Resurrection (codd. 21-23); and the secular historians of the Byzantine empire (codd. 6267). In fact, the works appear to be arranged in the order in which they were read. The notices of the writers vary much in length: those in the earlier part are very briefly noticed, the later ones more fully; their recent perusal apparently enabling the writer to give a fuller account of them; so that this circumstance confirms our observation as to the arrangement of the work. Several valuable works, now lost, are known to us chiefly by the analyses or extracts which Photius has given of them; among them are the Persica and Indica of Ctesias (q.v.), in cod. 72; the De Rebus post Alexandrum Mognum gestis, and the Parthica and the Bithynica of Arrian, in codd. 53, 92, and 93; the Historiae of Olympiodorus (q.v.), in cod. 80; the Narrationes of Conon, in cod. 186; the Nova Historia of Ptolemy  Hephaestion, in cod. 190; the De Heracleae Ponticae Rebus of Memnon, in cod. 224; the Vita Isidori by Damascius, in cod. 242; the lost Declamationes of Himerius, in cod. 243; the lost books of the Bibliotheca of Diodorus Siculus, in cod. 244; the De Erythraeo (s. Rubro) Mari of Agatharchides, in cod. 250; the anonymous Vita Pauli CPolitani and Vita Athanasii, in codd. 257 and 258; the lost Orationes, genuine or spurious, of Antiphon, Isocrates, Lysias, Iseaus, Demosthenes, Hyperides, Deinarchus, and Lycurgus, in codd. 259-268; and of the Chrestomatheia of Helladius of Antinoopolis, in cod. 279; besides several theological and ecclesiastical and some medical works. The above enumeration will suffice to show the inestimable value of the Bibliotheca of Photius, especially when we reflect how much the value of his notices is enhanced by the soundness of his judgment. The first edition of the Bibliotheca was published by David Hoeschelius, under the title of Βιβλιοθήκη τοῦ Φωτίου, Liborum quos legit Photius Patriarcha Excerpta et Censurae (Augsburg, 1601, fol.). Some of the Epistolae of Photius were subjoined. The text of the Bibliotheca was formed on a collation of four MSS., and was accompanied with notes by the editor; but there was no Latin version. A Latin version and scholia, by Andreas Schottus of Antwerp, were published (ibid. 1606, fol.); but the version is inaccurate, and has been severely criticised. It was, however, reprinted, with the Greek text, under the title of Φωτίου Μυριόβιβλον ἢ Βιβλιοθήκη, Photii Myriobiblon site Bibliotheca (Geneva, 1612, fol., and Rouen, 1653, fol.). This last edition is a splendid one, but inconvenient from its size. An edition, with a revised text, formed on a collation of four MSS. (whether any of them were the same as-those employed by Hoeschelius is not mentioned), was published by Immanuel Bekker (Berlin, 1824-25, 2 thin volumes 4to): it is convenient from its size and the copiousness of its index, but has neither version nor notes.

2. Ε᾿πιτομὴ ἐκ τῶν ἐκκλησιαστικῶν ἱστοπιῶν Φιλοστοργίου ἀπὸ φωνῆς Φωτίου πατριάρχου, Compendium Historie Ecclesiasticae Philostorgii quod dictavit Photius patriarcha. Cave regards this as a fragment of another work similar to the Bibliotheca, but his conjecture rests on no solid foundation. The Compendium is of great importance as preserving to us, though very imperfectly, an Arian statement of the ecclesiastical transactions of the busy period of the Arian controversy in the 4th century. It was first published, with a Latin version and copious notes, by Jacobus Gothofredus (Godefroi) (Geneva, 1643, 4to); and was  reprinted with the other ancient Greek ecclesiastical historians by Henricus Valesius (Henri Valois) (Paris, 1673, fol.) and by Reading (Cambridge, 1720, fol.).

3. Νομοκανών or Νομοκάνονον, Nomocanon, s. Nomocanonon, a. Nomocanonus, s. Canonumn Ecclesiasticorum et Legum Imperialium de Ecclesiastica Disciplina Conciliatio s. Harmonia. This work, which bers ample testimony to the extraordinary legal attainments of its author, is arranged under fourteen τίτλοι, Tituli, and was prefixed to a Σω῏/νταγμα τῶν κανόνων, Canonum Syntagma, or collection of the Cazones of the apostles and of the ecclesiastical councils recognised'by the Greek Church, compiled by Photius; from which circumstance it is sometimes called Προκάνων, Procanon. It has been repeatedly published, with the commenta" ries of Theodore Balsamon, who strongly recommended it, in preference to similar works of an earlier date: it appeared in the Latin version of Gentianus Hervetus (Paris, 1561, fol.), and in another Latin version of Henricus Agyvaeus (Basle, 1561, fol.), and in the original Greek text with the version of Agylaeus, edited by Christophorus Justellus (Paris, 1615, 4to). It was reprinted, with the version of Agylaeus, in the Bibliotheca Juris Canonici, published by Guillelmus Voellus and Henricus Justellus (Paris, 1661, fol.), 2:785, etc. The Nomocanon of Photius was epitomized in the kind of verses called politici by Michael Psellus. whose work iwas published, with one or two other of his pieces, by Franciscus Bosquetus (Paris, 1632, 8vo).

4. Περὶ τῶν ζ᾿ οἰκουμενικῶν συνόδων, De Septem Conciliis OEcumenicis. This piece subjoined, with a Latin version, to the Nomocanon in the Paris editions of 1615 and 1661, and often published elsewhere, is really part of one of the Epistolae of Photius, and is noticed in our account of them.

5. Ε᾿πιστολαί, Epistolas. There are extant a considerable number of the letters of Photius. The MSS. containing them are enumerated by Fabricius (Bibl. Graec. 11:11). It is much to be regretted that no complete collection of them has been published. David Hoeschelius subjoined to his edition of the Bibliotheca (Augsburg, 1601, fol.), mentioned above, thirty-five letters selected from a MS. collection which had belonged to Maximus Margunius, bishop of Cerigo, who lived about the end of the 16th century. One consolatory letter to the nun Eusebia on her sister's death was published by Conrad Rittershausius, with a Latin version, with some other  pieces (Ntirnberg, 1601, 8vo). But the largest collection is that prepared with a Latin version and notes by Richard Mountagu (Latinized Montacutius), bishop of Norwich, and published after his death (Lond. 1651, fol.). The Greek text was from a MS. in the Bodleian Library. The collection comprehends two hundred and forty-eight letters translated by the bishop, and a supplement of five letters brought from the East by Christianus Ravius, of which also a Latin version by another person is given. The first letter in Mountagu's collection is addressed to Michael, prince of the Bulgarians, on the question Τί ἐστιν ἔργον ἄρχοντος, De Officio Principis: it is very long, dnd contains the account of the seven general councils already mentioned (No. 4), as subjoined to the printed editions of the Nomocanon. This letter to prince Michael was translated into French verse by Bernard, a Theatin monk, dedicated to Louis XV, and published (Paris, 1718, 4to).

The second letter, also of considerable length, is an encyclical letter on various disputed topics, especially on that of the procession of the Holy Spirit, the leading theological question in dispute between the Eastern and Western churches. Mountagu's version has been severely criticised by Combefis (Fabricius, Bibl. Graec. 1:701, note f f f). Several important letters are not included in the collection, especially two to pope Nicholas I, and one to the archbishop or patriarch of Aquileia, on the procession of the Holy Spirit, of all of which Baronius had given a Latin version in his Annales Ecclesiastici (ad ann. 859, 61, etc.; 861, 34, etc.; and 883:5, etc.). Fragments of the Greek text of the letters to pope Nicholas were cited by Allatius in different parts of his works; the original of the letter to the archbishop of Aquileia was published in the Auctarium Novissinmum of Combefis, part 1, page 527, etc. (Paris, 1672, fol.), with a new Latin version and notes by the editor; and the original of all the three letters, together with a previously unpublished letter, Ad OEconomum Ecclesive Antiochiae, and the encyclical letter on the procession of the Holy Spirit (included in Mountagu's collection), the Acta of the eighth cecumenical council (that held in 879, at which the second appointment of Photius to the patriarchate was ratified), and some other pieces, with notes by Dositheus, patriarch of Jerusalem, were published by Anthimus "Episcopus Remnicus," i.e., bishop of Rimnik, in Wallachia, in his Τᾠμος χαρᾶς (Rimnik, 1705, fol.). A letter, Ad Theophanem Monachum, i.e., to Theophanes Cerameus, with a Latin version by Sirmond, was published by the Jesuit Franciscus Scorsus, in his Proommiune Secundum, § 3, to the Homilice of Cerameus (Paris, 1644, fol.), and another letter, Stauracio Spatharo-candidato, Praefecto insule Cypri, was included in the Ecclesiae  Graecae Monumenta of Cotelerius (2:104), together with a short piece, Περὶ τοῦ μὴ δεῖν πρὸς τὰ ἐν τῷ βίῳ λυπηρὰ ἐπιστρέφεσθαι, Quod non oporteat adpresentis vitce molestias attendere, which, though not bearing the form of a letter (perhaps it is a fragment of one), is in the MS. classed with the Epistole. A Latin version, from the Armenian, of some fragments of an Epistola Photii ad Zachariam Armeniae Patriarcham, in support of the doctrine of the Council of Chalcedon, is given in the Conciliatio Ecclesiae Armeniae cum Romana of Galanus (Rom. 1650, fol.). To all these we may add the Epistola Tarasio Fratri, usually subjoined to the Bibliotheca. The Epistola ad Zachariam, just mentioned, and another letter, Ad Principem A rmenium A sutium, are extant in MS. in an Armenian version (comp. Mai, Scriptor. Veterum Nov. Collectio, Proleg. in volume 1, Rom. 1825, 4to).

6. Λέξεων συναγωγή s. Λεξικόν, Lexicon. Marquardus Gudius, of Hamburg, had an anonymous MS. lexicon, which he believed and asserted to be that of Photius; but the correctness of his opinion was first doubted by some, and is now given up by most scholars; and another lexicon, much shorter, and.which is in the MSS. ascribed to Photius, is now admitted to be the genuine work of that eminent man. Of this Lexicon there exist several MSS., but that known as the Codex Galeanus, because given by Thomas Gale to the library of Trinity College, Cambridge, is considered to be the archetype from which the others have been transcribed; but this MS. is in itself very imperfect, containing in fact not much more than half the original work. Nearly the whole of the lexicon known as the Lexicon Sangermanease, a portion of which was published in the Anecdota Grceca of Immanuel Bekker (Berlin, 1814, 8vo), 1:319, etc., appears to have been incorporated in the Lexicon of Photius, of which, when entire, it is estimated to have formed a third part (Prcefat. to Porson's edition). The Lexicon of Photius was first published, from Continental MSS., by Gothofredus Hermannus (Leips. 1808, 4to). It formed the third volume of a set, of which the first two volumes contained the Lexicon ascribed to Joannes Zonaras. The publication of the Lea icon was followed by that of a Libellus Aninadversionum ad Photii Lexicon (Leips. 1810, 4to), and Curce Novissimce sive Appendix Notarunm et Emendationum in Photii Lexicon (Leips. 1812, 4to), both by Jo. Fried. Schleusner. But the edition of Hermann having failed to satisfy the wants of the learned, an edition from a transcript of the Codex Galeanus, made by Porson, was published  after the death of that eminent scholar (Lond. 1822, 4to and 8vo). (Comp. Edinb. Rev. 21:329, etc., No. 42, July 1813, and Class. Journ. l.c.)

7. Α᾿μφιλόχια, Amphilochia. This work, which Allatius, not a friendly censor, declared to be "a work filled with vast and varied learning, and very needful for theologians and expositors of Scripture," is in the form of answers to certain questions, and is addressed to Amphilochius, archbishop of Cyzicus. The answers are said in one MS. (apud Fabricius, Bibl. Grce. 11:26) to be two hundred and ninety-seven in number; but Montfaucon (l.c.) published an index of three hundred and eight, and a Vatican MS., according to Mai (Script. Vet. Nova Collectio, volume 1, Proleg. page 39), contains three hundred and thirteen. Of these more than two hundred and twenty have been published, but in various fragmentary portions (Mai, l.c.). The first portion which appeared in print was in the Lectiones A ntiquce of Canisius (Ingolstadt, 1604, etc., 4to), 5:188, etc., who gave a Latin version, by Franciscus Turrianus, of six of the Quaestiones; but the work to which they belonged was not mentioned. In the subsequent edition of the Lectiones by Basnage (Amsterd. 1725, 4to, volume 2, part 2, page 240, etc.), the Greek text of five of the six was added (the original of the sixth seems never to have been discovered), as well as the Greek text of a seventh Quaestio, "De Christi Voluntatibus Gnomicis," of which a Latin version by Turrianus had been published in the Auctarium Antiquarum Canisii Lectionuml of the Jesuit Petrus Stewartius (Ingolstadt, 1616, 4to); also without notice that it was from the Ampshilochia. Further additions were made by Combefis, in his SS. Patrum Amphilochii, etc., Opera (Paris, 1644, 2 volumes, fol.) (by a strange error he ascribed the work not to Photius, but to Amphilochius of Iconium, a much older writer, from whose works he supposed Photius had made a selection), and in his Novum Auctarium (Paris, 1648), 2 volumes, fol.; by Montfaucon, in his Bibliotheca Coisliniana (Paris, 1715, fol.); and by Jo. Justus Spier, in Wittenbergische Anmerkungen uber theologische, philosophische, historische, philologische, und kritische Materien (Wittenberg, 1738, 8vo), part 1 (Harles, Introd. in Historiam Linguae Graec. Supplem. 2:47). But the principal addition was made by Jo. Chr. Wolff, of forty-six Quaestiones, published, with a Latin version, in his Curae Philologicae (Hamb. 1735, 4to), volume 5 ad fin.; these were reprinted in the Bibliotheca Patrum of Galland (Venice, 1779, fol.), volume 13. A further portion of eighteen Quaestiones, under the title Ε᾿κ τῶν Φωτίου Α᾿μφιλοχίων τινα, Ex Photii Amphilochiis qucedam, was published, with  a Latin version, by Angelus Antonius Schottus (Naples, 1817, 4to); and some further portions, one of twenty Quaestiones, with a Latin version by Mai, in his Scriptorum Veterum Nova Collectio, 1:193, etc., and another of a hundred and thirty Quaestiones, in 9:1, etc. As many of the Quaestiones were mere extracts from the Epistolce and other published works of Photius, Mai considers that with these and with the portions published by him, the whole of the Amphilochia has now been published. He thinks (Scriptor. Vet. Nova Collect. volume 1, Proleg. p. 40) that the patriarch, towards the close of his life, compiled the work from his own letters, homilies, commentaries, etc., and addressed it to his friend Amphilochius, as a mark of respect, and not because the questions which were solved had actually been proposed to him by that prelate; and he thus accounts for the identity of many passages with those in the author's other works.

8. Adversus Manichaeos s. Paulicianos Libri Quatuor. No Greek title of the whole work occurs, but the four books are respectively thus described: 1. Διήγησις περἱ τῆς Μανιχαίων ἀναβλαστήσεως, Narratio de Manicheeis recens repullulantibus. 2. Α᾿πορίαι καὶ λύσεις τῶν Μανιχαίων, Dubia et Solutiones Manichceorum. 3. Τοῦ Φωτιου λόγος, Photii Sernmo II. 4. Κατὰ τῆς τῶν Μανιχαίων ἀρτιφυοῦς πλανῆς, Α᾿ρσενίῳ τῷ ἁγιωτάτῳ μοναχῷ πρεσβυτέρῳ καὶ ἡγουμενῳ τῷν ἱερῶν,, Contra repulluiantem Manicheorum Eirrorem ad Arsenium Monachum Sanctissimum Presbyterumn et Praefectum Sacrorum. The title of the second book is considered by Wolff to apply to the second, third, and fourth books, which formed the argumentative part of the work. and to which the first book formed a historical introduction. The second book is intended to show that the same God who created spiritual intelligences also created the bodies with which they are united, and the material world generally; the third vindicates the divine origin of the Old Testament; and the fourth reiterates some points of the second and third books, and answers the objections of the Paulicians. The first book has several points in common with the historical work of Petrus Siculus on the same subject, so as to make it probable that one writer used the work of the other, and it is most likely Photius availed himself of that of Petrus. This important work of Photius was designed for publication by several scholars (see Wolff, Praefat. in Anecdot. Graec. volume 1; and Fabricius, Bibl. Graec. 7:329; 11:18), but they were prevented by death from fulfilling their purpose. Montfaucon published the first book, with a Latin version, in his Bibliotheca Coisliniana (page 349, etc.); and the whole work was given by  Jo. Christoph. Wolff, with a Latin version and notes, in his Anecdota Grceca (Hamb. 1722, 12mo), volumes 1:ii, from which it was reprinted in volume 13 of the Bibliotheca Patrum of Galland (Venice, 1779, fol.). A sort of epitome of this work of Photius is found in the Panoplia of Euthymius Zigabenus. Oudin contended that the work of Metrophanes of Smyrnla. on the Manichaeans and on the Holy Spirit, was identical with this work of Photius; but this opinion is erroneous.

9. Κατὰ τῶν τῆς παλαῖας ῾Ρώμης ὅτι ἐκ Πατρὸς μόνου ἐκπορεύεται τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ ἃγιον ἀλλ᾿ οὐχὶ καὶ ἐκ τοῦ Υίοῦ, A dversus Latinos de Processione Spiritus Sacfti. This work is incorporated in the Greek text of the Panoplia of Euthymius Zigabenus (Tergovist. 1710, fol., pages 112, 113), of which it constitutes the thirteenth τίτλος or section. It.is omitted in the Latin versions of Euthymius. The work of Photius contains several syllogistic propositions, which are quoted and answered seriatim in the De Unione Ecclesiarum Oratio I, of Joannes Veccus, published in the Graecia Orthodoxa of Allatius (Rome, 1652, 4to), 1:154, etc. It is apparently the work entitled by Cave Disputatio Compendiaria de Processione Spiritus Sancti a solo Patre.

10. Homiliae. Several of these have been published:

(1.) ῎Εκφρασις τῆς ἐν τοῖς βασιλείου τοῦ ἐκκλησίας τῆς ὑπεραγίας θεοΦτόκου ὑπὸ Βασιλειου τοῦ Μακεδόνος οἰκοδομηθείσης, Descriptio Novae Sanctissimae Dei Genitricis Ecclesiae, in Palatio a Basilio Macedone exstsructae; a discourse delivered on the dav of the dedication of the church described. It was first printed by Lambecius, in his notes to the work of Georgius Codinus, De Originibus CPolitanis (Paris, 1655, fol.), page 187, and is contained, with a Latin version. in the Bonn reprint of Codinus (1839, 8vo). It is also contained in the Originumn CPolitanarum Manipulus of Coamefis (Paris, 1664, 4to), page 296, with a Latin version and notes; and in the Imperium Orientale of Bandurius (Paris, 1711, fol.), pars 3, page 117.

(2.) Εἰς τὸ γενέσιον τῆς ὑπεραγίας θεοτόκου, Homilia in Sanctissimae Dei Genitricis Natalem Diem, published by Combefis in his Auctarium Novumn (Paris, 1648, fol.), volume 1, col. 1583, and in a Latin version, in his Bibliotheca Patrum concionatoria (Paris, 1662, fol. etc.). Both text and version are reprinted in the Bibliotheca Patrum of Galland.

(3.) In Sepulturam Domini; a fragment, probably from this, is given by Mai (Scriptor, Vet. Nova l Collect. Proleg. in volume 1, page 41).

(4.) Περὶ τοῦ μὴ δεῖν πρὸς τὰ ἐν τῷ βιῳ λυπηρὰ ἐπιστρέφεσθα, Quod nomn oporteat ad prcesentis Vitce Molestios attendere.' — This piece, which is perhaps not a homily, but the fragment of a letter, was published in the Ecelesie Greece Monumenta of Cotelerius, and has already been noticed in speaking of the Epistolae of Photius.

11. Ε᾿ρωτήματα δέκα σὺν ἴσαις ταῖ ἀποκρίσεσι, Interrogationes decemn cune totidem'Responsionibus, s. Συναγωγαὶ καὶ ἀποδείξεις ἀκριβεῖς συνειλεγμέναι ἐκ τῶν συνοδικῶν καὶ ἱστορικῶν γραφῶν περὶ ἐπισκόπων καὶ μητροπολιτῶν καὶ λοιπῶν ἐτερων ἀναγκαίων ζητημάτων, Collectiones accurataeque Demonstrationes de Episcopis et Metropolitis et reliquis allis necessariis Quaestionibus ex Synodicis et Historicis Monumentis excerptae. This piece was published, with a Latin version and notes, by Francesco Fontani, in the first volume of his Notae Eruditorum Deliciae (Florence; 1785, 12mo). The notes were such as to give considerable offence to "the stricter Romanists. (Mai, Scriptor. Veteo. Nov. Collect. Proleg. ad volume 1, page 44).

12. Εἰς τὸν Λουκᾶν ἑρμηνείαι, In Lucam Expositiones. Some brief Scheoliaon the Gospel of Luke from MSS. Cafenae, are given, with a Latin version, in volume 1 of the Scriptorum Vetesume Nova Collectio of Mai, page 189, etc., but from which of Photius's' works they are taken does not appear.

13. Canonica Responsa, addressed to Leo, archbishop of Calabria; also published, with a Latin version, by Mai (ibid. page 362), from a Palimpsest in the Vatican Library.

Many works of this great writer still remain in MS.:

1. Commentarius in D. Paculi Epistolas, a mutilated copy of which is (or was, according to Cave) in the public library at Cambridge. It is largely cited by OEcumenius.

2. Catena in Psalmos. formerly in the Coislinian library, of which, according to Montfalcon (Bibl. Coislin. pages 58, 59), Photius appears to have been the compiler. Bunt the Commentary on the Prophets, Prophetarum Libe; ascribed to him by Cave, Fabricius, and others, appears to have no real existence; the supposition of its existence was founded on  the misapprehension of a passage in Possevino's Apparatus Sacer (Mai, Proleg. ut sup. page 1).

3. Homiice XIV, extant in MS. at 3 Moscow, of the subjects of which a list is given in the Auctarium Novissimum (ad calc. volume 1) of Combefis, in the De Scriptoribus Ecclesiasticis of Oudin (col. 210, etc.), and in the Ribl. Graeca (11:80, etc.) of Fabricius. To these may be added two other homilies, De Ascensione, and In Festo Epiphaniae, and an Enconmium Poto Martyis Theole (Fabricius, ibid.).

4. Odae. Nine are or were extant in a MS. formerly belonging to the college of Clermont, at Paris, and three in an ancient Barberini MS. at Rome. The latter are described bv Mai (Proleg. page 44) as of moderate length, and written in pleasing verse. Some Epigrammata of Photius are said to be extant (Montfaucon, Bibl. Coislin. page 520); but the Στιχηρόν, In Methodiunt Col., said to be given in the Acta Sanctorum, Junii, 2:969, is not to be found there.

5. Ε᾿πιτομὴ τῶν πρακτικῶν τῶν ἑπτὰ οἰκουμενικῶν συνοδων, Epitome Actorum Conciliorum septem Generalium. This is described by Cave and Fabricius as a different work from the published piece (No. 4, above). Some critics have doubted whether it is different from the similar work ascribed to Photius of Tyre; but as this prelate lived in the time of the third or fourth councils, he could not have epitomized the Acta of the fifth, sixth, and seventh. Thus the Epitome cannot be by Photius of Tyre, whatever doubt there may be as to its being the work of our Photius.

6. The Syntagmna Canonum has already been mentioned in speaking of the Nomocanon;

7. Περὶ τῆς τοῦ ἁγίου Πνεύματος μυσταγωγίας, De Spiritus Sancti Disciplina Arcixna, s. Περὶ τοῦ ἁγίου καὶ ζωοποιοῦ καὶ προσκυνητοῦ Πνεύματος, uber de Spiritu Sancto, addressed to a bishop Bedas, and different from the published work (No, 9). It is described by Mai, who has given some extracts (Proleg. page 45), as "liber lucalentus, varius, atque prolixus." It is ascribed in one MS., but by an obvious error, to Metrophanes of Smyrna.

8. Τὰ παρὰ τῆς ἐκκλησίας τῶν Λατίνων αἰτιώματα μερικά, A dversus Latinorum Ecclesiam Criminationes Particulares.

9. Contrea Flancos et Latinos (ibid. page 48); a very short piece. Various other pieces are mentioned by Cave, Lambecius, Fabricius, and Mai, as extant in MS.; but some of these are only fragments of the published writings (ibid. page 1) enumerated by ‘mistake as separate works.' The work In Categories Aristotelis, now or formerly extant in Vienna and Paris, is apparently a part of the Amphilochia (ibid. page 36). The works De Episcopis et Metropolitis, and the Annotatio del Patriarchis sede sua injuste pulsis) mentioned by Cave and Fabricius, appear to be either the Interrogationes decem published by Fontani, or a part of that work. (See No. 11 of the published works.) The Symbolem Fidei mentioned by Lambecimus, Cave, and Harles (Fabricius, Bibl. Graec. 11:30), part of one of the letters to pope Nicholas; and the Liber de Pulsione Ignatii ac Restitutione mentioned by Montfaucon (Bibl. Bibliothecarum, page 123), is also part of a letter of pope Nicholas; and the fragmrent De decem Oratoribus, mentioned by Vossius and others, and extant in MS. in the King's Library at Paris, is probably from the Bibliotheca (Mai, Proleg. page 1). Some works have perished, as that against the heretic Leontius of Antioch, mentioned by Suidas (s.v. Λεόντιος). Photius wrote also against the emperor Julian (Phot. Epist. 187, ed. Montac.), and in defence of the use of images. Some writings, or fragmrents of writings of his on this subject (Adversus Iconomachos et Paulicianos, and De Differential inter sacras Imagines atque Idola) are extant in the Imperial Library at Vienna, but whether in distinct works, or under what title does not appear to be known.

In the Synodicon of bishop Beveridge (volume 2, ad fin. part 1) a short piece is given, of which the running title is Balsamon in Photii Interrogationes quorumdam Monachorum; but the insertion of the name of Photius is altogether incorrect; the work belongs to the time of the emperor Alexius I Comnenus. The Exegesis, or Commentary of Elias Cretensis on the Scula Paradisi of Joannes Climacus, is, in a MS. of the Coislinian library (Montfaucon, Bibl. Coislin. page 141), improperly ascribed to Photius.

Two learned Romanists, Joannes Andresius and Jacobus Morellius, have in recent times contemplated the publication of a complete edition of the works of Photius; the latter proceeded so far as to draw up a Coinspectus of his proposed edition (Mai, Proleg. page 44). But unfirtunately the design has never been completed. Migie has published an edition in 4 volumes, roy. 8vo, which he claims to be complete, but it is hardly as  critical as the works of the greatest genius of his age deserves. This edition is entitled Photii, Constantinopolitani patriarcher, opera omnia in classes quinque distributa: exegetica, dogmatica, parmenetica, historiccaanonica. etc., accurante J.P. Migne (tomes 1 et 4, in grande a deux colonnes, 1416 p., Paris, impr. et libr. J.P. Migne, 1860. Veneunt 4 volumes, 42 francis gallicis). See Cave, Hist. Litt. 2:47, etc. (ed. Oxford, 1740-1743); Fabricius, Biblioth. Graec. 1:701; 6:603; 7:803; 10:670 to 11:37; 12:185, 210, 216, 348; Oudin, Comment. de Scriptorib. et Scriptis Eccles. volume 2, col. 200, etc.; Hankius, De Rerum Byzantin. Scriptorib. pars 1, c. 18; Dupin, Nouvelle Bibliotheque des Auteurs Eccls, IXme Siecle, page 346 (2me ed. 1698); Ceillier, Auteurs Sacres, 19:426, etc.; Ittigius, De Bibliothecis Patrum, passim; Gallandius, Biblioth. Patrum, Proleg; in volume 13; Fontani, De Photio.Nove Romae Episcopo ejusque Scriptis Dissertatio, prefixed to volume 1 of the Novae Eruditorum Deliciae; Mai, Scriptor. Vet. Nova Collectio, Proleg. in volume 1; Assemani, Bibliotheca Juris Orientalis, lib. 1, c. 2, 7, 8, 9; Vossius, De Historicis Graecis, lib. 2, c. 25; Donaldson's Literatuae (see Index in volume 2); Lea, Sacerdotal Celibacy (see Index), Ffoullkes, Divisions of Christendom, volume 2, chapter 1; Flenry, Hist. Ecclesiastique; Maimbourg, Schisme des Grecs; Dollinger, Lehrbuch der Kirchengesch. volume 1; Jager, Hist. de Photius, d'apres les monuments origineaux (Paris, 1845).

## Photius Of Tyre[[@Headword:Photius Of Tyre]]

             another Eastern ecclesiastic, flourished near the middle of the 5th century. On the deposition of Irenaeus, bishop of Tyre, in A.D. 448, Photius was appointed his successor. Evagrius (Hist. Ecc 1:10) makes the deposition of Irenaeus one: of the acts of the notorious Council of Ephesus, held in A.D. 449, and known as the "Concilium Latrocinale;" but Tillemont more correctly considers that the council only confirmed the previous deposition (Mmnoires, 15:268). Photius of Tyre was one of the judges appointed by the emperor Theodosius II, in conjunction with Eustathius, bishop of Berytus, and Uranius, bishop of Himerae in Osrhoene, to hear the charges against Ibas, bishop of Edessa. Photius, Eustathius, and Uranias met at Berytus, and Photius and Eustathius again met at Tyre, in the year 448 or 449, heard the charges, acquitted Ibas, and brought about a reconciliation between him and his accusers, who were presbyters of his ownfChurch at Edessa (Concil. volume 4, col. 627, etc., ed. Labbe; volume 2, col. 503, etc., ed. Hardouin).

There is a considerable  difficulty as to the chronology of these meetings, which is discussed by Tillemont in two of his careful notes (Mem. 15:897, etc.). Photius was present at the Council of Ephesus, known as the “Concilium Latrocinale," where he joined in acquitting the archimandrite Eltyches, and restoring him to his ecclesiastical rank from which he had been deposed (Concil. volume 4, col. 260, ed. Labbe; volume 2, col. 220, ed. Hardouin). About the same time Photius had a contest with Eustathius, bishop of Bervtus, who had obtained an edict of the emperor Theodosius II, erecting Berytus into a metropolitan see, as to the extent of their respective jurisdictions. Tillemont judges that the dignity accorded to the see of Berytus was designed to be merely titular, and that the struggle was occasioned by the attempt of Eustathius to assume metropolitan jurisdiction over some bishoprics previously under the jurisdiction of Tyre. In this attempt, being supported by the patriarchs Xnatolius of Constamntinople alid Maximus of Antioch, he effected his purpose; and Photius, after a struggle, was constrained, not so much by an excommunication, which was speedily recalled, as by a threat of deposition, to submit. The jurisdiction of the dioceses abstracted was, however, restored to Photius by the Council of Chalcedon, A.D. 451 (Concil. volume 4, col. 539, ed. Labbe; volume 2, col. 435, etc., ed. Hardouin). Photius was among those who at the same council voted that Theodoret was orthodox, and should be restored to his see (Concil. col. 619, ed. Labbd; col. 495, ed. Hardouin). He also took part in some of the other transactions of the assembly. Nothing further is known of him. There is extant one piece of Photius, entitled Δεήσεις, Preces s. Supplex Libellus, addressed to the emperors Valentinian III and Marcian, respecting the dispute with Eustathius of Berytus. It is given in the Actio Quarta of the Council of Chalcedon (Concil. volume 4, col. 542, etc., ed. Labbd; volume 2, col. 436, etc., ed. Hardouin).

A Synopsis de Conciliis, extant in MS., is ascribed to Photius of Tyre: this cannot be, as some have supposed, the same work as the Epitome Actorum Conciliorum, also extant in MS., and ascribed to the more celebrated Photius, patriarch of Constantinople. See Tillemont, Mein. l.c.: Cave, Hist. Litt. ad ann. 451, 1:443; Fabricius, Biblioth. Graec. 10:678; 12:358; Smith, Dict. of Gr. and Rom. Biog. and Mythol. s.v.

## Photizomonoi[[@Headword:Photizomonoi]]

             (φωτιζόμενοι, enlqkhtened), a term frequently used among the early Christians to denote the baptized as being instructed in the mysteries of the Christian religion. SEE PHOS.

## Phrat[[@Headword:Phrat]]

             SEE EUPHRATES.

## Phrenology[[@Headword:Phrenology]]

             (from φρήν, the mind, and λόγος, a discourse), an empirical science, which claims to read the mental peculiarities of individuals by means of the exterior developments of the skull. It had its origin with Franz Joseph Gall, a physician of Germany, and was greatly extended by Dr. Spurzheim, of the same country, and by George and Andrew Combe, of Scotland. In this country it has been chiefly popularized by the late L.N. and O.S. Fowler. There is a sprightly periodical, called the Phrenological Journal, published in New York, devoted to its advocacy. In accordance with its theory of the special functions of particular portions of the brain, it has mapped out the cranium into various "organs," as amativeness, philoprogenitiveness, etc., in the animal order; ideality, veneration, etc., in the aesthetic and moral; figure, time, tune, etc., in the perceptive, and so on. It has largely been used by itinerant lecturers as a method of indicating the character of unknown persons, somewhat after the fashion of fortune-telling. Its claims to scientific value are not generally admitted by sound physiologists and mental philosophers, as neither its craniological nor its psychological theory and analysis agree with the best setted principles of either of those departments of self-knowledge. Its theological bearings are decidedly materialistic. For a fuller exposition the reader is referred to the works of the writers above cited. SEE ALSO PSYCHOLOGY.

## Phrontisterion[[@Headword:Phrontisterion]]

             (φροντιστήριον, a place of meditation), a name anciently applied to denote monasteries as being places of education and schools of learning. Baptisteries were also occasionally called by this name, the catechumens being there educated in religious truth.

## Phrygia[[@Headword:Phrygia]]

             (Φρυγία, perhaps from φρύγω, hence parched), an inland province of Asia Minor, bounded on the north by Bithynia and Galatia. on the east by Cappadocia and Lycaonia, on the south by Lycia, Pisidia, and Isauria, and on the west by Caria, Lydia, and Mysia. Perhaps there is no geographical term in the New Testament which is less capable of an exact definition. Many maps convey the impression that it was coordinate with such terms as Bithynia, Cilicia, or Galatia. But in fact there was no Roman province of Phrygia till considerably after the first establishment of Christianity in the peninsula of Asia Minor. The word was rather ethnological than political, and denoted, in a vague manner, the western part of the central region of that peninsula. Accordingly, in two of the three places where it is used, it is mentioned in a manner not intended to be precise (διελθότες τὴν Φρυγίαν καὶ τὴν Φαλατικὴν χώραν, Act 16:6; διερχόμενος καθεξῆς τὴν Γαλατικὴν χώραν καὶ Φρυγίαν, Act 18:23), the former having reference to the second missionary journey of St. Paul, the latter to the third. Nor is the remaining passage (Act 2:10) inconsistent with this view, the enumeration of those foreign Jews who came to Jerusalem at Pentecost (though it does follow, in some degree, a geographical order) having no referencs to political boundaries. By Phrygia we must understand an extensive district, which contributed portions to several Roman provinces, and varying portions at different times. In early times Phrygia seems to have comprehended the greater part of the peninsula of Asia Minor. It was subsequently divided into Phrygia Major on the south, and Phrygia Minor or Epictetus (acquired) on the northwest. The Romans divided the province into three districts: Phrygia Salutaris on the east, Phrygia Pacatiana on the west, and Phrygia Katakekaumene (the burnt) in the middle. The country, as defined by the specified limits, is for the most part level, and very abundant in corn, fruit, and wine. It had a peculiar and celebrated breed of cattle, and the fine raven-black wool of the sheep around Laodicca on the Lycus was in high repute. The Maeander and the Hermus were its chief rivers. The Phrygians were a very ancient people, and are supposed to have formed, along with the Pelasgi, the aborigines of Asia Minor. Jews from Phrygia were present in Jerusalem at the Feast of Pentecost (Act 2:10). All over this district the Jews were probably numerous. They were first introduced there by Antiochus the Great (Josephus, Ant. 12:3, 4); and we have abundant proof of their presence there from Act 13:14; Act 14:1; Act 14:19, as well as from Act 2:10.  The cities of Laodicea, Hierapolis, and Colosse, mentioned in the New Testament, belonged to Phrygia, and Antioch in Pisidia was also within its limits (see the names). See Rosenmuller, Bibl. Geog. 3:43-45; Leake, Geog. of Asia Minor; Smith, Dict. of Claus. Geog. s.v. SEE ASIA MINOR.

## Phrygians or Cataphrygians[[@Headword:Phrygians or Cataphrygians]]

             (q.v.), a sect in the 2d century, so called as being of the country of Phrygia. They were orthodox in everything, setting aside this, that they took Montanus for a prophet, and Priscilla and Maximilla for true prophetesses, to be consulted in everything relating to religion; as supposing that the Holy Spirit had abandoned the Church. SEE MONTANISTS

.

## Phtha or Ptah[[@Headword:Phtha or Ptah]]

             the supreme god of the ancient Egyptians, in the first four dynasties or successions of kings, extending about 321 years. This god seems, however, in later times to have been degraded from his high position and become a secondary god. No image of this, nor indeed of any other god or goddess, is found upon the most ancient Egyptian monuments. The worship of Phtha passed from Egypt into Greece, and was altered into Hephaestus. "When, in later times," says Mr. Osburn, in his Religions of the World, "pictures and images of the gods made their appearance on the ruins of ancient Egypt, Ptah was represented as a tall youth, with handsome features, and a green complexion, denoting the swarthy, sallow hue which the burning sun of Africa had already impressed upon the skins of Phut and his descendants. He was swathed in white linen like a mummy to denote that he had been dead, but his hands had burst through the cerements, and grasped many symbols, to denote that he has risen again. This god is made the son of many divine parents, according to the later fables, both of the monuments and of the Greek authors, most of them prompted by political motives; but not on the monuments of all epochs. The image of Ptah of Memphis is enclosed in a shrine, to denote that he claimed affinity with no other god, and that his real parentage was unknown or forgotten."

## Phthartodocetae[[@Headword:Phthartodocetae]]

             (from φθαρτός, destructible, and δοκεω, to seem). One of the numerous Monophysite sects. They were so called because they maintained that the body of Christ was truly corruptible before his resurrection. They were  opposed to another sect which affirmed that the body of Jesus was rendered incorruptible in consequence of the divine nature blended with it: these were called Aphthartodocetae, Phantasiasts, etc., and were likewise divided into parties, some of which debated whether the body of Christ was created or uncreated. SEE APHTHARTODOCETAE; SEE MONOPHYSITES

.

## Phthartolatrae[[@Headword:Phthartolatrae]]

             (φραρτός, destructible, and λατρεύω, to worship), a term of reproach applied to the Severians (q.v.) in the 6th century, who maintained that Christ's body was corruptible of itself, but by reason of the Godhead dwelling in it was never corrupted.

## Phud[[@Headword:Phud]]

             (Φούδ), an incorrect Greek form (Jdg 2:23) of the Heb. name (Eze 27:10) PHUT SEE PHUT (q.v.).

## Phurah[[@Headword:Phurah]]

             (Heb. Purah', פֻּרָה, bough; Sept. Φαρά), the servant of Gideon, who went with him by night to spy the camp of the Midianites (Jdg 7:10-11). B.C. 1362.

## Phurim[[@Headword:Phurim]]

             (Esther 11:1). SEE PURIM.

## Phut[[@Headword:Phut]]

             (Heb. Put, פּוּט; Sept. Φούδ or Φούτ, but usually Λίβυες, and so Josephus Ant, 6:2) the name of a people mentioned in connection with Mizraim and Cush as third among the descendants of Ham (Gen 10:6; "Put," 1Ch 1:8), elsewhere applied to an African country or people (Jer 46:9; Eze 30:5; Eze 38:5; "Put," Nah 3:9. Comp. also Jdg 2:23, in the Greek and Syriac). In all of these passages Phut or Put is named with Cush, Ludim, and Lubim. Putites served in the Egyptian; army (Jeremiah l.c.; comp. Eze 30:5), and the Tyrian navy (Eze 27:20), and are numbered in the army of Gog (Eze 38:5). Josephus (Ant. 1:6, 2) understands here the Mauritanians. He also mentions a river bearing the same name, in the  territory of the Mauri, which is called Fut by Pliny (page 242, ed. Hard.), and flows into the Atlantic. Ptolemy (4:1, 3) calls it Phthouth (long. 7½o, lat. 30-o), in Mauritania Tingitana (comp. Michael. Spicil. 1:160 sq.). These traces of the name, however, are not needed. That it is a name of Libya is sufficiently obvious from the Sept. in Jeremiah and Ezekiel, and from the fact that Faiat is a Coptic name for Libya in Egypt — that is, for that part of Lower Egypt which lies west of the Canopic mouth of the Nile, so called (see Gesen. Thesaur. 2:1093). More recently Hitzig would identify with Put the tribe of Putiya, mentioned in the inscriptions at the tomb of Darius, and refers to Putea (Πούτεα), a city on the west bank of the river Triton in Northern Africa (Ptol. 4:3, 39). But no weight can be given to his remark that a people which served in the Egyptian army in foreign expeditions must not be sought in Western Africa. — Winer, 2:229. SEE LIBYA

"In the above genealogical lists Phut follows Cush and Mizraim, and precedes Canaan. The settlements of Cush extended from Babylonia to Ethiopia above Egypt, those of Mizraim stretched from the Philistine territory through Egypt and along the northern coast of Africa to the west; and the Canaanites were established at first in the land of Canaan, but afterwards were spread abroad. The order seems to be ascending towards the north: the Cushite chain of settlements being the most southern, the Mizraite chain extending above them, though perhaps through a smaller region, at least at the first and the Canaanites holding the most northern position. We cannot place the tract of Phut out of Africa, and it would seem that it was almost parallel to that of the Mizraites, as it could not be farther to the north: this position would well agree with Libya. But it must be recollected that the order of the nations or tribes of the stocks of Cush, Mizraim, and Canaan is not the same as that we have inferred to be that of the principal names, and that it is also possible that Phut may be mentioned in a supplementary manner, perhaps as a nation or country dependent on Egypt. The few mentions of Phut in the Bible clearly indicate, as already remarked, a country or people of Africa, and, it must be added, probably not far from Egypt. It is noticeable that they occur only in the list of Noah's descendants and in the prophetical Scriptures. Isaiah probably makes mention of Phut as a remote nation or country, where the A.V. has Pul, as in the Masoretic text (Isa 66:19). Nahum, warning Nineveh by the fall of No-Amon, speaks of Cush and Mizraim as the strength of the Egyptian city, and Phut and Lubim as its helpers (Nah 3:9). Jeremiah  tells of Phut in Necho's army With Cush and the Ludim (Jer 46:9). Ezekiel speaks of Phut with Persia and Lud as supplying mercenaries to Tyre (Eze 27:10), and as sharing with Cnsh, Lud, and other helpers of Egypt, in her fall (Eze 30:5); and again, with Persia, and Cush, perhaps in the sense of mercenaries, as warriors of the army of Gog (Eze 38:5). From these passages we cannot infer anything as to the exact position of this; country or people; unless indeed in Nahum, Cush and Phut, Mizraim and Lubim, are respectively connected, which might indicate a position south of Egypt. The serving in the Egyptian army, and importance of Phut to Egypt, make it reasonable to suppose that its position was very near.

"In the ancient Egyptian inscriptions we find two names that may be compared to the Biblical Phut. The tribes or peoples called the Nine Bows, IX Petuorm IX Na-Petu, might partly or wholly represent Phut. Their situation is doubtful, and they are never found in a geographical list, but only in the general statements of the power and prowess of the kings. If one people be indicated by them, we may compare the Naphtuhim of the Bible. SEE NAPHTUHIM. It seems unlikely that the Nine Bows should correspond to Phut, as their name does not occur as a geographical term in use in the directly historical inscriptions, though it may be supposed that several well-known names there take its place as those of individual tribes; but this is an improbable explanation. The second name is that of Nubia, To-pet, "the region of the Bow," also called Tonmeru-pet, “the region, the island of the Bow," whence we conjecture the name of Meroe to come. In the geographical lists the latter form occurs in that of a people, Anu-meru- pet, found, unlike all others, in the lists of the southern peoples and countries as well as the northern. The character we read Pet is an unstrung bow, which until lately was read Kens, as a strung bow is found following, as if a determinative, the latter word, which is a name of Nubia, perhaps, however, not including so large a territory as the names before mentiolied. The reading Kens is extremely doubtful, because the word does not signify bow in Egyptian, so far as we are aware, and still more because the bow is used as the determinative of its name Pet, which from the Egyptian usage as to determinatives makes it almost impossible that it should be employed as a determinative of Kens. The name Kens would therefore be followed by the bow to indicate that it was a part of Nubia. This subject may be illustrated by a passage of Herodotus, explained by Mr. Harris, of Alexandria, if he may premise that the unstrung bow is the common sign,  and, like the strung bow, is so used as to be the symbol of Nubia. The historian relates that the king of the Ethiopians unstrung a bow, and gave it to the messengers of Cambyses, telling them to say that when the king of the Persians could pull so strong a bow so easily he might come against the Ethiopians with an army stronger than their forces (3:21, 22, ed. Rawlinson: Sir G. Wilkinson's note). For the hieroglyphic names, see Brugsch, Geogr. Inschr.

"The Coptic Piphaiat must also be compared with Phut. The first syllable being the article, the word nearly resembles the Hebrew name. It is applied to the western part of Lower Egypt beyond the Delta; and Champollion conjectures it to mean the Libyan part of Egypt, so called by the Greeks, comparing the Coptic name of the similar eastern portion, Phapabia or Tapabia, the older Arabian part of Egypt and Arabian Nome (L'Eyypte sous les Pharaons, 2:28-31, 243). Be this as it may, the name seems nearer to Naphtuhim than to Phut. To take a broad view of the question, all the names which we have mentioned may reasonably be connected with the Hebrew Phut; and it may be supposed that the Naphtuhim were Mizraites in the territory of Phut, perliaps intermixed with peoples of the latter stock. It is, however, reasonable to suppose that the Pet of the ancient Egyptians, as a geographical designation, corresponds to the Phut of the Bible, which would therefore denote Nubia or the Nubians, the former, if we are strictly to follow the Egyptian usage. This identification would account for the position of Phut after Mizraim in the list in Genesis, notwithstanding the order of the other names; for Nubia has been from remote times a dependency of Egypt, excepting in the short period of Ethiopian supremacy, and the longer time of Ethiopian independence. The Egyptian name of Cush, Kesh, is applied to a wider region well corresponding to Ethiopia. The governor of Nubia in the time of the Pharaohs was called Prince of Kesh, perhaps because his authority extended bevond Nubia. The identification of Phut with Nubia is not repugnant to the mention inlthe prophets; on the contrary, the great importance of Nubia in their time, which comprehended that of the Ethiopian supremacy, would account for their speaking of Phut as a support of Egypt, and as furnishing- it with warriors. The identification with Libya has given rise to attempts to. find the name in African geography, which we shall not here examine, as such mere similarity of sounld is a most unsafe guide."

The name of Phtha, the chief deity of Memphis, has been considered by some Egyptologists to be the hieroglyphic transcription of Phut, the son of  Ham, whose descendants settled in the oases of the Libyan desert. as is demonstrated by the circumstance that the country named after Phut, in the Hebrew, is translated Libya by the Sept. (see Gesenius, Lexicon, s.v. פוּט). "The name Phut, in its change to Phtha," says Osbuin, "has undergone an extraordinary process, highly characteristic of the modes of thought that prevailed in very ancient times. Written with the final h, which may be added to a Hebrew word without altering the sense, it represents the consonants of the verb 'to reveal,' which in the Coptic sense is 'to write hieroglyphics.' A still stranger use has been made of this pun upon the name of Phut. His animal representative has been named after the action in direct antagonism with that of the human, original. The hieroglyphic name of the bull Apis, hp, is the Coptic verb pet, 'to hide,' which is a mere transcription of the ancient verb חפה חו, with the same meaning. The comparison of the two groups renders this contrast very apparent. It will be seen that one group is as nearly as possible an inversion of the other. The meanings are in like manner in antithesis. In the bull Apis, therefore, were concealed the attributes which were revealed in Phtha" (Mon. Hist. of Egypt, chapter 5).

Some late Egyptologists, however, regard Put as a merely Egyptian pronunciation for Punt (Bunsen, Egypt, 2:304), which was the name of an Arabian tribe east of Egypt (Brugsch, Geogr. Inschr. 2:15). SEE ETHNOGRAPHY.

## Phuvah[[@Headword:Phuvah]]

             (Ieb. Puvvah', צפֻּוָּה, mouth; Sept. Φουά), the second named of four sons of Issachar (Gen 46:13). B.C. 1900. This name is also written "Pua" in the A.V. (Num 26:23), and "Puah," margin “Phuyalh" (1Ch 7:1). His descendants are called "Punites" (Num 26:23).

## Phygellus[[@Headword:Phygellus]]

             (Gr. Φύγελλος, perh. a fugitive), a Christian of Asia, who being at Rome during Paul's imprisonment, deserted him in his necessity (2Ti 1:15). A.D. 64. "It is open to question whether this repudiation of the apostle was joined with a declension from the faith (see Buddaeus, Eccl. Apostol. 2:310), and whether the open display of the feeling of Asia took place — at least so far as Phygellus and Hermogenes were concerned — at Rome. It was at Rome that Onesiphorus, named in the next verse, showed  the kindness for which the apostle invokes a blessing on his household in Asia: so perhaps it was at Rome that Phygellls displayed that change of feeling towards Paul which the apostle's former followers in Asia avowed. It seems unlikely that Paul would write so forcibly if Phvgellus had merely neglected to visit him in his captivity at Rome. He may have forsaken (see 2Ti 4:16) the apostle at some critical time when his support was expected; or he may have been a leader of some party of nominal Christians at Rome, such as the apostle describes at an earlier period (Php 1:15-16) opposing him there. Dean Ellicott, on 2Ti 1:15, who is at variance with the ancient Greek commentators as to the exact force of the phrase 'they which are in Asia,' states various opinions concerning their aversion to Paul. The apostle himself seems to have foreseen it (Act 20:30); and there is nothing in the fact inconsistent with the general picture of the state of Asia at a later period which we have in the first three chapters of the Revelation." '

## Phylactery[[@Headword:Phylactery]]

             (φυλακτήριον, a receptacle for safekeeping), a small square box, made either of parchment or black calf-skin, in which are enclosed slips of parchment or vellum with Exo 13:2-20; Exo 13:11-17; Deu 6:4-9; Deu 6:13-22, written on them, and which are worn on the head and left arm by every strict Jew on week-day mornings during the time of prayer.

1. Name and its Signification. — The Greek term (φυλακτήριον =phylactery, is a later expression used in the N.T. for the O.T. word טוֹטֶפֶת, plur. טוֹטָפֹת, "frontlets," which is rendered תְּפַילַּין., prayer- fillets, by the Chaldee paraphrases of Onkelos and Jonathan b.-Uzziel, as well as by the unanimous voice of Jewish tradition. It is now generally agreed by lexicographers that, according to the analogy of בָּבֶל, which stands for בִּלְבֵּל, and כּוֹכָב: which stands for כָּבְכָּב, and which are formed by the reduplication of the chief two radical letters, טוֹטֶפֶתstands for טָפְטֶפֶת, from טו, to bind round (Ewald, Lehrbuch der Iebarischen Sprache, § 158, c), ant that it denotes a tie, a band, a frontlet. The Sept. in all the three instances in which עני ִלטוטפת ביןoccurs (Exo 13:16; Deu 6:8; Deu 11:18), renders it by ἀσάλευτον πρὸ ὀφθαλμῶν σου, a fixture before thine eyes. with which Symmachus and Theodotion agree. The rendering of Aquila, εἰς ἀτίνακτα, obr ain inwmovable (comp. Montfaucon, Hexapla, nota ad vers.), is to the same  effect.

Philo (2:358), however, translates it σειόμενα πρὸ ὀφθαλμῶν, and afterwards adds that it is to be a constant- pendulum (σάλον ἐχέτω ταῦτα κινούμενον) to summon the sight by its motion to a very clear inspection. Herzfeld (Geschichte des Volkes Israel, 2:224) infers from this that Philo must either have read σάλευτον in the Sept., or taken the a before it as intensitive, and assigns to טו the sense of to move backwards and forwards, vindicating for טוטפותthe meaning of pendulum, pendent ornament. Herzfeld, moreover, maintains that this rendering is more in harmony with the little houses, or square boxes, constituting the phylacteries, and that it escapes the following objections to the current rendering of it by binding round: (1) In the phylacteries the box in the front is the principal part, and not the strap round the head which holds it; and (2) the טוטפתis to be "between the eyes," which does not tally with forehead tie (Stirnbinde). The name תפילין, prayer-fillets, by:which the Chaldee paraphrases and the Syriac version render טוטפות, and which is the common appellation for the phylacteries among the Jews to the present day, owes its origin to the fact that the phylacteries are worn during prayertime. Hence the plural תפיליןhas the masculine termination to distinguish it from the feminine תפילות, which denotes prayers, just as the plural masculine תהליםdenotes psalms, in contradistinction to the fem inine plural תהלות, praise.

2. The Manner in which the Phylacteries are Made and Used. — As the Mosaic law (Exo 13:16; Deu 6:8; Deu 11:18) gives no specific directions how the phylacteries are to be made, but simply says that they are to be of a double nature, viz. for the hand and between the eyes, the Jewish canons have enacted minute regulations about the arrangement and use of them. A piece of leather is soaked, stretched on a square block cut for the purpose. sewed together with gut-strings while wet, and left on the block till it is dried and stiffened, so that when it is taken off it forms a (בית) square leather box (Jerusalem Megilla, 4:9). As the Mosaic code enjoins one for the hand and another for the head, two such boxes (בתים) are requisite for making the phylacteries. The box of which the phylactery for the hand (תפלה של יד) is made has no inscription outside, and only one cell inside, wherein is deposited a  parchment strip with the four following sections written thereon in four columns, each column having seven lines. On column “is written" Exo 13:1-10, treating on the sanctification of the first-born, and containing the injunction about the phylacteries; on Colossians 2, Exo 13:11-16, which also treats on the sanctification of the first-born, and repeats the injunction about the phylacteries; on Colossians 3, Deu 6:4-9, enjoining that the law and the command about the phylacteries should be inculcated into the minds of the rising generation; and on Colossians 4 is written Deu 11:13-21, describing the blessing attached to the keeping of the law, and to the observance of the command about the phylacteries. The order, therefore, of the passages of Scripture is as follows:

Deu 11:13-21 Deu 6:4-9 Exo 13:11-16 Exo 13:1-10

The slip is rolled up, put inside, tied with white and well-washed hairs of a calf or cow, generally obtained from the tail, and put into the box; a flap connected with the brim is then drawn over the open part and sewed firmly down to the thick leather brim, in such a manner as to form a loop on one side, through which passes a very long leather strap (רצועה), wherewith the phylactery is fastened to the arm. The box of which the phylactery for the head (תפלה של ראש) is made has on the outside to the right the regular three-pronged letter Shin, being an abbreviation for שדי, wthe Almighty, and on the-left side a four-pronged letter Shin (Sabbath, 28 b). In the inside are four cells, in which are deposited four slips of parchment, whereon are written the same four passages of Scripture as on the one slip in the phylactery for the hand. The box is closed in the same manner,:and a thong passes through the loop with which it is fastened to the head.

The phylacteries, like the Mezuzah, i.e., the scrolls on the door-posts, must be written in Hebrew characters, while the law may be written in Greek (Mishna, Megilla, 1:8). Every Jew, from the time that he is thirteen years of age, when he is considered a member of the congregation (בר מצוה), is obliged to wear the phylacteries during the time of morning prayer, every day except on Sabbath and festivals. Before commencing his devotions he first puts on one on the left arm through the sling formed by the long strap.  Having fastened it just above the elbow, on the inner part of the naked arm, in such a manner that when the arm is bent the phylactery may touch the flesh and be near the heart, to fulfil the precept, "Ye shall lay up these words in your heart," he first twists the long strap three times close to the phylactery, forming a Shin, which stands for שדי, the A lmighty, pronouncing the following benediction: " Blessed art thou, O Lord our God, King of the universe, who hast sanctified us with thy commandments and enjoined us to put on the phylacteries." He then twists the long leather strap seven times around the arm (in the form of two Shins, one with three prongs and the other with four), and puts on the phylactery on the head, placing it exactly in the centre between the eyes, so as to touch the spot where the hair begins to grow, and before he secures it pronounces the following benediction: "Blessed art thou, O Lord our God, King of the universe, who hast sanctified. us with thy commandments, and enjoined upon us the command about the phylacteries;" and immediately after adjusting it says, "Blessed be the name of the glory of his kingdom forever and ever" (Maimonides, Iad Ha-Chezaka, Hilchoth Tephillin, 4:5). He then winds the end of the long leather strap three times around his middle finger, and the remainder around the hand, saying, " I will betroth thee unto me forever, yea, I will betroth thee unto me in righteousness and in judgment, and in loving-kindness, and in mercy, and thou shalt know the Lord" (Hos 2:19).

There is no special canon about the size of the boxes (בתים) which contain the slips, and thus constitute the phylacteries. They are generally made an inch and a half square, and are worn during morning prayer, except on Sabbath and festivals, because these days being themselves a sign (אות) require no other sign or pledge (Maimonides, ibid. 4:10). The pious Jews who are engaged in the study of the law, and in meditations also wear them during these hallowed engagements; they make the phylacteries a little larger than the ordinary ones to give more space, and hence more distinctness to every letter and word composing the writing inside, and walk with the phylacteries on from one place to another. The hypocrites among the Pharisees imitated this, and made their phylacteries more than ordinarily large, so as to make them conspicuous and visible to any one at a distance, thereby to indicate that they were praying or in holy meditation, which our Saviour rebuked (Mat 23:5). If the  phylacteries are written by an infidel they must be burned; and if written by a Samaritan, an informer, a slave, a woman, or a minor, they are unlawful and must be shut up (Maimonides, ibid. 1:13). The Sadducees wore the phylacteries on the forehead or brow, and on the palm of the hand (Maimonides, ibid. 4:3).

3. Origin and Design of the Phylacteries. — It is the unanimous voice of Jewish tradition that the phylacteries are enjoined in Exo 13:9; Exo 13:16; Deu 6:8; Deu 11:18. It is true that Rashbam and Aben-Ezra (on Exo 13:9), who are followed by De Lyra, Calvin, bishop Patrick, H. Michaelis, Keil, etc., take the passages in question in a figurative sense. But against this the advocates of the usage urge that —

(1.) It is inconceivable that the same declaration should be used four times figuratively, there being no parallel for such a usage throughout the whole Pentateuch.

(2.) In two cases out of the four (Deu 6:9; Deu 11:20), the injunction is: immediately followed by the command about the Mezuzah, which is generally admitted to be literal, SEE MEZUZAH, and it is against all sound rules of exegesis to take one command in a figurative and the other in a literal sense.

(3.) In every one of the four instances wherein the injunction is given, the expression אות is used, which in all other passages of Scripture invariably denotes a visible sign, given either to attest an event or doctrine stated in the foregoing passage, or to serve as a remembrance. Now, on the supposition that the whole commandment is to be taken figuratively, it would be no sign whatever, and the term לזכרוןcould not have been substituted for the technfcal expression לטוטפת, as it is in Exo 13:9.

(4.) The end of the external action enjoined in the first clause of Exo 13:9 is immediately introduced in the second clause by למען, "that the law of the Lord may be in thy mouth;" whereas, as Philippsohn rightly remarks, the simple conjunction וwould be required if the preceding words had the same internal figurative meaning.

(5.) It was a commonl custom in ancient days for those who engaged in military service, or devoted themselves to the worship of a special deity, to  be marked either on the forehead or on the hand, or on both (Veget. de Milit. 2:5; Herod. 2:113; Lucian, De Syr. Dea, 59; Asiat. Res. 7:281 sq.). Thus the high-priest, as being especially consecrated to the service of Jehovah, had inscribed in the plate on the front of his head "Holiness to the Lord" (Exo 28:36), the ordinary servants of Jehovah were commanded to have a mark (Eze 9:4; Eze 9:6); and at the ingathering of Israel we are told that even the horses shall have written upon their bells "Holiness to the Lord" (Zecheriah 14:20); while the worshippers of the beast are represented as bearing his inscription on their foreheads and arms (Rev 7:3; Rev 13:16-18; Rev 14:9-11; Rev 16:2; Rev 19:20; Rev 20:4). The Moslems, Nusairieh and Bedawin Arabs, to the present day, either tie, or have tattooed, on their hands and foreheads select passages of the Koran. It was therefore natural that the Mosaic law, which forbids tattooing (Lev 19:28), should appropriate, for the service of the Most High, the innocent and generally prevailing, custom, which the lawgiver could not eradicate, of wearing ornaments and tokens, with inscriptions declaring that they belonged to Jehovah, and that the Lord is their Redeemer. This universal custom would of itself be sufficient argument for taking the injunction in its literal sense, even if we had not the support of the ancient versions and the undeviating practice of the synagogue; and be it remembered that even the Sadducees, who rejected tradition and adhered to the simple meaning of the law, also wore phylacteries. As to the phrase כתבם על לוח לב(ִPro 3:3, etc.), which is frequently quoted in support of the spiritual meaning, it must be observed that it too is to be taken literally, inasmuch as לוחdoes not denote the external front of the breast, but the tablet which the ancients wore on their hearts. It is the same as פנקס, which so frequently occurs in the Mishna (comp. Kelin, 24:7), and which the Greeks called Πίναξ, and the Romans Pugillares. This tablet, when made of wood, was called לוח (Isa 30:8; Hab 2:2); when of metal, it was termed גליון(Isa 8:1), and when it was of stone it was denominated אבנים. The argument of Spencer, that because the Sept. renders טוטפותby ἀσάλευτα, and not φυλακτήρια, therefore this version did not understand it literally, "inter eos (qui legem illam sensu tantum metaphorico exponendam censuerunt) LXX cum primis notandi veniunt, qui quod in Moisi est טוטפותipsi non φιλακτήρια sed ἀσάλευτα transtulerunt" (De Leg. Hebraeor. ritual. lib. 4, c. 2), ignores the fact that φυλακτήρια is a term which obtained at a much later period  as an equivalent for תפלין. Josephus, too, who like all the ancient and modern Jews takes the injunction literally, does not render טוטפותby φυλακτήρια (Ant. 4:8, 13).

The fact is, that in very early days there was no fixed and technical term for those frontlets. Hence Herzfeld (Gesch. des Volkes Israel, 2:223) has pointed out that the phylacteries are meant in 2Ki 11:12, where the high-priest is said to have put upon Joash "the crown and the עדות; and Duschak (Josephus und die Tradition, page 85) supposes that the Tephillin are meant by צור תעודה(Isa 8:16). The injunction about the phvlacteries was so generally observed among the Jews after the Babylonian captivity, that the Writers of them found it a most lucrative business. Ience we are told that "twenty-four fast days were ordained by the Great Synagogue, in order that the writers of the scrolls of the law, the phylacteries, and the mezuzahs, might not grow rich, inasmuch as they were not allowed to write them on these days" (Pesachinm, 50 b). In harmony with the design of the phylacteries, Maimonides propounds their utility, when he remarks: "The sacred influence of the phylacteries is very great; for as long as one wears them on his head and arm he is obliged to be meek, Godfearing, must not suffer himself to be carried away by laughter or idle talk, nor indulge in evil thoughts; but must turn his attention to the words of truth and uprightness" (Kitto). Nevertheless, the fact that these appendages, being regarded more or'less in the light of amulets, engender superstition, has led interpreters generally to view the sacre-d injunction as a spiritual or figurative precept. This is the opinion of the Karaites, Grotius, Schottgen (Her. Heb. 1:194), Rosenmuller, Hengstenberg (Pent. 1:458 sq.), and most others. In Mat 23:5 only they are called φυλακτήρια, either because they tended to promote observance of the law (ἀεὶ μνημὴν ἔχειν τοῦ θεοῦ, Just. Mart. Dial. c. Tryph. page 205, for which reason Luther happily renders the word by Denkzettel), or from the use of them as amulets (Lat. praebia, Gr. περιαπτά, Grotius ad Mat 23:5). Φυλακτήριον is the ordinary Greek word for an amn ulet (Plutarch, 2:378, B, where φυλ. = the Roman bulla), and is used apparently with this meaning by a Greek translator (Eze 13:18) for כֵּסָתוֹת, cushions (Rosenmiller, Schol. ad loc. 1; Schleusner, Lex. in N.T.). Jerome (on Mat 23:5) says they were thus used in his day by the Babylonians, Persians, and Indians, and condemns certain Christian " mulierculae" for similarly using the Gospels ("parvula evangelia," βίβλια μικρά, Chrys.) as περιάμματα, especially the Prooem. to St. John (comp. Chrysost. Horn. in Matt. 73). The Koran  and other sacred books are applied to the same purpose to this day (Hottinger, Hist. Orient. 1:8, page 301; De numinis Orient. 17. sq.; "The most esteemed of all Chegabs is a Milshaf, or copy of the Koran," Lane, Mod. Egypt. 1:338). Scaliger even supposes that phylacteries were designed to supersede those amulets, the use of which had been already learned by the Israelites in Egypt. SEE AMULET.

There was a spurious book called Phylact. Angelorum, where pope Gelasius evidently understood the word to mean "amulets," for he remarks that Phylacteria ought rather to be ascribed to devils. In this sense they were expressly forbildden by pope Gregory ("Si quis '. . . phylacteriis usus fuerit,' anathema sit," Sixt. Senensis, Bibl. Sanct. page 92; comp. Can. 36, Concil. Laod.).

The expression "they make broad their phylacteries" (παλτύνουσι τὰ φυλ. αὐτῶν, Mat 23:5) refers not so much to the phylactery itself, which seems to have been of a prescribed breadth, as to the case (קציצה) in which the parchment was kept, which the Pharisees (among their other pretentious customs, Mar 7:3-4; Luk 5:33, etc.) made as conspicuous as they could (Reland, Ant. 2:9, 15). Misled probably by the term πλατύνουσι, and by the mention of the צַיצַת, or fringe (Num 15:38, Sept. κλῶσμα ὑακίνθινον ἐπὶ τὰ κράσπεδα τῶν πτερυγίων) in connection with them, Epiphanius says that they were πλάτεα σήματα πορφύρας, like the Roman laticlave, or the stripes on a Dalmatic cloak (πὰ δὲ σήματα τῆς πορφύρας φυλακτήρια εἰώθασιν οἱ ἠκριβωμένοι μετονομάζειν, c. Haer. 1:33; Sixt. Sen. l.c.). He says that these purple stripes were worn by the Pharisees with fringes, and four pomegranates, that no one might touch them, and hence he derives their name (Reland, Antiq. 2:9, 15). But that this is an error is clearly shown by Scaliger (Elench. Trihaer. 8:66 sq.). It is said that the Pharisees wore them always, whereas the common people only used them at prayers, because they were considered to be even holier than the ציוֹ, or golden plate, on the priest's tiara (Exo 28:36), since that had the sacred name once engraved, but in each' of the Tephillin the tetragrammaton recurred twenty- three times (Carpzov, App. Critic. 196). Again the Pharisees wore the tephillah above the elbow, but the Sadducees on the palm of the hand (Goodwyn, l.c.). The modern Jews only wear them at morning prayers, and sometimes at noon (Leo of Modena, l.c.). In our Lord's time they were worn by all Jews, except the Karaites; women, and slaves. Boys, when (at  the age of thirteen years and a day) they become, בני מצות(sons of the commandments), were bound to wear them (Baba Berac. fol. 22, 1, in Glossa), and therefore they may have been used even by our Lord, as he merely discountenanced their abuse. The suggestion was made by Scaliger (l.c.), and led to a somewhat idle controversy. Lightfoot (Hor. Hebr. ad Mat 24:5) and Otho (Lex. Rab. page 656) agree with Scaliger, but Carpzov (l.c.) and others strongly deny it, from a belief that the entire use of phylacteries arose from an error.

The rabbins even declared that God wore them, arguing from Isa 62:8; Deu 33:2; Isa 49:16. Perhaps this was a pious fraud to inculcate their use; or it may have had some mystic meaning (Zohar, part 2, fol. 2; Carpzov, l.c.), but the rabbins disapproved the application of them to charm wounds or to lull children to sleep (Id. Leg. 253; Maimonides. De Idol. 2). He who wore them was supposed to prolong his days (Isaiah 38 :f6), but he who did not was doomed to perdition, since he thereby broke eight affirmative precepts (Maimonides, Tephil. 4:26). We have a specimen of this style of interpretation in the curious literalism of Kimchi's' comment on Psa 1:2. Starting the objection that it is impossible to meditate in God's law day and night, because of sleep, domestic cares, etc., he answers that for the fulfilment of the text it is sufficient to wear tephillin! In spite of these considerations, Justin (Dial. c. Tryph. l.c.), Chrysostom, Euthymius, Theophylact, and many moderns (Baumgarten, Comm. 1:479; Winer, s.v. Phylact.), prefer the literal meaning. It rests, therefore, with them to account for the entire absence of all allusion to phylacteries in the O.T. The passages in Proverbs (ut sup.) contain no such reference, and in Eze 24:17, פְּאֵרmeans not a phylactery (as Jarchi says), but a turban (Gesen. Thesaur. page 1089).

4. Literature. — Besides the authors already quoted (Sixt. Senensis, Reland, Lightfoot, Schottgen, Carpzov, Hottinger, Goodwyn, Rosenmuller, etc.), see the following, to whom they refer: Surenhusius, Mishna ad Tract. Berachoth, pages 8, 9; Beck, De Judaeorum ligamentis precativis, and De usu Phylact. (1679); Basnage, Hist. des Juifs, V, 12:12. sq.; Braunius, De Vest. Sacerd. page 7 sq.; Buxtorf, Synag. Jud. page 170 sq.; Maimonides, Yad Hacash. pages 2, 3; Ugolino, De Phylacter. Hebraeor. in Thesaur. tom. 21; Townley, Reasons for the Laws of Moses, page 350; Bodenschatz, Gottesdienstl. Verfassung d. Juden, 4:15 sq.;  Gropp, De Phylact. (Leips. 1708); Otho, Lex. Rabbin. page 756; Wagenseil, Sota. c. 2, page 397 sq.; Spencer, De Leg. Hebr. IV, 1-7; Herzfeld, Gesch. d. Jul. 2:223 sq.; the Dermech ha-Chayimn (Vienna, 1859), page 24 sq.; Hochmuth, in Ben Chananya, page 215; and the nionographs cited by Volbeding, Index Programmatum, page 130. SEE FRONTLET.

## Phyllobolia[[@Headword:Phyllobolia]]

             (from φύλλον, a leaf, and Βάλλω, to throw), a custom which existed among the ancient heathen nations of throwing flowers and leaves on the tombs of the dead. The Greek was placed on his funeral bed as if asleep, wearing a white robe and garland. the purple pall half hidden by numerous chaplets, and so was carried out to his burial before the dawn of day. The Romans, deriving the custom from the Greeks, covered tie bier and the funeral pile with leaves and flowers. It is not an unfrequent custom in different parts of England in our day to spread flowers on and around the body when committing it to the coffin. In Wales also, when the body is interred, females hasten with their aprons full of flowers to plant them on the grave. The practice of connecting flowers with the dead seems to have been of great antiquity, for an Egyptian of high rank was wont to be carried to his sepulchre in a sarcophagus adorned with lotus, had his tomb decked with wreaths, and his mummy-case painted with acacia leaves and flowers. The use of the flowers on such occasions was no doubt connected with the idea of life after death.

## Physician[[@Headword:Physician]]

             (וֹפֵא, rophe, a curer; ἰατρός). Among the Hebrews, as among the ancients generally, medical remedies (Exo 21:19) were early (comp. Pliny, 29:5) dispensed by a special class, who probably derived their skill from the Egyptians (Gen 1:1; comp. Herod. 2:84; 3:1, 129; Diod. Sic. 1:82; Diog. Laert. 3:8; Pliiy, 26:3; 29:30: see Sprengel, Geschichte, 1:62; Wilkinson, 3:390), who were famous for their medicines (Odyss. 4:229). Their aid was at first made use of, as among common people at all times, for surgery and in extraordinary cases, and medicines (Exo 1:15 : the "stools," אָבְנִיַם, there spoken of were, according to Gesenius, Thes. Heb. page 17, benches or seats on which the parturient females were  seated; but the word, see Studien u. Krit. 1834, pages 81, 626, 641; 1842, page 1048, will scarcely bear this signification, see Ewald, Gesch. Isr. 1:481, and Lengerke; Keizma, page 387) were regularly employed (see Kall, De obstetricib. matrum Hebr. in XEg. Hamb. 1746). In later times Hebrew prescriptions obtained, which the prophets sometimes applied (2Ki 4:21; 2Ki 5:10; 2Ki 8:7; 2Ki 20:7; Isaiah 38; which cases, although miraculous, evince the custom of seeking relief from that class of persons); mostly for external injuries or complaints (Isa 1:6 : Eze 30:21; 2Ki 8:29; 2Ki 9:15), but sometimes for internal maladies (2Ch 16:12), and even for mental diseases (1Sa 16:16; comp. Josephus, Ant. 8:2, 5); but these never reached any extensive degree of science (see Buxtorf, Lex. Chald. s.v. רפא). The resort to physicians was very general before and especially after the exile (2Ch 16:12; Jer 8:22; Sir 38:1; Mar 5:26; comp. Luk 4:23; Luk 5:31; Luk 8:43; see Josephus, War, 2:8, 6; Doughtaei Analect. 2:35), and eventually medical practitioners could be foumd even in the smaller cities of the land (Josephus, Life, 72; comp. Ant. 14:13, 10). Their remedies consisted mostly in salves (especially balsam, Jer 8:22; Jer 46:11; Jer 51:8; comp. Prosp. Alpin. Med. AEg. 118 sq.; or oil, Luk 10:34; Mishna, Sabb. 14:4; including the oilbath, Josephus, War, 1:33, 5; Mishna, Berachoth, 1:2), leaves (Eze 47:12), plasters (e.g. of fig, 2Ki 20:7; comp. Pliny, 23:63; Strabo, 15:713), and bathing in mineral springs (Josephus, Ant. 17:6, 5; Life, 16; War, 1:33, 5; 2:21, 6; comp. Joh 5:2), or in flowing streams (2Ki 5:10). Internal nostrums are again and again recommended in the Talmud (see the Mishna, Sabb. 14:3; 22:6; Joma, 8:6); in the Old Test. honey only is mentioned (Pro 16:24), which still holds a conspicuous place among medical compounds in the East. Specimens of the Jewish prescriptions may be seen in Lightfoot on Mar 5:26 (the formula or "Recipe" is לייתי). Surgical operations are mentioned in the Mishna (Sabb. 22:6; Chelim, 12:4; comp. Sabb. 6:5). Great curative virtue was attributed to amulets (Mishna, Sabb. 6:2, 10), incantations, charms, the touch of certain individuals, and other superstitions of a like character (2Ki 5:11 [comp. Rosenmuller, Morgenl. 3:227]; Josephus, Ant. 8:5); especially in cases of hypochondria or supposed daemoniacal possession. SEE AMULET; SEE DAEMONIAC.

The priests (Luk 17:14) were appointed by the law (Leviticus 12-15) the civil health-wardens, not so much for the cure as for the inspection of the sick, or of persons suspected of certain maladies, and the instructions  given to them, especially respecting endemic diseases, exhibit a very careful observation, and afford apt and accurate symptoms. SEE LEPROSY; SEE PLAGUE. For the priests themselves, who, in consequence of being obliged to perform their services barefoot, were often liable to catch cold (see Kall, De morbis sacerdotum V.T. Hafn. 1745), a special physician (medicus viscerum) was (in later times) appointed at the Temple (Lightfoot, page 781). The priests must have obtained considerable anatomical knowledge (comp. the Talmudic abstract on osteology in the Mishna, Oholoth, 1:8) from the daily slaughter of the animal sacrifices. On the subject generally, see Borner, Diss. de statu medicinae ap. vet. Ebr. (Viteb. 1755) Lindlinger, De. Hebr. vet. arte medica (1774); Sprengel, De medicina Ebraeor. diss. (Hal. 1789); comp. Schmidt's Bibl. Medicus (Till. 1743); also Norberg, De medicina Arabum (in his Opusc. acad. 3:404 sq.); Wunderbar, Biblisch-talmudische Medicin (Riga, 1859). SEE MEDICINE.

The superstitious credulity of modern Orientals as to curative means is proverbial, and has been noticed by all travellers. The Arabs are ready to put faith in almost any Frank as a professional "medicine man" or hakim (literally "wise man"), as they term all physicians. Prescriptions of all sorts are at once taken by them, however absurd; but they are generally unwilling to exercise the patience, care, self-restraint, and especially the cleanliness necessary to a real cure. They expect sudden and immediate restoration, and invariably prefer extraordinary to simple remedies. All this is in keeping with the supernatural character of the nostrums ordinarily employed by them. Indeed, fatalism being the basis of Mohammedanism, a resort to direct divine power might naturally be expected. SEE SUPERSTITION.

"It is a very prevalent notion among the Christians of Europe that the Muslims are enemies to almost every branch of knowledge. This is an erroneous idea; but it is true that their studies, in the present age, are confined within very narrow limits. Very few of them study medicine, chemistry (for our first knowledge of which we are indebted to the Arabs), the mathematics, or astronomy. The Egyptian medical and surgical practitioners are mostly barbers, miserably ignorant of the sciences which they profess, and unskilful in their practice; partly in consequence of their- beiig prohibited by their religion from availing themselves of the advantage of dissecting human bodies. But a number of young men, natives of Egypt, are now receiving European instruction in medicine, anatomy, surgery, and other sciences, for the service of the government. Many of the Egyptians,  in illness, neglect medical aid, placing their whole reliance on Providence or charms. Alchemy is more studied in this country than pure chemistry, and astrology more than astronomy" (Lane, Mod. Egypt. 1:239).

## Physiognomy[[@Headword:Physiognomy]]

             (from φύσις, nature, and γνῶμον, an index), a method, rather than a science, of discovering the hulman character by means of the features, especially of the countenance. To some extent this is instinctively practiced, as all have learned to read the natural language of the tones, expression, gesture, etc., which spontaneously accompany our emotions. There can be no doubt also that passions or states of mind habitually indulged imprint themselves upon the lineaments of the face, and so become an indication of character. But when it is claimed that this is invariably the case, and that it may be reduced to fixed rules of interpretation which will serve as an unerring guide, the principle becomes proverbially deceptive. Laviter is especially famous for his fanciful scheme on this basis; and by Campe the so-called "facial angle" was relied on for determining the comparative intellectual capacity of individuals; but experience has demonstrated the fallacy of all such arbitrary systems of physiognomy.

## Physiology[[@Headword:Physiology]]

             (from φύσις, nature, and λόγος, a discourse), the science of the animal constitution, especially in man. This branch of self-knowledge is evidently of the highest temporal importance, and lies at: the basis of the practice of medicine. Modern education has recognised its claims by incorporating it among the common-school studies; and few of the coming generation, it is hoped, will be so ignorant as to labor under the popular delusions and superstitions to.whlich its neglect in former ages has led.

## Pi-beseth[[@Headword:Pi-beseth]]

             (Heb. id. פַּיאּבֶסֶת; Sept. Βούβαστος; Vullg. Bubastus), a town of Lower Egypt, mentioned but once in the Bible (Eze 30:17). In hieroglyphics its name is written Bahest, Bast, and Ha-Bahest, followed by the determinative sign for an Egyptian city, which was probably not pronounced. The Coptic forms are Bast, with the article pi prefixed, or Poubaste, Poubast Phoubasthi, Bouasti, Pouast;. and the Greek, Βούβαστις, Βούβαστος. The first and second hieroglyphic names are the same as those of the goddess of the place, and the third signifies the abode of Behest, that goddess. It is probable that Bahest is an archaic mode of writing, and that the word was always pronounced, as it was sometimes written, Bast. It seems as if the civil name was Bahest, and the sacred Ifa- Bahest. It is difficult to trace the first syllable of the Hebrew and of the Coptic and Greek forms in the hieroglyphic equivalents. There is a similar case in the names Ha-Hesar, Bousiri, Pousiri, Βούσιρις, Busiris. Dr. Brugsch and M. Devdria read Pe or Pa, instead of Ha; but this is not proved. It may be conjectured that in pronunciation the masculine definite article pepa or pi was prefixed to Ha, as could be done in Coptic: in the ancient language the word appears to be common, whereas it is masculine in the later.

Or it may be suggested that the first syllable or first letter was a prefix of the vulgar dialect, for it is frequent in Coptic. The name of Philae may perhaps afford a third explanation, for it is written Eelek-t, Eelek, and  P-Felek (Brugsch, Geogr. Inschr. 1:156, Nos. 626, 627); whence it would seem that the sign city (not abode) was common, as in the first form the feminine article, and in the last the masculine one, is used, aud this would admit of the reading Pa-Bast, "the [city] of Bubastis [the goddess]." The goddess Bast, who was here the chief object of worship, was the same as Pesht, the goddess of fire. Both names accompany a lion-headed figure, and the cat was sacred to her. Herodotus considers the goddess Bubastis to be the same as Artemis (2:137), and that this was the current opinion in Egypt in the Greek period is evident kfrom the name Speos Artemidos of a rock temple dedicated to Pesht, and probably of a neighboring town or village. The historian speaks of the annual festival of the goddess held at Bubastis as the chief and most largely attended of the Egyptian festivals. It was evidently the most popular, and a scene of great license, like the great Moslem festival of the Sevid el-Bedawi celebrated at Tanteh in the Delta (2:59, 60).

There are scarcely any historical notices of Bubastis in the Egyptian annals. In Manetho's list it is related that in the time of Boethos, or Bochos, first king of the 2d dynasty (B.C. cir. 2231), a chasm of the earth opened at Bubastis, and many perished (Cory's Ancient Fragments, 2d ed. pages 98, 99). This is remarkable, since, though shocks of earthquakes are frequent in Egypt, the actual earthquake is of very rare occurrence. The next event in the list connected with Bubastis is the accession of the 22d dynasty (B.C. cir. 990), a line of Bubastite kings ibid. pages 124, 125). These were either foreigners or party of foreign extraction, and it is probable that they, chose Bubastis as their capital. or as an occasioital residence, on account of its nearness to the military settlements. SEE MIGDMOI.

Thus it must have been a city of great importance when Ezekiel foretold its doom: "The young men of Aven and of Pi-beseth shall fall by the sword and these [cities] shall go into captivity" (Eze 30:17). Heliopolis and Bubastis are near together, and both in the route of an invader from the East marching against Memphis. Bubastis was situmated on the west bank of the Pelulsiac or Bubastite branch of the Nile, about forty miles from the central part of Memphis, and was the principal town of the Bubastite nome (Pliny. Hist. Nat 5:9; Ptolemy, 4:5). Herodotus speaks of its site as having been raised by those who dug the canals for Sesostris, and afterwards by the labor of criminals under Sabacos the Ethiopian, or, rather, under the Ethiopian dominion. He mentions the temple of the goddess Bubastis as well worthy of description, being more beautifull than any other known to  him. It lay in the midst of the city, which, having been raised on mounds, overlooked it on every side. An artificial canal encompassed it with the waters of the Nile, and was beautified by trees on its bank. There was only a narrow approach leading to a lofty gateway. The enclosure thus formed was surrounded by a low wall, bearing sculptures; within was the temple, surrounded by a grove of fine trees (2:137, 138). Sir Gardner Wilkinson observes that the ruins of the city and temple confirm this account. The height of the mounds and the site of the temple are very remarkable, as well as the beauty of the latter, which was "of the finest red granite." It "was surrounded by a sacred enclosure, about 600 feet square, . . . beyond which was a larger circuit, measuring 940 feet by 1200, containing the minor one and the canal." The temple is entirely ruined, but the names of Rameses II of the 19th dylnasty, Userken I (Osorchon I) of the 22d, and Nekht-har-heb (Nectanebo I) of the 30th, have been found here, as well as that of the eponymous goddess Bast. There are also remains of the ancient houses of the town, and, "amidst the houses on the N.W. side are the thick walls of a fort, which protected the temple below" (Notes by Sir G. Wilkinson in Rawlinson's Herodotus, 2:186, plan). Bubastis thus had a fort, besides being strong from its height. The city was taken by the Persians. who destroyed the walls (Diod. Sic. 16:51); but it was still a place of some consideration under the Romalis. It was near Bubastis that the canal leading to Arsinoe (Suez) opened to the Nile (Strabo 17:805; Mela, 1:9, 9; Herod. 2:138); and although the mouth was afterwards often changed and taken more southward, it has now returned to its first locality, as the present canal of Tel el-Wadi commences in the vicinity of Tel Basta. This Tel has recently been explored (Navile, Bubastis, "Eg Explor. Fund," Lond. 1891. 4to). See Wilkinson, Modern Egypt, 1:300, 427-429; Ritter, Erdkunde, 1:825; Roselini. Monum. Storichi, 2:76 sq.; Manliert, Geog. 10, 1:588 sq., Maltis, in the Descr. de l'Egypte, 3:8307.

## Pi-hahiroth[[@Headword:Pi-hahiroth]]

             (Heb. Pi-hachiroth', פַּי הִחֹירֹת, understood by some to be of Hebrew etymology, and rendered mouth of the gorges; Sept. ἡ ἔπαυλις, τὸ στόμα Εἰρώθ, Εἰρώθ; Vulg. Phihihiroth), a place before or at which the Israelites encamped, at the close of the third march from Rameses, when they went out of Egypt. Pi-hahiroth was before Migdol, and on either hand were Baal-zephon and the sea (Exo 14:2; Exo 14:9; Num 33:7-8). The name is probably that of a natural locality, from the unlikelihood that there should have been a town or village in both parts of the country where it is placed in addition to Migdol and Baal-zephon, which seem to have been, if not towns, at least military stations, and its name is susceptible of an Egyptian etymology giving a sense apposite to this idea. The first part of the word is apparently treated by its punctuation as a separate prefix (Num 33:8), and it would therefore appear to be the masculine definite article Pe, Pa, or Pi. Jablonsky proposed the Coptic pi-Achirot, "the place where sedge grows," and this, or a similar name, the late M. Fulgence Fresnel recognised in the modern Ghuweybet el-bus, "the bed of reeds," near Ras Atakah. There is another Ghuweybet el-bus near Suez, and such a name would of course depend for its permanence upon the continuance of a vegetation subject to change. Migdol appears to have been a common name for a frontier watch-tower. SEE MIGDOT.

Baal- zephon we take to have had a similar meaning to that of Migdol. SEE BAAL-ZEPHON. We should expect, therefore, that the encampment would have been in a depression, partly marshy, havilig on either hand an elevation marked by a watch-tower (Smith). It is evident that so vague a circumstance as the presence of reeds, which are common in any moist place near Suez, cannot serve to determine the locality. This must be fixed by the more definite notices of the narrative, which appear to us to point to the opening of the plain el-Bfedeah, between Jebel Atakah and Jebel Abu- Deraj. SEE EXODE; SEE RED SEA, CROSSING OF.

## Piaggia, Teramo Or Erasmo[[@Headword:Piaggia, Teramo Or Erasmo]]

             (also called Teramo di Zoagli), an Italian painter, was born at Zoagli, in; the (Genoese state, near the beginning of the 16th century. He was a pulpil of Lodovico Brea, and painted at Genoa in 1547. In conjunction with Anltonio Semini he painted several pictures for the churches at Genoa, the most esteemed of which is an altar-piece of the Martyrdom of Attendet, in the church of that saint. Lanzli highly commends this work, and says, "None can witness this very beauitiful altar-piece without seeing traces of  Brae's style, already enlarged and changed into one more modern." He also painted several pieces by himself, at Genoa and at Chiavari.

## Piales, Jean Jacques[[@Headword:Piales, Jean Jacques]]

             a French canonist, was born in 1720 at Mur-de-Barrez (Aveyron). Being received as a lawyer in the Parliament of Paris (1747), he formed a connection with Claude Mey, one of the supporters of Jansenism, and both gave a great number of consultations and took a very active part in the affairs of the appellants. While one treated of the great questions of public law and jurisdiction, the other gave himself entirely to practice relating to benefices. Although Piales lost his sight in 1763, he lost nothing of his zeal for the cause which he maintained, and M. Dupin says, "There is no counsellor in the world who dictated more consultations." He died in Paris August 4, 1789. Unforeseen changes in ecclesiastical matters have rendered. his works useless; they are, Traite de la Collation des Benefices (Par. 1754 and 1755, 5 volumes, 12mo): — De la Provision de la Cour de Rome a litre de Prevention (2 volumes, 12mo): — De la Devolution, du Decolu et des Vacances de plein Droit (3 vols. 12mo): — De l'Expectative des Gradues (1758, 6 volumes, 12mo): — Des Commnendes et des Reserves (3 vols. 12mo): — Des Riparations et Reconstructions des Eglises (Par. 1762, 4 volumes, 12mo; 1788; 5 volumes, 12mo, ed. given by Camus). The first volume (the only one which appeared) of the Histoire de la Fete de la Conception is attributed to Piales. See Journal Chretien (1758 and 1759); Camus et Dupin, Biblioth. choisie des Livres de Droit;. Picot, Memoires Eccles. tom. 4; Feller, Dict. Hist. Feller, Nouv. Biog. Generale 40:32.

## Piarists[[@Headword:Piarists]]

             is the name of a Roman Catholic order which was founded by St. Josep- Clasanza or Calasantius, a Spanish nobleman and priest at Rome in 1607, and was approved by pope Gregory XV in 1,622 as a congregation of regulated clergy, under the name Patres scholarum piarum (Fathers of the pious schools). Paul V was the first pontiff to give encouragement to the work of this now celebrated order. Until that time Calasanza labored at Rome only, and was so remarkably successful in getting children for instruction under himself and his associates that his work was gladly accepted as that of a religious order by 1622. Calasanza was the first general of the congregation, and under his management it spread through Poland, Germany, Italy, and other countries. In 1860 the Piarists had 33 houses in Germany, 28 in Italy, 32 in Hungary, 14 in Poland, and at least 30 in Spain. In Italy they have since been suppressed; and the only country in which the Piarists conduct at present, educational institutions of note is the Austro-Hungarian monarchy. In Cis-Lithuanian Austria, in 1870, they had 29 houses with 297 members; included in which were 4 under- gymnasia. The Piarists take besides the three usual monastic vows, a fourththat of free instruction of youth. Pope Innocent XII granted them the privileges of the Begging Monks. Their dress is a long, black coat, like the overcoat of the Jesuits, and a mantle like theirs. At the head of the congregation stands the general, who is elected for six years, and to whom are subject the generals of the different societies or countries in which the order prevails. (J.H.W.)

## Piastrini, Giovanni Domienico[[@Headword:Piastrini, Giovanni Domienico]]

             a painter, was born at Pistoja about 1700. He studied under Cav. Benedetto Luti at Florence, and afterwards went to lome, where he distinguished himself by paintings in the church of St. Maria in Via Lata; in which, according to Lanzi, he rivalled the best followers of Carlo Maratti. He also painted some works for the churches in his native city, particularly in La Madonna della Umilta, where he filled two large spaces with pictures illustrating the history of that church.

## Piatti, Francesco[[@Headword:Piatti, Francesco]]

             an Italian painter, was, according to Fuessli, born at Teglio, in the Valteline, in 1650. He executed many works for the churches in the neighborhood, and painted much for the collections.

## Piattoli, Gaetano[[@Headword:Piattoli, Gaetano]]

             a Florentine painter, was born in 1703. He studied under Francesco Riviera at Leghorn. Lanzi says he is particularly extolled for the excellence of his portraits. He found abundant employment at Florence in that branch of the art, and was not only patronized by the inhabitants, but was employedto paint the portraits of the foreign nobility who visited that city. He died in 1770.

## Piazza, Carlo Bartolomeo[[@Headword:Piazza, Carlo Bartolomeo]]

             an Italian monk, deserves to be mentioned here. He was abbe and counsellor of the Congregation of the Index, and published Diarium Vaticanum (Rome, 1687, 4to), and La Gerarchia cardinalizia (ibid. 1703, fol.). — Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, 40:35.

## Piazza, Cav. Andrea[[@Headword:Piazza, Cav. Andrea]]

             an Italian painter of the Venetian school, was born at Caitelfranco about 1600. He was the nephew and pupil of Paolo Piazza (q.v.), whom he accompanied to Rome, and whose style he adopted, though somewhat modified by an attentive study of the works of the great masters. He acquired distinction, and was patronized by the duke of Lorraine, in whose service he continued many years, and received from him the honor of knighthood. He afterwards returned to Venice, where he executed some works for the churches, the best of which is the Marriage at Cana, in the church of S. Maria, a grand composition of many figures, which Lanzi says is one of the best works in the place. He died there in 1670.

## Piazza, Girolamo Bartolomeo[[@Headword:Piazza, Girolamo Bartolomeo]]

             an Italian Dominican friar, flourished in the first half of the 18th century. He was highly esteemed by his coreligionists, and was at one time judge of the Inquisition. But the cruelty and injustice of the Roman Ultramontanists caused him to withdraw from the Church of Rome. He went over to England, and was admitted into the Church of England. He taught Italian and French for many years at Cambridge, and died there about 1745. He is the author of A Short and True Account of the Inquisition and its Proceedings, as it is Practiced in Italy, set forth in some Particular Cases (Engl. and Fr., Lond. 1722). See Quetif and Echard, Scriptores ordinis Praedicationum, s.v.

## Piazza, Paolo[[@Headword:Piazza, Paolo]]

             (commonly called Padre Cosimo), was born at Castelfranco, in the Venetian territory, in 1557. He studied under the younger Palma, and Baglioni commends him as one of his best pupils. He did not follow the style of his master, but adopted one of his own, which, though not distinguished by great vigor or energy, was graceful and pleasing, and gained him so much reputation that he was successively employed by pope Paul V, the emperor Rudolph II, and the doge Priuli. He executed many works, both in oil and fresco, for the churches and public edifices at Rome,Vienna, Venice, and other places. He was employed several years by the emperor Rudolph. Among his best works are the Descent from the Cross in the Campidoglio, and the History of Antony and Cleopatr in the Palazzo Borghese at Rome. After Piazza had inquired distinction, he joinedl the Capuchin friars, and took the name Padre Cosino, by which appellation he is usually known. He died at Venice in 1621.

## Piazza, Prancesco[[@Headword:Piazza, Prancesco]]

             an Italian theologian, was born in Bologna near the beginning of the 15th century. In 1424 he took the dress of the Dominicans. and distinguished himself by his skill in the science of canon law. He died at Bologna December 17, 1460. His treatise De restitutionibus, usuris et excommunicationibus (Cremona, 1472, fol.) has been several times  reprinted. Another, composed by him, De actu matrimonial, which contains singular opinions, is preserved in manuscript at Leipsic. — Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, 40:35.

## Piazzetta, Giovanni Battista[[@Headword:Piazzetta, Giovanni Battista]]

             one of the most celebrated of the later Venetian painters, was born in 1682. According to Zanetti, he was instructed in the rudiments of the art by his father, a reputable sculptor in wood, and afterwards became the pupil of Antonio Molinari. His first style was distinguished for a clear and brilliant tone of coloring, but on visiting Bologna he employed himself with  Spagnoletto; and by diligently studying the works of Guercino, he imitated his strong contrasts of lights and shadows, and boldness of relief, with considerable success. Lanzi says it is supposed that he had long observed the effects of lights applied to statues of wood and images of wax, and by this means he was enabled to draw with considerable judgment and exact precision the several parts that are comprehended in the shadowing; owing to which art his designs were eagerly sought after,.andhis works repeatedly engraved by Pitteri, by Pelli, and by Monaco, besides many other masters in Germany and elsewhere. His method of coloring, however, diminished in a great measure the chief merit of his pictures. His shades have increased and changed, his lights sunk, and his tints become yellow; so that there remains an inharmonious and unformed mass. There are a few of his pictures still in good preservation: as the Decoration of St. John the Baptist, in the church of that saint at Padua, placed in competition with those of the first artists in the state, and at that period esteemed best of all. "Yet if we follow him closely he will not fail to displease us by that monotonous coloring of lakes alnd yellows, and by that rapidity of hand called, by some, spirit, though to the judicious it often appears neglect, as if the artist were desirous of abandoning his task before it was completed." He executed manyt chalkdrawings which were greatly valued. He also etched a few plates from his own designs. He died at Venice in 1754. See Spooner, Biog. Hist. of the Fine Arts, 2:690.

## Piazzi, Calisto[[@Headword:Piazzi, Calisto]]

             an Italian painter, was born at Lodi, and flourished from 1524 to 1556 as. appears from the dates on his pictures. According to Orlandi, he was one of the most successful imitators of Titian. Lanzi says that his picture of the Assumption of the Virgin, in the collegiate church of Codogno, is worthy of ally of the disciples of Titian. It is a grand composition, containing figures of the apostles, and two portraits of the Marchesi Trivulzi. In the church of the Incoronata, at Lodi, he painted three chapels ill fresco, each ornamented with four beautiful histories. One contains the Mysteries of the Passion, another the Acts qf St. John the Baptist, and the third the Life of the Virgin. "It is currently believed," says Lanzi, "that Titian, in passing through Lodi, painted several of the heads — a story probably originating from the exceeding beauty that may be observed in them." He sometimes imitated the style of Giorgione, as may be seen in his altar-piece in the church of St. Francesco at Brescia, representing the Virgin among several  saints, which is esteemed one of the most beautiful productions in that city. He executed many works for the chlilches in other cities, particularly atr Crema and Alessandria. In the cathedral of the latter city are several of his best works. Lanzi rebukes Ridolfi, who commends him for nothing except his coloring, whereas "he boasts a very noble design, is tolerably select in his forms, and rich, and harmonious in his coloring. His Wedding at Cana, in the refectory of the Padri Cisterciensi, at Milan, is truly a surprising production, no less for its boldness of hand than for the number of its figures, which seem to live and breathe, though the whole of them are not equally well studied, and a few are really careless and incorrect." Lomazzo also, speaking of his Choir of the Muses — in which he introduced the portraits of the president Sacco and his wife, for whom it was painted — says, "I may, without fear of temerity, observe that it is impossible to produce anything more perfectly graceful and pleasing, and more beautiful in point of coloring, among works in fresco."

## Pic, Jean[[@Headword:Pic, Jean]]

             a young French Christian, suffered martyrdom for his devotion to the Protestant cause. He was born in 1546, and flourished at Tournay. Together with his friend, Hugo Destailleur, accused of heresy, they were proven to have circulated the Genevese tracts, and refusing to recant, were imprisoned; and March 22, 1565, were sentenced to be burned to death. Thev died faithful to the Lord they had decided to serve. See Hurst, Martyrs to the Truct Cause, pages 154-164.

## Picaids[[@Headword:Picaids]]

             a Christian sect of heretics which arose in Bohemia in the 15th century. John Picard, the founder of the sect, whence their name, drew after him men and women to whom he promised that he would restore them to the primitive state of innocence wherein man was created. With this pretence he taught them to give themselves up to all impurity, saying that therein consisted the liberty of the sons of God, and all those not of their sect were in bondage. He first published his notions in Germany and the Low Countries, and persuaded many people to go naked, and gave them thename of Adantites (q.v.); and accordingly he assumed the title of New Adam. After this he seized on an island in the river Lausnecz, some leagues from Tabor, the:headquarters of Zisca, where he established himself and his followers. His women were common, but none were allowed to enjoy them without his permission; so that when any man desired a particular woman he carried her to Picard, who gave him leave in these words: 'Go increase, multiply, and fill the earth." At length, however, Zisca, general of the Hussites (famous forrtlis victories over the emperor Sigismond), incensed at their abominations, marched against them, made himself master of their island, and put them all to death except two, whom he spared that he might learn their doctrine.

Such is the account which various writers, relying on the authorities of AEneas Silvius and Varillas, have given of the Picards. Some, however, doubt whetller a sect of this denomination, chargeable with such wild principles and such wild conduct, ever existed. It appears probable that the reproachful representations of the writers just mentioned were calumnies invented and propagated in order to disgrace the Picards, merely because they deserted the communion and protested against the errors of the Church of Rome. Lasitius informs us that Picard, together witlh forty other persons, besides women anti children, settled in Bohemia in the year 1418. Balbinus, the Jesuit, in his Epitome Rerum Bohenmicarum, lib. 2, gives a  similar account, and charges on the Picards none of the extravagances or crimes ascribed to them by Svlvius. Schlecta, secretary of Ladislaus, king of Bohemia, in his letters to Erasmus, in which he gives a particular account of the Picards, says that they considered the pope, cardinals, and bishops of Rome as the true antichrists; and the adorers of the consecrated elements in the eucharist as downright idol worshippers. According to this author, the Picards are Vaudois, who fled from persecution in their own country and sought refuge in Bohemia. Beausobre held the same opinion, on the ground that the Vaudois were settled in Bohemia in the year 1178, where some of them adopted the rites of the Greek, and others those of the Latin Church. The former were pretty generally adhered to till the middle of the 14th century, when the establishment of the Latin rites caused great disturbance. At the commencement of the national troubles in Bohemia, on account of the opposition of the papal power, the Picards more publicly avowed and defended their religious opinions; and they formed a considerable body in an island by the river Launitz, or Lausnecz, in the district of Bechin, and, resorting to arms, were defeated by Zisca. See Hardwick, Hist. of the M.A. Church, page 436; Ref. page 95; Mosheim, Church Hist. volume 2; and the references under ADAMITES. (J.H.W.)

## Picard, Jean (1)[[@Headword:Picard, Jean (1)]]

             a French priest, is noted especially as an astronomer. He was born at La Fleche, in tie present department of the Sarthe, and after taking holy orders became prior ofRille, in the.same department. He gave himself largely to astronomic studies, and many are his publications ill this department of natlural science. Picard died at Paris July 12, 1682. For a list of his publications, which are not of special interest to us, we refer to Condorcet, Eloge de Picard; Fontenelle; Eloge de Piccard; and the Biographie Universelle, s.v.

## Picard, Jean (2)[[@Headword:Picard, Jean (2)]]

             a French humanist, was born in Beauvais in the 16th century. He was regular canon of St. Victor, in Paris. He died in 1617. We owe to him the edition of the chronicle of Guillaume de Neubourg (De -ebus A Inglicis [Paris, 1610, 8vo], lib. 5), accompanied by the life of the author and historical notes, and that of the OEuvres de St. Bernard (Paris, 1615. fol.). See Moreri, Dict. Hist. s.v.; Papillon, Bibl. de Burgogne, s.v. — Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, 40:47.

## Picard, John[[@Headword:Picard, John]]

             SEE PICARDS.

## Picard, Mathurin[[@Headword:Picard, Mathurin]]

             a French ecclesiastic who flourished in the early part of the 17th century, was curate of Mestil-Jourdain, in the diocese of Evreux. Picard is the author of a quaint book, which has become very rare, Le Fouet des Paillards, ou juste Punition des Voluptueux et Charnzels (Rlouen, 1623, 12mo). He incurred the same accusations as Urbain Grandier, and was doomed to the same penalty. His alleged crime was bewitching tie nuns of Saint-Louis of Louviers, and sundry acts of profanation and debauchery. As he was tried after his death, his body was exhumed and burned at Rouen, in execution of a judgment rendered August 21, 1647. See Frere, Bibliogr. Normande. — Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, 40:48.

## Picardet, Charles N[[@Headword:Picardet, Charles N]]

             a French priest, was born at Dijon near the beginning of the 18th century. Before the Revolution he was canon of Saint-Jean-Baptiste of Dijon, and  prior of Neuilly, near that city. He died about 1794. We have of his works, Essai sur l'Education des petits Enfants (Dijon, 1756, 12mo): — Les deux Abdolonymes (ibid. 1779, 8vo): — and Histoire metorologique, nosoloyique, et economique pour l'Anmnee 1785. He had undertaken a considerable work, which, under the title of Grande Apologetique, was to contain the refutation of all heresies since the establishment of Christianity. See Biog. Nouv. des Contemp. — Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, 40:53.

## Picart, Bernard[[@Headword:Picart, Bernard]]

             a famous French engraver, was born at Paris in 1673. He was the pupil of Le Clerc. His best works are those executed in France. Having embraced the Reformed religion, he took up his residence in Holland. In Amsterdam, to which place he accompanied his father in 1710, he worked exclusively for the booksellers, and became mannered, metallic, and merely ornamental. A great many of his prints are from his own designs, in which he imitated the style of composition of Antoine Coypel. He had a facility in imitating the styles of other earlier engravers, and he published many prints of this class which are said to have deceived collectors; Picart used to call them Impostures innocentes, and. they were publishled under this title, to the number of seventy-eight, with a list of his works (Amsterdam, 1738), after his death. His prints altogether amount to about 1300, and one of the best of them is a Slaughter of the Innocents, after a design of his own: there are various impressions of it. He died in 1733. The French text which Picart's copper-plates were intended to illustrate was Written by J.F. Bernard and Bruzen de la Martiniere. The first and best edition of the work in the original French is that of 1728-37; to which should be added  Supplement (1743, 2 volumes), and Superstitions, Anciennes et Modemne (1733-36, 2 volumes). Picart is the author of a work on The Religious Ceremonies and Customs of the several Nations of the known World, represented in more than a hundred copper-plates, which he designed, and accompanied with historical explanations and several curious dissertations (Lond. 1731-39, 7 volumes, fol.). See Duplessis, Hist. de la Gravure en France; Haag Freres, La France Protestante, s.v.; Darling, Cyclop. Bibliogr. s.v.; English Cyclop. s.v.

## Picart, Etienne[[@Headword:Picart, Etienne]]

             called Le Romain, father of the preceding, also a celebrated French engraver, was born at Paris in 1631. His prints, chiefly portraits and history, are very numerous: they are finely executed, but want harmony. He worked with the graver and, the etching-needle, much in the style of Poilly. He is supposed to have been called Le Romain from hlis log., sojourn in Rome, or he assumed the name that he might not be confounded with another engraver of the name of Picart. He was engraver to the king, and a member of the French Academy of Painting, etc. He left his country because he was persecuted for his religious belief, and died at Amsterdam in 1721. He engraved many sacred subjects of the great masters, among them the Birth of the Virgin, after Guido; the Marriage of St. Catharine, after Correggio; the Holy Family, after Palma. etc.

## Piccadori, Jean Baptiste[[@Headword:Piccadori, Jean Baptiste]]

             an Italian ascetic of some note, was born at Rieti in 1766. He entered the congregation of the regular Minorites, and professed philosophy and theology. In 1791 he obtained the professorship of morals, and kept it while he lived. He was at the same time curate of the parish of Saint- Vincent-et-Saint-Anastase, consultor of the Index, etc. In September, 1826, Leo XI appointed him superior-general of his order, in which he had occupied different minor charges. Piccadori published Institutions ethique, ou de la Philosophie morale, and was prevented by death from finishing Institutions du Droit des Gens. He died at Rome December 29, 1829. — Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, 40:55.

## Picchiani, Francesco[[@Headword:Picchiani, Francesco]]

             (also called Picchetti), an Italian archlitect, was born at Ferrara in the latter part of the 17th century. He was the son, and probably the pupil, of  Bartolofimeo Picchiani, who erected the church del Monte della Misericordia at Naples. Francesco settled in that city, where he gained a high reputation for his talents. He was employed by the viceroy Don Pedro Arragona to assist in the construction of a basin for the royal galleys, and other vessels. He also constructed the beautiful avenue leading from the basin to the piazza of the palace, adorning it with elegant fountains. Among his other works were the church and monastery of S. Giovanni della Monache. without the Porta Alba; S. Agostino; La Divino Amore; the church and monastery de Miracoli; and the Monte de Poveri, in the Strada di Toledo. He died in 1690.

## Picchianti, Giovanni Domenico[[@Headword:Picchianti, Giovanni Domenico]]

             all Italian designer and engraver, was born at Florence about 1670. He was instructed in the rudimellts of drawing by Giovanni Battista Foggini, and afterwards learned engraving. Picchianti with Lorenzini, Mogalli, and other artists, was employed in engraving a set of plates from pictures in the Florentine Gallery. Among other works of his are the following: The Madonna della Seggiola, after Raffaelle; The Virgin and Infant Jesus, with St. John, after Anthony Caracci; The Tribute-Money, after Titian; The Firgin and Infant, after Titian; Abraham Sending away Hagar, after P. da Cortona.

## Piccinardi, Serafino[[@Headword:Piccinardi, Serafino]]

             an Italian theologian of some note, was born at Padua in 1634. He embraced the rule of St. Dominic; professed theology at Bologna, Verona, Genoa, and Milan and was called upon, in 1669, to occupy the chair of metaphysics at the universitv of his native place. According to Papadopoli, he died in 1686 at Brescia; according to Echard, in 1695. He published, Philosophice dogmaticce peripateticce Christiance lib. 9 (Padua, 1671- 1676, 2 volumes, 4to): — De approbatione doctrinae St. Thorae lib. 7 (ibid. 1683, 3 volumes, fol.): — and Praedestinatus (ibid. 1686, 4to). — Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, 40:55.

## Piccini, Giacomo[[@Headword:Piccini, Giacomo]]

             an Italian engraver, was born at Venice in 1617. It is not known by whom he was instructed. He engraved a set of thirty portraits of the principal painters of the Venetian schlool, for the account of their lives by Ridolfi, published inl 1648. He also engraved a few plates after the Italian masters,  among which are The Holy Trimity, after P. Liberi; Judith with the Head of Holofernes at her Feet, and The Holy Family, after Titian. His plates are executed in a stiff, disagreeable style. He was living in 1669.

## Piccioni, Matteo[[@Headword:Piccioni, Matteo]]

             a painter and enoraver, was born at Ancona according to Nagler, in 1615. Little is known of him as a painter, save that he flourished at Rome, and was elected a member of the Acadlemy of St. Luke in 1655. Lanzi says he was a fellow-student of Giiovanmi Antonlio Galli. Bartsch gives a list of twenty-three prints by him, among wliich are the following: St. Luke painting the Virgin, after Raffaelle; The Adoration of the Shepherds, after P. Veronese; The Holy Family, after P. Veronese; The Virgin and Infant Jesus, with St. John, after A. Camassei; The Exposing of Moses in the Waters of the Nile, after A. Camassei.

## Piccola, Niccola (or Niccola Lapicola)[[@Headword:Piccola, Niccola (or Niccola Lapicola)]]

             a Sicilian painter, was born at Crotona, in Calabria Ultra, in 1730. He studied under Francesco Alancini at Rome, and acquired considerable repultation. He executed several works for the churches in that city, and decorated the cupola of a chapel in the Vaticaln, which was so much esteemed that it was afterwards copied in mosaic. Many paintings by Piccola are at Veletri, but none of his works are specified. He died in 1790.

## Piccolomini, Alessandro[[@Headword:Piccolomini, Alessandro]]

             one of the most distinguished of Italian prelates of the 16th century, was born at Siena in 1508. He sprang from the same family as pope Pius II (q.v.). and by his piety, modesty, and scholarship gained great renown; but no events of his life are particularly worth recording. He deserves to be remembered for the wide extent of his writings, and the esteem in which they were held by his contemporaries and immediate followers. He died in 1578. He was of an original turn of mind, and his writings are almost all in Italian, so that he is among the earliest of those who endeavored to raise the character of vernacular literature by treating all branches of knowledge in modern tongues. His commentaries on Aristotle were prized for their good sense, and for their abandonment of most of the scholasticisms by which that philosophy was disfigured by commentators. He advocated in 1578 the reformation of the calendar, which was afterwards adopted. In his book on the fixed stars and the sphere he adopts the mode of designating  the stars by letters — a small matter, but one which makes the greater part of the immortality of Bayer, and to which the diagrams of Piccolomini establish his prior claim. His works are of a most miscellaneous character — astronomy, physics, comedies, sonnets, morals, divinity, and commentaries on Aristotle. De Thou speaks in strong terms of the rare union of diversity and depth which his acquirements presented. For a list of his most important works, and an estimate of them, see Fabiani, Vita d' Aless. Piccolomini (Vienna, 1749, 1759, 8vo); Ughelli, Italia Sacra, s.v.; Tiraboschi, Storia della letter. ital. volume 7, part 1, page 506; Niceron, Memoires, volume 23, s.v. — Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Gen. s.v.

## Piccolomini, Francesco[[@Headword:Piccolomini, Francesco]]

             an Italian philosopher, father of the preceding, was born in 1520 at Siena. At Padua, Where he pursued his studies, he was condisciple of Felix Peretti, who became pope under the name of Sixtus V, and who boasted of having worsted him in public disputation. He professed philosophy,at Siena, Macerata, Perugia (1550), and finally at Padua (1560). His advanced age compelled him, in 1601, to leave the latter city and retire to Siena. He strove both by his lessons and by his writings to restore the philosophy of Plato, and to show that it is compatible after all with the principles of Aristotle. He died at Siena in 1604. He left, Universa philosophia de moribus (Venice, 1583, fol.); the editions of Frankfort (1601,1611, 8vo) contain besides, under the title of Comes politicus, an answer to the attacks of Zabarella: — Libri de scientiae natura V puttibus (Frankf. 1597, 1627, 4to), which is a treatise on natural philosophy: — De arte definiendi et eleganter discurrendi (ibid. 1600, 4to): — Commentaria in Aristotelem De Ortu et Interitu, De anima et De Coelo (Mentz, 1608, 8vo); each of these commentaries was also published separately. — Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, 40:67.

## Picenardi, Carlo (1)[[@Headword:Picenardi, Carlo (1)]]

             (called The Elder), an. Italian painter who accordilng to Zaist, flourished at Cremona about 1600. He was of a patriciani family, and a faIvorite pupil of Lodtovica Caracci. He executed somne works for the churches of his native city, and painted some burlesque histories which gained him considerable reputation. He died young.

## Picenardi, Carlo (2)[[@Headword:Picenardi, Carlo (2)]]

             (called The Younger), son of the preceding, was born about 1610. It is not known by whom he was instructed; but, after studying at Rome, ihe went to Venice, and formed a style of his own, Roman in design and Venetian in coloring. On his return to Cremona he executed some works for the churches and public edifices, but painted most for the collections. Lanzi says he was very successful in burlesque histories, in imitation of the elder Picenardi. He died about the year 1680.

## Pichler, Aloys, Dr[[@Headword:Pichler, Aloys, Dr]]

             one of the most prominent Roman Catholic theologians of Germany, was born in 1833 at Burgkirchen, in the diocese of Passau. He studied at the Passau Lyceum and at Munich, and in 1857 he received the prize for an essay on Polybius. Two years later he was made a priest; in 1861 he was honored with the theological doctorate, and in the following year he commenced his lecttires on Church history. In 1869 he was appointed librarian at St. Petersburg; but two years later he was found to be guilty of kleptomaniac propensities in his official capacity, and as he had robbed the library of many valuable possessions, he was brought to trial, found guilty, and condemned to banishment to Siberia, where he remained till 1874, when he was pardoned through the intervention of the Bavarian prince Leopold. Pichler then returned to his native country. He died June 3, 1874, at Siegdorf, near Trauenstein. He wrote, Geschichte des Protestantisnus in der orientalischen Kirche im 17 Jahrhund., oder der Patriarch Cyrillus Lucaris u. seine Zeit (Munich, 1861): — Die orientalische Kitchenfrage nach ihrem gegenwartigen Stande (ibid. 1861): — Geschichte der kirchlichen Trennung zwischen Orient und Occident (1864-65, 2 volumes); which had the distinction of being placed on the Romish Index — Die Theologie des Leibnitz (1869 sq., 2 volumes): — Die wahren Hindernisse und die Grundbedingungen einer durchgreifenden Reform der Kirche (1870). Towards the last he became more estranged from his Church. See Ztchhold, Bibliotheca Theologica. 2:995; Literarischer Hardweiser furs katholische Deutschland, 1874, page 335 sq.; Kurtz, Lehrbuch der Kircherngesch. 7th ed., 2:357. (B.P.)

## Pichler, Veit[[@Headword:Pichler, Veit]]

             a German Roman Catholic theologian and member of the Society of Jesus, was born at Berchtofen, Bavaria, in the second half of the 17th century. He entered the Jesuitic order, and was a professor of canonical law at Dillingen; became in 1716 professor of jurisprudence at Ingoldstadt, and in 1731 he obtained a professorship of jurisprudence at Munich, He died in 1736. We have of him, Iter polemnicun au Ecclesie catholicae veritatem (Augsb. 1708, 8vo): — Examen polemicut super Augustana confessione (ibid. 1708, 8vo): — Papatus numquam errans in proponendis fidei articulis (ibid. 1709, 8vo): — Lutheranismus constantor errans in fidei articulis (ibid. 1709, 8vo): — Theologia polemica (ibid. 1719, 4to, and often): — Summa jurisprudentiae sacrae (ibid. 1723, 5 volumes, 8vo): — Jus canonicum practiae explicatum (ibid. 1728, 4to; 1735, 1746, fol.). — Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, 40:77.

## Pichon, Jean[[@Headword:Pichon, Jean]]

             a French Jesuit, noted as a revivalist, was born at Lyons in 1683. He early became a preacher, but after entering the Society of Jesus in 1697, and obtaining orders, preached in missions at Rheims, Langres, and Metz. Stanislas, duke of Lorraine and Bar, gave him the direction of the missions which he founded in this country with truly royal liberality. To refute some Jansenists, who dissuaded the people from frequeint communion by asserting that man must be perfect before approaching the holy table, he published Esprit de Jesus Christ et de l'Eglise sur la Communion frequente (1745, 12mo). His book caused a great stir. It was attacked by the authors of the Nouvelles Ecclesiastiques, condemned by an ordinance of M. de Caylus, bishop of Auxerre (September 27, 1747), and soon afterwards by other prelates, zealous partisans of the "Unigenitus bull." Jesuits and Jansenists being united against his book, Pichon retracted his obnoxious opinions in a letter to M. de Beaumont, archbishop of Paris, January 24, 1748. He then went to preach at Colmar; but as it soon appeared that he was endeavoring secretly to instigate a number of German prelates against the proscription of his work in France, he was banished to Maariac (1748), and soon after compelled to leave France. Having found an asylum in the house of the bishop of Lyons (Valais), he became grand- vicar and general visitor of his bishopric. He died at Lyons May 3, 1751. — Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, 40:78.

## Pichon, Thomas-Jean[[@Headword:Pichon, Thomas-Jean]]

             a French litterateur, was born in 1731 at Le Mans. Having been ordained a priest, he attached himself to M. d'Avrincourt, bishop of Perpignan, by whose protection he became canon and chorister of the Sainte-Chapelle of Le Mans. He was historiographer of the king's brother, whose estate was in that part of France. At the time of the Revolution the constitutional bishopric of Sarthe was offered to Pichon; but he would accept only the situation of administrator of the hospital of Le Mans. He died at that place November 18, 1812. His principal writings are, La Raison triomphante des Nouveautes (Paris, 1756, 12mo): it is an essay, upon manners and incredulity: — Traite historique et critique de la Nature de Dieu (ibid. 1758, 12mo): — Cartel aux Philosophes a quatre Pattes (Brussels, 1763, 8vo), in which he exposes materialism: — Memoire sur les Abus du Celibat dans l'Orde politique (Amsterdam, 1763, 8vo); this memoir, quite singular and inaccurate, excited some complaints against the author: — La Physique de l'Histoire (La Haye, 1765, 12mo); general considerations upon the temperament and character of people: — Les Droits respectifs de l'Etat et de l'Eglise rappelis a leurs Principes (Paris, 1766, 12mo): — Memoires sur les Abus dans les Mariages (Amsterdam, 1766, 12mo): — Des Etudes theologiques (Avignon, 1767, 12mo); researches upon the abuses which opposed the progress of theology in the public schools: — Les Arguments de la Raison en Faveur de la Religion et du Sacerdolae (Paris, 1776, 12mo); an examination of the treatise De l'Homme of Helvetius. Abbe Pichon also published the Principes de la Religion et de la Morale of Saurin (Amsterdam, 1768, 2 volumes, 12mo), the same work as the Esprit de Saurlin of J.F. Duranel: — La France agricole et marchande of Goyen (Paris, 1768, 8vo): — and Le Sacrae et le Couronement de Louis XVI of Gobet (Paris, 1775, 8vo and 4to), to which was added a Journal historique of this ceremony. See Desportes, Bibliog. du Maine; Querard, France Litter. s.v. — Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, 40:79.

## Pick[[@Headword:Pick]]

             a name common to several Hebrew literati, of whom we mention the following:

1. AARON. — When and where he was born, and when lie became a Christian, we do not know. From his publicatiios we see, what he states himself, that he was formerly professor of Hebrew and Chaldee at the  University of Prague. He afterwards resided at London, where he published A Literal Translationfrnom the Hebrew of the Twelve Minor Prophets, with Notes and Critical Remarks (Lond. 1833; 2d ed., without notes, ibid. 1835; 3d ed. 1838): — A Treatise on the Hebrew Accents (ibid. 1837): — The Bible Student's Concordance, by which the English Reader may be enabled readily to ascertain the Literal Meaning of any Word in the Sacred Original (ibid. 1840, 1850, 4to); a work of little account to scholars: — The Gathering of Israel (ibid. 1845). When Pick died we do not know. See Steinschneider, Bibliographisches Handbuch (Berl. 1859), page 111; Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors, s.v.

2. ISRAEL, the founder of the Amenian Congregation, was born at Seuftenberg, Bohemia, about the year 1825. After attaining maturity, he obtained his livelihood by writing for periodicals at Vienna till the year 1852, when he received an appointment to act as rabbi for the Jewish synagogue in Bucharest, the chief city of the present Roumania. In the latter part of 1853, having been impressed in favor of the Christian religion, lie boldly confessed his faith in Christ crucified; was baptized at Breslau, Silesia, Jan. 1,1854, on which occasion Pick delivered an address to the Jews assembled at the Hofkirche.Viewing the promises given to the Jewish people in the Old Testament from a Hebraic standpoint, Pick :intended to constitute in the Holy Land a congregation of the people of God, consisting of Jewish Christians. The whole Mosaic law, including the Jewish Sabbath and circumcision, alongside of baptism and theLord's Supper, he intended to make the basis of ecclesiastical and civil organization. Here and there he was successful in winning some believers, whom he called the Armenian Congregation, because in Christ (theאלהי אמן, Isa 65:16) all promises of the Old Covenant are yea and amen. The nucleus of this congregation was in Munchen-Stadbach. In the year 1857 Pick went to Palestine, in order to reconnoitre the field for a settlement of his adherents, where, however, he disappearedwithout leaving any traces. He wrote, Israel hat eine Idee zu tragen: ein Wort an mein Volk (Breslau, 1854; Engl. translation, "A Word to my People," Edinburgh, 1854): — Der Gott der Synagoge und der Gott der Judenchristen (ibid.): — Briefe an meine Stammesgenossen (Hamburg, 1854): — Der Stern aus Jacob (ibid. 1855-56): — Wider Stahl und Bunsen (Barmen, 1856). See Kurtz, Lehrbuch der Kirchengeschichte (7th ed. Mitau, 1874), 2:445; Niedner, Lehrbuch der christlichen Kirchengeschichte (Berlin, 1866), page 950; Jewish Intelligencer (Lond.  1854), page 302 sq.; Pick, In Saat auf Hoffnung (Leips.), 1857; Zuchhold, Bibliotheca Theologica, 2:995. (B.P.)

## Pickard, Edward[[@Headword:Pickard, Edward]]

             an English dissenting minister, inclined to Arianism, was born at Alcester. Warwickshire, in 1714. After studying theology, he became minister at Bermondsev in 1740, and at Carter Lane, London, in 1746. He died in 1778. He is the author of National Praise to God for the glorious Revolution, the Protestant Succession, and the syinal Successes and Blessings with which Providence has crowned tis, a sermon on Psa 147:1 (Lond. 1761. 8vo):— The Religious Government of a Family, particularly the Obligation and Importance of Family Worship, in three discourses (ibid. 1762, 8vo).

## Pickard, John H[[@Headword:Pickard, John H]]

             a Presbyterian minister, was born in Orange County, N.C., in March 1783. He received a limited education, and was not a graduate of aiy college. In 1816 he was licensed, and installed over Stony Creek and Bethesda churches, in N. C., where ha continued to labor devotedly for upwards of thirty years. During the later years of his life he preached occasionally in the destitute portions of his neighborhood. He died September 11, 1858. See Wilson, Presb. Hist. Almanac, 1860, page 77.

## Pickering, George[[@Headword:Pickering, George]]

             one of the great pioneers of New England Methodism, was born in Talbot County, Maryland, in 1769, converted in St. George's Church, Philadelphia, when eighteen years old, and almost immediately began his public labors. In 1790 he was received on probation by the Conference, and for fifty-six years continued to receive its appointments, and lived to be the oldest active preacher in the itinerancy. He died December 8, 1846, retaining his mental faculties to the last hour; and as he laid aside his armor to give up the ghost, could use such language as "All my affairs for time and eternity are settled, glory be to God." George Pickering was a rare man in all respects. Any just delineation of him must comprehend the whole man, for it was not his distinction to be marked by a few extraordinary traits, but by general excellence. In person he was tall, slight, and perfectly erect. His countenance was expressive of energy, shrewdness, self-command, and benignity; and in advanced life his silvered locks,  combed carefully behind his ears, gave him a striking appearance. The exactitude of his mind extended to all: his physical habits. In pastoral labors, exercise, diet, sleep, and dress, he followed a fixed course, which scarcely admitted of deviation. Almost unerring prudence marked his life. If not sagacious at seizing new opportunities, he was almost infallibly perfect in that negative prudence which secures safety and confidence. No man who knew him would have apprehended surprise or defeat in any measure undertaken by him after his usual deliberation. His character was full of energy, but it was the energy of the highest order of minds, never varving, never impulsive. He continued to the last to wear the plain, Quakerlike dress of the first Methodist ministry. His voice was clear and powerful, and his step firm to the end. His intellectual traits were not of the highest, but of the most useful order. Method was perhaps his strongest mental habit, and it comprehended nearly every detail of his daily life. His sermons were thoroughly "skeletonized." He pretended to no subtlety, and was seldom if ever known to preach a metaphysical discourse. The literal import of the Scriptures, and its obvious applications to experimental and practical religion, formed the substance of his sermons. Perspicuity of style resulted from this perspicacity of thought. The most unlettered listener could have no difficulty in comprehending his meaning, and the children of his audience generally shared the interest of his adult hearers. See Stevens, Hist. of the Meth. Episc. Church; N.Y. Methodist, volume 7, No. 6; Sherman, New England Sketches, pages 399; Sprague, Annals of the Amer. Pulpit, 7:196-200. (J.H.W.)

## Pickering, Robert[[@Headword:Pickering, Robert]]

             a noted Wesleyan preacher, was born at Sancton, Yorkshire, in 1786; was early converted to God, and called to the duties of the Christian ministry. Having for some time labored as a local preacher in the Hull Circuit, he offered to accompany Dr. Coke as a missionary to the East. But as Coke had obtained his complement of young men, Pickering regarded this as a providential indication that he was not intended for the mission field. Soon after he passed the required examinations, and at the Conference of 1811 was placed on the president's list of reserves. In November of the same year he was sent as temporary supply to Partington Circuit, and in the following January to Spilsby. At the Conference of 1812 he was appointed to Horncastle; and in 1813 to the Spilsby mission. His next appointment was to Louth, where he spent two years. Subsequently he travelled at  Todmorden, Barnsley, and Doncaster, and in 1822 was appointed to Colne, where he remained three years. Here his exertions, both of mind and body, in the erection of a new chapel and two preachers' houses, seriously impaired his health. In 1827 he was stationed at Kettering; next at Norwich; in 1831 at West Bromwich, and there he labored faithfully, although rapidly declining in health. While at Conference in London in 1834 he was taken very ill, and he died August 18. Pickering was a man of genuine piety. As a preacher he was a workman who needed not to be ashamed. He was well and extensively read in theology and general literature. As a man he was fearless and honorable. What he considered to be his duty he unhesitatingly discharged. See Wesleyan Meth. Mag. 1836, pages 889-895; 1835, page 719. (J.H.W.)

## Pickett, John R[[@Headword:Pickett, John R]]

             a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South. was born April 2, 1814, in Fairfield District. S.C., of godly parentage; was converted in 1831; called of God to the ministry, he began to preach October 1834, and in the following spring entered South Carolina Conference. He labored faithfully and acceptably for the Church until 1862, when an attack of paralysis obliged him to take a superannuate's relation. He died March 15, 1870. He was quick in perception, patient in study, strong in will, possessed great powers of analysis, and a lively imagination. In temper he was genial, hearty, self-possessed, iand confident. He had the simplicity of a child, both in and out of the pulpit. His manner in the pulpit was self- possessed and deliberate; but as he proceeded in his sermon, he generally warmed with his subject, and his voice assumed a depth and fulness of volume which was wonderful. See Annual Minutes of the Conferences of the Meth. Episc. Church, South, pages 420, 421.

## Pico[[@Headword:Pico]]

             SEE MIRANDULA.

## Picot, Francois Edouard[[@Headword:Picot, Francois Edouard]]

             a French painter, was born at Paris in 1786. He was a disciple of Vincent, and in 1811 obtained the second grand prize for paintings in France from the Academy. After studying for some time at Rome, he was intrusted with the execution of a picture representing The Death of Sapphira (1819) for the church of St. Sveerin. In the same year he exIlibited the tableau of  Amor and Psyche, the figures of which, expressive of graceful naivete, obtained great favor, and which was bought by the duke of Orleans. M. Picot was rewarded at that exhibition by a first-class medal. After this auspicious beginning he executed freely and successfully. Among his works are Raphael and the Fornarina; The Deliverance of St. Peter; The Annunciation; two ceilings in the Louvre, in the Musee des Antiques. Picot had a share in the work of restoration of the paintings of the Fontainebleau palace. He executed The Crowning of the Virgin (Notre Dame de Loretto); the paintings of the ship and choir of St. Vincent de Paul, with M. Flandrin; and some picttires in the church of St. Clotilde. M. Picot was received a member of the Academie des Beaux Arts in 1836, in the place of Charles Vernet. He was created an officer of the Legion of Honor in 1832. He died in 1870. — Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, 40:86.

## Picot, Michel Joseph Pierre[[@Headword:Picot, Michel Joseph Pierre]]

             a French writer of some note, was born March 24, 1770, at Neuvilleaux- Boix, near Orleans. He was early destined for the Church, and was received at the age of thirteen in the house of the bishop of Bayeux. He studied theology at the seminary of Orleans. While professor of humanities at Meung-sur-Loire, he refused the oath required by the civil constitution of the clergy. A warrant being issued against him for his share in the evasion of a royalist, he absconded to Paris; then, submitting to the duties of the requisition which he had shirked till then, he offered to enter the marine (1793), and, after two campaigns, was employed in the equipment office at Brest. In 1797 he was released, and devoted himself to the study of the history of the Church during the 18th century. The Memoires which he published in 1896 obtained the eulogies of religious societies, especially of the abbe Boulogne, who intrusted him with the redaction of the Memorial Catholique, a monthly paper founded by him. In the month of April, 1814, he was called upon to manage L'Ami de la Religion et du Roi, which soon became the official journal of the clergy. He died November 15, 1841, at Paris. He left, Memoire pour servir a l'Histoire ecclesiastique pendant le dix-huitieine Siecle (Paris, 1806,1815-1816, 4 volumes, 8vo; 3d edit. 6 volumes, 8vo); this valuable publication is less polemical than the Memoires of father d'Avrigny, of which it is a kind of continuation; but the historical part of it is weak, and the bibliography is incomplete: — Essai historique sur I'Influence de la Religion en France pendant le dix- seqtieme Siecle (ibid. 1824, 2 volumes, 8vo). He is the chief contributor to  the collection of the Melanges (9 volumes, 8vo), commenced by the abbe Boulogne; and he edited in 1827 the works of that prelate, adding to the same a Tableau reliqieux de la, France sous le Directoire, and a Precis historique sur l'Eglise constitutionnelle. He wrote a number of articles in the Journal des Cares, in the Supplement au Dict. historique of Feller, the Biographie Universelle of Michaud, etc. He bequeathed part of his rich library to the seminary of Saint-Sulpice. — Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, 40:85.

## Picot, Pierre[[@Headword:Picot, Pierre]]

             a Swiss preacher, was born in 1746 at Geneva. He descended from Nicolas Picot, who left Noyon in company with Calvin, his friend, to settle in Geneva. His studies being finished, he visited France, Holland, and England, and connected himself with Franklin, who vainly urged him to accompany Cook in his second voyage around the world. After having served for ten years the Church of Sattigny, he was attached to that of Geneva (1783), and there received in 1787 the title of honorary professor of theology. He died in Geneva March 28, 1822. We have of his works, De multiplici montium utilitate (Geneva, 1790, 8vo): — the Eloge historique de J.A. Mullet-Favre, in the Guide astronomique of Lalande (1771): — and some Sermons (ibid. 1823, 8vo), remarkable for their harmony of style. See Rabbe, etc., Biog. univ. et portat. des Contemp.; Haag Freres, La France Protestante, s.v. — Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, 40:83.

## Picot, Victor Maria[[@Headword:Picot, Victor Maria]]

             a French engraver, was born at Abbeville in 1744. About the year 1770 he went to London, where he engaged in business. He died in 1805. Nagler gives a list of thirty-six prints by him, among which is The Four Evangelists, after Rubens.

## Picquet, Francois (2)[[@Headword:Picquet, Francois (2)]]

             a French missionuary, was born at Bourg (in Bresse) December 6, 1708. He took holy orders, and for a time preached in the diocese of Lyons, but finally entered the Congregation of St. Sulpice, and in 1735 was by it sent to Montreal, to share in the work of the North American missions. Towards 1740 he settled north of that city, near the lake of Two Mountains, where he constructed a fort with the money sent for that purpose by Louis XV, and by requisitions. With the aid of this fort he succeeded in keeping sedentary two roaming tribes, the Algonquins and Nipissings, who took to agriculture. He induced them, as well as the  Trokas and Hnirons, to submit to France; and during the war of 1742 to 1748, Picquet's measures for the safety of his colony were so effective that it remained untouched by English invasion. Peace being restored, he founded in 1749 a new mission near Lake Ontario, and called it La Presentation; the point, occupied by it is the same where the English afterwards founded Kingston. In 1753 he arrived at Paris, and reported to the minister of the marine as to the flourishing state of the colony, which counted already no less the five hundred families. In the war that broke out soon afterwards, he put himself at the head of the Indians which he had trained, destroyed all English forts south of Ontario, and contributed to the defeat of general Braddock. After the defeat of Quebec (1759), Picquet determined to return to France by way of Louisiana. He started with twenty-five Frenchmen and two small troops of savages, which were successively relieved by others in the tribes he met; traversed Upper Canada, reached Michilimakinac, crossed Michigan, and by the Illinois and the Mississippi rivers went to New Orleans, where he spent twenty-two months. The English had offered a reward for his head. Picquet had never received any reward, except a bounty of a thousand dollars and some books in 1751. The books he had to sell to enable himn.to return to France, and he was compelled to live on his scantv inheritance until the assembly of the clergy of France in 1765 presented him a bounty of twelve hundred pounds, which they gave him a second time in 1770. In 1777 he undertook a. journey to Rome, where Pius VI, to honor his merits, paid all his expenses, and made him a present of five thousand pounds. Picquet came home to die at Verjou, near Bourg, the house of his sister, a poor peasant- woman, July 15, 1781. — Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, 40:87.

## Picquet, Frangois (1)[[@Headword:Picquet, Frangois (1)]]

             a French prelate, was born at Lyons April 12, 1626. The son of a banker, he was destined to a commercial career, and travelled in France, Italy, and England. As he had thus become associated with several influential Parisians, he was in 1652 appointed to the consulship of France at Aleppo; and, although he was only twenty-six years of age, he was so shccessful in the discharge of his duties that the Dutch republic intrusted him with her own representation in the same city. Although a layman, he displayed  extraordinary zeal for the promotion of the missionary work. He received the tonsure in 1660 at the hands of Andre, archbishop of Syria, who was indebted to him for his elevation. Two years afterwards he resigned the consulship and went to Rome, to give to pope Alexander VII an account of the state of religion in Syria. When he returned to France he received orders, was appointed prior of Grimand (Provence), and (1663) apostolic protonotarius. He was proposed in 1674 for the apostolic vicarate of Babylon, and became in 1675 bishop in partibus of Caesaropolis, in Macedonia. In 1679 he embarked for Aleppo with the chevalier d'Arvieux. the new French consul, endeavored with unrelenting zeal to revive the faith of the Catholics, anla started in May 1681, as ambassador of the courts of France and Rome in Persia, with a view of working for the restoration and expansion of the Catholic faith. He arrived at Ispahan July 12, 1682, and soon afterrards witnessed the celebrations in that city in honor of the passage of tie khan of the Tartars, Usbeck, who was on his way to Mecca. He was granted an audience, harangued the khan in Italian, and obtained a promise of protection for the Roman Catholics of his lands. Towards the close of 1683 he took the same prince rich presents from the king of France, and transmitted to his sovereign the answer and presents of the Persian sovereign. That same year he was appointed bishop of Babylon, and he had arrived at Hamadan, when his impaired health compelled him to stop several months in that city, where he died, August 26, 1685, after writing to the Congregation of the Propaganda for a coadjutor. A special honor was conferred on him by his burial in the church of the Armelians. Picquet furnished to Nicole several important documents for his work on the perpetuity of the faith of the Church in regard to the Eucharist. — Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Gen. 40:87.

## Pictet, Benedict[[@Headword:Pictet, Benedict]]

             a learned Swiss divine, was born at Geneva in 1655. He studied there under Francis Turretin, whom he succeeded as professor of theology in 1687, and obtained great celebrity. In 1690 he was made rector of the academy; in 1700 pastor of the Italian Church. He died in 1724. Pictet joined to vast erudition a vivid and natural eloquence. A list of his numerous works is given by Niceron. Among these the following are the most important: La Theologie Chretienne, et la Science du Salut (new ed. Genesis 1721, 3 volumes, 4to); originally Theologia Christiana (ibid. 1616, 2 volumes, 12mo); Christian Theology (translated from the Latin by the Reverend Frederick Reyroux, B.A., Lond. 1847, sm. 8vo): — La  Morale Chretienne, ou l'A Art de bien vivre (nouv. ed. augmentee, Genesis 1709,8 volumes, 12mo); the first volume of this vork appeared anonymously. It was reprinted at Lyons, in France, with a dedication to the bishop of Belley: — Dissertation sur les Temples, leur Dedicace, et plusieurs Choses qu'on y voit. avec un Sermon (ibid. 1716., 12mo): — Huit Sermons sue l'Examen des Religions (1Th 5:21) (ibid. 1716, 8vo): — Dix Sermons sur divers Sujets (ibid. 1718, 8vo): — L'Histoire du douzieme Siecle (Amst. 1732, 4to): — Quatorze Sermons sur divers Sujets (Genesis 1721, 8vo). See Biblioth. Germanique, s.v.; Niceron, Memoires, volume 1; Senebler, Hist. litter. de Geneve, 2:249 sq.; Darling, Cyclop. Bibl. s.v.; Mosheim, Eccles. Hist. volume 3; Hook, Eccles. Biog. 8:92. (J.H.W.)

## Pictorial Bibles[[@Headword:Pictorial Bibles]]

             The value and interest added to books of almost all sorts by graphic illustrations has not escaped the attention of editors of the Holy Scriptures. In the Middle Ages this was effected by illuminating copies by hand. SEE ILLUMINATION, ART OF. Since the invention of printing and the discovery of engraving, a similar effect has been more cheaply produced by designs on wood, metal, or stone, either etched or in relief. The romantic scenes of Bible history have been so often reproduced in paint and pencil, and the remains and scenes of Bible lands are so rich in apt and important elucidations of ancient customs and institutions, that a just idea of Oriental life and manners can hardly be conveyed without some such aid to the eye. Accordingly both fancy and fact have been put into requisition for this purpose, and multitudes of volumes have appeared expressly aimed at this result. One of the earliest is the Poor Man's Bible. SEE BIBLIA PAUPERUM. The most noted is that of Hans Holbein (q.v.). In modern times artists and authors have vied with each other, and publishers have been lavish in their endeavors to enrich and beautify the sacred pages with pictorial additions, representing not only the realities of antiquarian research, but also the conceptions of creative genius. Much of this is of little real help to the student, and some of it has really misled readers by imaginary notions and false analogies. But a real gain has been effected by most of the delineations borrowed from books of travel and exploration. These have been also incorporated in a compact and convenient form in the best Bible dictionaries now so widely circulated. One of the most popular  and really serviceable of all the pictorial Bibles is that edited by the late Dr. John Kitto (q.v.). More expensive and elaborate ones have been issued by several English and American houses, which are an ornament to the household and an heirloom to the family.

## Picture[[@Headword:Picture]]

             the rendering in the A.V. in three passages of two Hebrew words which are from the same root (שָׂכָה, to look at).

1. Maskith, מִשְׂכַּית, an image; used alone, either literally (plur. "pictures," Pro 25:11) or in the sense of imagination ("conceit," Pro 18:11; plur. "wish," Psa 73:7); with אֶבֶן, a stone ("image of stone," Lev 26:1; plur. " pictures," Num 33:52); with חֶדֶר, an apartment (plur. "chambers of imagery" [ q.v.], Eze 8:12), "it denotes idolatrous representations, either independent images, or more usually stones 'portrayed,' i.e., sculptured in low relief, or engraved and colored (Eze 23:14; Layard, Nin. and Bab. 2:306, 308). Movable pictures, in the modern sense, were doubtless unknown to the Jews; but colored sculptures and drawings on walls or on wood, as mummy-cases, must have been familiar to them in Egypt (see Wilkinson, Anc. Egyptians, 2:277). In later times we read of portraits (εἰκόνας), perhaps busts or intagli, sent by Alexandra to Antony (Josephus, Ant. 15:2, 6). The 'pictures of silver' of Pro 25:11, were probably wall-surfaces or cornices with carvings, and the 'apples of gold' representations of fruit or foliage, like Solomon's flowers and pomegranates (1Ki 6:7). The walls of Babvlon wlere ornamented with pictures on enamelled brick."

2. Sekiyah, שְׂכַיּה, the flag of a ship, as seen from afar (plur. "picture," Isa 2:16). The Phoenician and Egyptian vessels had their flags and  sails of purple and other splendid colors (see Eze 27:7; comp. Diod. Sic. 1, 51; Wilkinson, Anc. Egypt. 3:211). SEE STANDARD.

## Pictures, Worship Of In Churches[[@Headword:Pictures, Worship Of In Churches]]

             The use of paintings and images in churches was introduced as early as the commencement of the 4th century, but was speedily condemned by a council held at Illiberis, in Spain, A.D. 305. Individual writers also dulrig this century bore their testimony against the practice in question. Eusebius of Caesarea, at the beginning of the century, and Epiphanius of Salamis, towards the close of it, denounced the practice as heathenish and unscriptural (see Milner's Hist. of the Church. volume 4, chapter 13, page 423). Nevertheless the practice of hanging up pictures of saints and martyrs, as well as symbolical representations of Scripture histories, prevailed in the 5th century. No images of God or representations of the Holy Trinity were tolerated in churches till after the second Nicene council. Pictures of Scripture scenes were hung on the walls of churches at first to aid those who could not read. The idolatrous devotion with Which the Papists bow down before the images and paintings of the dead is a consequence of this practice. SEE IMAGE-WORSHIP.

Besides, the pictures are used by the Romanists for working upon the superstitious belief of the masses. Thus Seymour tells us the following in: his Pilgrinmage: "There is scarcely an incidenlt in the life of our Lord that has not its rival incident or parallel in the legendary life of Mary. For example, a picture represents an angel announcing to Mary the miraculous conception of the Messiah; it is rivalled by another representing an angel alnnouncing to Anna, the legendary mother of Mary, the miraculous and immaculate conception of Mary in the womb. A picture represents the birth of our Lord; it is paralleled by another representing the nativity or birth of the Virgin Mary. If there is one representing our Lord sitting on the throne and bearing the crown as King of kings, there is a rival picture representing Mary sitting oil the same throne, bearing the sceptre, and wearing the crown as Queen of heaven. There are two classes of miraculous pictures. One class comprehends those which are said to have had a miraculous origin; that is, to have been painted in part or in whole by no human hands, lbut by an angel, or some mysterious visitant from the world of spirits. The second class of miraculous pictures is far more numerous, and comprehends all those which have performed miracles. At the church of St. Giovanni e Paolo, near Rome, is a small picture of the Virgin Mary, which  is said to have shed tears on the French invasion of Italy. At Arezzo we were shown a picture in the cathedral church, which wept many tears at the language of some drunkards. It was a Madonna, and the bishop made it the means of collecting sufficient flunds to build a new chapel to commemorate it. In the church of St. Pietro Ale Montorio is a singularly ugly representation of Mary and our Lord. Indeed, it is positively hideous; but an inscription on a marble slab announces that 'this sacred likeness of the mother of God, holding her son and a book, is illustrious for miracles more and more every day.' In St. Peter's, however is a very important one, not only for the miracle, but for its authentication. It is in the subterranean chapel, usually called the Grotto. It is a picture of the Virgin with a mark under the left eye, and the following is the inscription: 'This picture of the Most Holy Virgin Mary, which stood between the pillars of the porch of the ancient Basilica, having been struck by an impious hand, poured forth blood (sanguinem fudit) on the stone, which is now protected by a grating.' On one side is a large stone, on the other are two small stones. All three are covered with a strong iron grating, to preserve them, as on them the blood of this miraculous picture is said to have fallen." See Riddle, Christian Antiquities; Coleman, Christian Antiquities.

## Piderit, Johann Rudolph Anton[[@Headword:Piderit, Johann Rudolph Anton]]

             a Lutheran theologian of Germany, was born August 18, 1720, at Pyrmont. He studied at Jena and Marburg, and commenced his academical career at the latter place in 1746. In 1747 he was professor of philosophy, in 1759 doctor of theology, in 1766 professor of Oriental languages at "Collegiumn Carolinum" in Cassel, and died, after having experienced in a high degree the "odium theologicurn," August 2, 1791. He published, De Voluntate, Decreto et Bonitate Dei (Jena, 1738): — Diss. Inauguralis de Agelis (1746): — De Characteribus Antichristi (1750): — Diss. viii de Erroribus Theologorum Loqicis circa Sacram Scripturam (Marburg, 1752): — Observationes in Psalms 90 (1758): — Beitrage zur Vertheidigung und Erlauterung des Kanons der heiligen Schrift (1775), etc. See Doring, Die gelehrten Theologen Deutschlands, s.v.; Furst, Bibl. Jud. 3:99. (B.P.)

## Pie[[@Headword:Pie]]

             is a table or rule which was used in the old Roman offices previous to the Reformation, showing in a technical way how to find out the service which is to be read upon each day, and corresponds to what the Greeks called πίναξ, or the index (literally a plank, by metonymy a painted table or picture); and because indexes or tables of books were formed into square figures resembling pictures or painters' tables hung up in a frame, these likewise were called πίνακες, or, being marked only with the first letters of the word, πἰ, or pies. Pie is the familiar English name for the Romish pica (ordinal, or service-book), which perhaps cam'e from the ignorance of the friars, who have thrust in many barbarous words into the liturgies. Some say that the word pye is derived from littera picata, a great black letter in the beginning of some new order in the prayer, and among printers that term is still used, the pica type. See Procter. Book of Common Prayer; Eadie, Eccles. Cyclop. s.v

## Pie, Louis Francois Desire Edouard[[@Headword:Pie, Louis Francois Desire Edouard]]

             a French prelate, was born at Pontgouin (Eure-et-Loir) in 1815. For some time vicar-general of Chartres, he was appointed in 1849 bishop of Poitiers, and made himself conspicuous by his zeal in defending the temporal power of the pope. He opposed the imperial government in a series of pastoral letters, and assembled, in January 1868, a provincial council at Poitiers to discuss the religious interests of his diocese and of France. From the very beginning of the ecumenical council in 1870 he was one of the most ardent defenders of papal infallibility. Pie was made cardinal in 1879, and died at Angouleme in 1880. He published, Instruction Synodale sur les Erreurs de lat Philosophie Moderne (1855): — Instruction sur les Principales Erreurs des Temps Present (1854): — Discours Prononce a l'Occasions du Service Solennel pour les Solduts de l'Armae Pontificale (1860). See Trolley de Prevaue, Le Cardinal Pie et ses OEuvres (Paris, 1882); Lichtenberger, l'Encyclop. des Sciences Religieusess, s.v. (B.P.)

## Piece Of Gold[[@Headword:Piece Of Gold]]

             The A.V., in rendering the elliptical expression "six thousand of gold," in a passage respecting Naaman, relating that he "took with him ten talents of silver, and six thousand of gold, and ten changes of raiment" (2Ki 5:5), supplies "pieces" as the word understood. The similar passage respecting silver in which the word understood appears to be shekels, probably justifies the insertion of that.definite word. SEE PIECE OF SILVER.

The same expression, if a weight of gold be here meant, is also found in the following passage: "And king Solomon made two hundred targets [of] beaten gold: six hundred of gold went to one target" (1Ki 10:16). Here the A.V. supplies the word "shekels," and there seems no doubt that it is right, considering the number mentioned, and that a common weight must be intended. That a weight of gold is meant in Naaman's case may be inferred, because it is extremely unlikely that coined money was already invented at the time referred to, or indeed that it was known in Palestine before the Persian period. SEE DARIC; SEE MONEY.

Rings or ingots of gold may have been in use, but we are scarcely warranted in'supposing that any of them bore the name of shekels, since the practice was to weigh money. The rendering "pieces of gold" is therefore very doubtful; and "shekels of gold" as designating the value of the whole quantity, not individual pieces, is preferable. SEE GOLD

.

## Piece Of Money[[@Headword:Piece Of Money]]

             SEE KESITAH; SEE STATER.

## Piece Of Silver[[@Headword:Piece Of Silver]]

             The passages in the O.T. and those in the N.T. in which the A.V. uses this term must be separately considered. SEE MONEY.

I. In the O.T. the word "pieces" is used in the A.V. for a word understood in the Hebrew, if we except one or two cases to be afterwards noticed. The phrase is always "a thousand" or the like "of silver" (Gen 20:16; Gen 37:28; Gen 45:22; Jdg 9:4; Jdg 16:5; 2Ki 6:25; Hos 3:2; Zec 11:12-13). In similar passages the word "shekels" occurs in the Hebrew, and it must be observed that these are either in the law, or relate to purchases, some of an important legal character, as that of the cave and field of Machpelah, that of the threshing-floor and oxen of Araunah, or to taxes, and the like (Gen 23:15-16; Exo 21:32;  Lev 27:3; Lev 27:6; Lev 27:16; Jos 7:21; 2Sa 24:24; 1Ch 21:25, where, however, shekels of gold are spoken of; 2Ki 15:20; Neh 5:15; Jer 32:9). There are other passages in which the A.V. supplies the word "shekels" instead of "pieces" (Deu 22:19; Deu 22:29; Jdg 17:2-4; Jdg 17:10; 2Sa 18:11-12), and of these the first two require this to be done. It becomes then a question whether there is any ground for the adoption of the word "pieces," which is vague if actual coins be meant, and inaccurate if weights. The shekel. be it remembered, was the common weight for money, and therefore most likely to be understood in an elliptical phrase. When we find good reason for concluding that in two passages (Deu 22:19-20) this is the word understood, it seems incredible that any other should be in the other places. SEE SHEKEL.

One of the exceptional cases in which a word corresponding to "pieces" is found in the Hebrew is in the Psalms, where presents of submission are prophesied to be made of "pieces of silver," [ רִצֵּיאּכֶסֶ (68:30, Hebrews 31). The word רִוֹ; which occurs nowhere else, if it preserve its radical meaning, from רָצִוֹ, must signify a piece broken off, or a fragment: there is no reason to suppose that a coin is meant. — Smith. Another exceptional passage is 1Sa 2:26, where the Heb. word rendered "piece [of silver]" is אֲצוֹרָהagodah, which seems to signify a small piece of money, as wages, from the idea of collecting (root אגרto gather). SEE SILVER. For the "pieces of silver" in Jos 24:32, SEE KESITAH.

II. In the N.T. two words are rendered by the phrase "piece of silver," drachma, δραχμή, and ἀργύριον.

(1.) The first (Luk 15:8-9) should be represented by drachm. It was a Greek silver coin, equivalent, at the time of Luke, to the Roman denarius, which is probably intended-by the evangelist, as it had then wholly or almost superseded the former. SEE DRACHMA.

(2.) The second word is very properly thus rendered. It occurs in the account of the betrayal of our Lord for "thirty pieces of silver" (Mat 26:15; Mat 27:8; Mat 27:5-6; Mat 27:9). It is difficult to ascertain what coins are here intended. If the most common silver pieces be meant, they would be denarii. The parallel passage in Zec 11:12-13 must, however, be taken into consideration, where, if our view be correct, shekels must be  understood. It may, however, be suggested that the two thirties may correspond, not as of exactly the same coin, but of the chief current coin. Some light may be thrown on our difficulty by the number of pieces. It can scarcely be a coincidence that thirty shekels of silver was the price of blood in the case of a slave accidentally killed (Exo 21:32). It may be objected that there is no reason to suppose that shekels were current in our Lord's time; but it must be replied that the tetradrachms of depreciated Attic weight of the Greek cities of Syria of that time were of the same weight as the shekels which we believe to be of Simon the Maccabee, SEE MONEY, so that Josephus speaks of the shekel as equal to four Attic drachmae (Ant. 3:8, 2). These tetradrachms were common at the time of our Lord, and the piece of money found by Peter in the fish must, from its name, have been of this kind. SEE STATER. It is therefore more probable that the thirty pieces of silver were tetradrachms than that they were denarii. There is no difficulty in the use of two terms, a name designating the denomination and "piece of silver," whether the latter mean the tetradrachm or the denarius, as it is a vague appellation that implies a more distinctive name. In the received text of Matthew the prophecy as to the thirty pieces of silver is ascribed to Jeremiah, and not to Zechariah, and much controversv hlas thus been occasioned. The true explalnation seems to be suggested by the absence of any prophet's name in the Syriac version, and the likelihood that similarity of style would have caused a copyist ilamdvertently to insert the name of Jeremiah instead of that of Zechariah. SEE SILVERLING.

## Piedler, Caspar[[@Headword:Piedler, Caspar]]

             a Lutheran theologian, was born at Rochlitz, in Bohemia, October 20, 1649, and died there, May 15, 1719. He was an ascetic writer. See Heynen, Beschreibung von Rochlitz; Jocher, Allgemeines Gelehrten- Lexikon, s.v. (B.P.)

## Piedmontese Version Of The Scriptures[[@Headword:Piedmontese Version Of The Scriptures]]

             As early as 1831 a translation of the New Test., faithfully rendered from Martin's French version into modern Piedmontese, was forwarded to the British and Foreign Bible Society by lieutenant-colonel Beckwith. The translation was made by Mr. Berte, pastor of La Tour, and Mr. Gegmet of Lausanne. An edition was completed at press in 1834, but in 1840 the New Test. was put on the index of forbidden books at Rome. In 1837 the British  and Foreign Bible Society issued the gospels in parallel columns with the French text, and in 1841 the Piedmontese version of the Psalms, executed from Diodati's Italian version, was published. This edition had also, in parallel columns, the Italian text. Of late, however, things have changed for the better, and the British and Foreign Bible Society now freely circulates the Piedmontese New Test., the Psalms with the Italian text, and the gospels with the French, in parallel columns. See Bible of Every Land, page 286. (B.P.)

## Pierce, Edward[[@Headword:Pierce, Edward]]

             an English painter who flourished in the reigns of Charles I and II, was eminent both in history and landscapes. He also drew architecture, perspective, etc., and was much esteemed in his time. But there is little of his work now remaining, the far greater part being destroyed in the fire of London, 1666. It chiefly consisted of altar-pieces, ceilings of churches, and the like; of these there is one yet remaining, done by him, in Covent Garden Church, where are to be found many admirable parts of a good pencil. He worked some time for Vandyck, and several good pieces by Pierce are to be seen at Belvoir Castle, in Leicestershire. He died in London about the close of the 17th century.

## Pierce, George Edmond, D.D[[@Headword:Pierce, George Edmond, D.D]]

             an American Congregational divine, noted especially as an educator, was born at Southbury, Conn., September 9, 1794. He was educated at Yale College, class of 1816; then studied theology at Andover Theological Seminary, class of 1821, teaching at the same time at the Fairfield Academy. In July 1822, he was ordained pastor of the Congregational Church at Harwinton, where he remained until called to the presidency of the Western Reserve College in 1834. He remained at the head of this high school until 1855, and gave to ft an excellent reputation. He died at Hudson, Ohio, May 27, 1871.

## Pierce, George Poster, D.D[[@Headword:Pierce, George Poster, D.D]]

             a bishop of the Methodist Episcopal Church South, son of Dr. Lovick Pierce, was born in Greene County, Georgia, February 3, 1811. He graduated from Franklin College, Athens, began to study law, but was soon after converted, and in 1831 was received into the Georgia Conference, in which he filled important appointments until his election as president of the Georgia Female College at Macon in 1840. He was a member of the memorable General Conference of 1844. Having returned to the pastoral work, he was called in 1848 to the presidency of Emory College, and in 1854 to the episcopacy, an office which he filled with. eminent ability until his death, September 3, 1884. He was a laborious pastor, an eloquent preacher, and a most upright Christian. See Minutes of Annual Conferences of the M.E. Church South, 1885, page 152: Simpson, Cyclop. of Methodism, s.v.

## Pierce, Gershorm[[@Headword:Pierce, Gershorm]]

             a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born in the closing quarter of the last century. He was converted about 1800, and called of God to the work of the sacred ministry joined the Methodist Episcopal Church, and entered in 1803 the New York Conference. His first appointment was at Plattsburgh. In 1804 he preached at Fletcher; 1805, Niagara; 1806, Oswegatchie; 1807. Dunham; 1808, Saratoga; 1809-10, Granville; 1811, Thurman; 1812, Grand Isle; 1813-14, Cambridge; 1815- 16, Montgomery; 1817-18, Sharon; 1819, Albany; 1820, Coevmans; 1821- 22, Chatham; 1823-24, Granville; 1825-26, Pittsfield; 1827, Burlington; 1828-29, Redding; 1830-31, Hempstead and Huntington. At the Conference of 1832 he became superannuated, and continued in that relation to the period of his death. Mr. Pierce was a man of much more than ordinary ability. His intellect, in force and habit is best described by the expression "long-headed." He was a devout manm at times a most powerful preacher. His sermons, weighty with thought, fervid with feeling, and in power of the Holy Spirit, made a deep and abiding impression. He died in much peace at Milan, Ohio, March 23, 1865. See Smith, Sacred Memories, page 288 sq.

## Pierce, James Edwin[[@Headword:Pierce, James Edwin]]

             an American divine of, note, was born at West Townsend, Vermont in 1839. He graduated at Middlebury College in 1861, and at Au.burn Theological Seminary in 1865. On his graduation he was elected to a professorship (of the Hebrew language and literature) in the last-named institution, which position he retained till his death (at Auburn, July 13,  1870). He was a close student, a thorough and able teacher, and an impressive and popular preacher. — Appleton's Amer. Cyclop. 10:570.

## Pierce, John J[[@Headword:Pierce, John J]]

             a Presbyterian minister,was born in Vermont in 1791. He secured his early education principally by his own exertions; graduated at Princeton College in 1820, and at the theological seminary in the same place in 1823. He was licensed by the New Brunswick Presbytery, and began preaching at Portsmouth, Virgina, where he remained until 1824, when he left for Clarksville, Tennessee. In 1825 he was elected president of an academy in Ellkton, Kentucky, which position he held until 1837. Soon after he occupied temporarily the place of one of the professors in Centre College, Danville, Kentucky; then returned again to Elkton; but subsequently left, and spent two years in teaching in Illinois and Missouri. On his return he took charge of Ridgewood Church, Kentucky, where he continued to labor until his death, March 18, 1861. Mr. Pierce was a purehearted, simple-  minded man; never attaining any very eminent success in the ministry, but ever contented and happy. See Wilson, Presb. Hist. Almanac, 1862, page 116. (J.L.S.)

## Pierce, John, D.D[[@Headword:Pierce, John, D.D]]

             a noted American Congregational minister, was born at Dorchester, Mass., July 14, 1773. He was educated at Harvard University, class of 1793, and then became a tutor, in his alma mater. Descended of very humble parentage, he had made his way to college by his own exertions, and maintained his position by the force of his own industry feeling persuaded that his work was that of the Christian ministry, he took up the study of tleology, and March 15, 1797, was ordained over the First Congregational Church, Brookline, Massachusetts, of which he was sole pastor for half a century. He died in this place August 24, 1849, respected by all who knew him, and greatly mourned by the ecclesiastic body to which he belonged. Dr. Pierce was member of the Academy of Arts and Sciences, and of the Massachusetts Historical Society. For several years he was president of the Massachusetts Bible Society. In all matters appertaining to family and literary statistics he was a prodigy. He had 18 quarto volumes of 600 pages each, of his own MS., containing memoirs and memorabilia. He published Half-century Discourse at Brookline (March 1847): — Sketch of Brookline, in "Mass. Hist. Collections," 2d sermon volume 2: — Sernmon at Ordination of S. Clark (1817): — Dudleian Leet. (1821); also occasional Sermons, etc. See Sprague, Annals of the Amer. Pulpit, 8:331; Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors, s.v. (J.H.W.)

## Pierce, Lovick, D.D[[@Headword:Pierce, Lovick, D.D]]

             a distinguished minister in the Methodist Episcopal Church South, was born in Halifax County, N.C., March 24, 1785. In early childhood he removed with his parents to South Carolina; in 1803 was converted; in 1804 began to preach; and January 1, 1805, entered the South Carolina Conference. In it he served Pedee Circuit; Apalachee Circuit, Georgia; in 1807 Augusta Station; in 1809 was made presiding elder; in 1812, while stationed at Milledgeville, he was drafted to serve as a soldier, but was soon commissioned as chaplain, in which capacity he acted during the war; about that time he studied medicine, and, retiring from the conference, followed its practice for about six years. In 1823 he re-entered the effective ranks, and was stationed at Augusta. From that time he filled the chief appointments. He was a member of the first General Conference, which met in 1812, and was always elected to represent his conference in the  General Conferences. He read much and wrote a great deal; was always ready, clear, cogent, coherent, and powerful. He died at the residence of his son, bishop Pierce, in Sparta, Georgia, November 11, 1879. See Minutes of Annual Conferences of the M.E. Church South, 1879, page 88; Simpson, Cyclop. of Methodism, s.v.

## Pierce, Thomas A[[@Headword:Pierce, Thomas A]]

             a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, was born in Fauquier County, Virginia, October 25, 1819; was converted at the age of twenty; aild feeling called of God to the work of the sacred ministry, joined the Virginia Conference at Charlottesville in the fall of 1847, and was appointed to the Stafford Circuit. In 1848 he was sent to Rappahannock and Culpepper; in 1849 he, went to King William, where he travelled two  years; in 1852 and 1853 he labored on the James City and :ew Kent Circuit; in 1854, in King George; 1855, in New Hampshire; 1856 and 1857, in Hanover. In 1858 he was again in King William; in 1859 he was sent to Greensville; in 1860 and 1861 he had his pastoral charge in Mecklenburg; in 1862 and 1863. in Campbell; 1864 and 1865, in Appomattox. In all of these appointments he labored like a man of God, and was instrumental in doing much good. Failing health obliged him in 1866 to take a superannuated relation. He died February 26. 1867. See Minutes of Ann. Cona: of the M.E. Church. South, 1868.

## Pierce, Thomas, D.D[[@Headword:Pierce, Thomas, D.D]]

             an Elnglish divine of riite, flourished near the middle of the 17th Cedturv. He was educated at Magdalen College, Oxford, and after graduation was presented with a fellowship. In 1648 he was ejected for nonconformity, but was restored under the Protectorate, and became prebend of Canterbury and Lincoln; in 1661 president of Magdalen College; in 1671 dean of Salisbury. He died in 1691. Dean Pierce was a man of more than ordinary talent and acquisition. In theology he was decidedly Arminialn, and published a number of occasional sermolns. theolot ical treatises, and controversial tracts. Among these we mention, The Sinner Impleaded in his own Court, wherein are represented the Great Discouragements from Sinning which the Sinner receiveth from Sin itself (Lond. 1656, 8vo): — The Divine Philanthropie defended against the Declamatory Attempts of certain late printed Papers, entitled, A Correptory Correction. In Vindication of some Notes concerning God's Decrees, especially of Reprobation [against Barlee] (Lond. 1657, 4to): — A Collection of Sermons upon Several Occasions (Oxf. 1671, 4to): — A Correct Copy of some Notes concerning God's Decrees, especially of Reprobation (Oxf. 1671, 4to): — Pacificatorium Orthodoxae Theologiae Corpusculum. Secundae huic editioni accesserunt, De perfectissimo Dei cultu ad normam divinam exigendo [Anon.] (Lond. 1685, sm. 8vo). Dean Pierce also greatly assisted bishop Walton in the publication of the Polyglot Bible. He was the decided antagonist of Baxter, and, according to Watson, "compelled that great controversialist to quail before him" (Works, 1:469). See Wood, Athenae Oxonienses; Lowndes, Brit. Librarian, p. 1080; Watts, Bibl. Brit. s.v. (J.H.W.)

## Pieri, Stefano[[@Headword:Pieri, Stefano]]

             a Florentine painter, born in 1513, and a pupil of Battista Naldini. He passed much of lis life at Rome, where he was patronized by cardinal Alessandro Medici, by whom he was employed in the church oof S. Prassede, where he painted the Annunciation and some pictures of the apostles. He executed other works for the churches at Rome and Florence, in which latter city he assisted Vasari in the cupola of S. Maria del Fiore. Lanzi says one of his best works is the Sacrifice of Isaac, in the Palazzo Pitti. Another fine picture is the Assumption of the Virgin, in the church of S. Maria in Via. at Rome. His works are well designed, but Baglioni censures them as being dry and hard. He died at Rome in the year 1600.

## Pieritz, Joseph Abraham[[@Headword:Pieritz, Joseph Abraham]]

             a noted Anglican divine, was born of Jewish parentage in the year 1815 at Kletzko, in Prussia. At the age of twenty-three Pieritz became a Christian by being baptized at London. Four years later "the London Society for Propagating the Gospel among the Jews" appointed him a missionary among his brethren, and for about eight years he faithfully discharged his duty in that relation, residing in different places in the west of England. In the year 1851 he accepted an appointment to a pastoral charge in British Guiana. For about twenty years he labored as rector of the parish of St. Patrick, in the town of New Amsterdam, in the colony of British Guiana, where he died, October 16, 1870. See Jewish Intelligencer (London), 1838, page 292; 1870, page 20; Report of the London Society, 1851, page 34; Kalka, Israel und die Kirche, page 172. (B.P.)

## Pierius[[@Headword:Pierius]]

             surnamed the younger Origen, a disciple of Origen, was distinguished in the Church of the 3d century as a scholar and author of high reiute. We know nothing of his personal history, and his writings are no longer extant, or at least are inaccessible.

## Pierius, Urban[[@Headword:Pierius, Urban]]

             (originally Birnbaunm), a Protestant theologian of Germany, was born at Schwedt, Pomerania, in 1546. He studied law and theology, was for some time doctor and professor of theology at Frankfort, afterwards pastor at Brandenburg, and superintendent at Custrin. In 1589 he was appointed superintendent at Dresden, aid in the same year professor of theology and general superintendent at Wittenberg. In 1591 he was dismissed as Crypto- Calvinist, and imprisoned, but was finally released at the intercession of queen Elizabeth of England. Pierius then went to Bremen, and died May 12, 1616, superintendent. He wrote, Typus Doctrinae Orthodoxae de Persona et Officio Christi: — Examen und erlauterung der in der Leichenpredigt Nic. Crell's furgebrachten neuen Religions-Streitigkeiten: — Apologia und Verantwortung des uber Nicol. Crell nach gehultener Leichenprmedigt angestellten Examinis. See Winer, Handbuch der theol. Lit. 1:759; Jocher, Allgemeines Gelehrten-Lexikon, s.v. (B.P.)

## Pierpont, Hezekiah B[[@Headword:Pierpont, Hezekiah B]]

             an American Presbyterian minister, was a native of Connecticut, and was born about 1791. In 1821 he came to New York state and settled at Rochester, and soon after was ordained a Presbyterian minister. He became the pastor of a Church in Hopewell, Ontario County, for several years. He was then called to the pastorate at Avon, and there he lived until about 1861, when he moved to Rochester, N.Y., where he died in 1871, beloved by all his acquaintances for his many social and genial qualities. Indeed, none knew him but to honor him, both as a Christian and as a gentleman. "He lived a long life of usefulness as a pastor of the Presbyterian Church, and died full of years, in the blessed consciousness of a blameless life as an honored servant of God's ministry."

## Pierpont, James[[@Headword:Pierpont, James]]

             a noted New England Congregational minister of colonial days, was born at Roxbur, Connecticut, in 1661. He was educated at Harvard College, where he graduated in 1681; was ordained fourth minister in New Haven, Connecticut, in 1685, and retained that connection until his death in 1714. In the year 1698 Mr. Pierpont was one of three ministers who concerted the plan of founding a college — a plan which took effect in the establishment of Yale College in 1700. As one of the original trustees of the institution he was untiringly active; and it was through his influence, in no small degree, that the distinguished individual from whom it received its name was induced to make it the object of his liberal benefactions. Dwight, in his life of Edwards, states that Mr. Pierpont read lectures to the students in Yale College as professor of moral philosophy. This, however, Dr. Bacon considers doubtful, as the college was not removed from Saybrook till after Mr. Pierpont's death. Of the famous synod held at Saybrook in 1708, for the purpose of forming a system that should better secure the ends of Church discipline and the benefits of communion among the churches, Mr. Pierpont was a prominent member. The "Articles" which  were adopted as the result of the synod, and which constitute the well- known "Saybrook Platform," are said to have been drawn up by him. The only publication of Mr. Pierpont was a sermon preached at Boston, in Cotton Mather's pulpit in 1712, entitled Sundry false Hopes of Heaven discovered and decryed. Mather introduces the sermon with a short preface, in which he says of the author, “He has been a rich blessing to the Church of God." New Haven values him, all Connecticut honors him — they have cause to do so. Dr. Bacon writes thus concerning him:

"That we are not able to form so lively an idea of him as of Davenport is partly because his life was shorter, and was less involved in scenes of conflict, and partly, no doubt, because his nature and the early discipline of Divine Providence had less fitted him to make himself conspicuons by the originality and energy of his character and to leave his image stamped with ineffaceable distinctness on the records of his times. In the pulpit Mr. Pierpont was distinguished among his contemporaries. His personal appearance was altogether prepossessing. He was eminent in the gift of prayer. His doctrine was sound and discriminating, alnd his style was clear, lively, and impressive, without anything of the affected qnaintness which characterized some of the most eminent men of that day."

See Sprague, Annals of the American Pulpit, 1:205, 206; Bacon, Historical Discourses, page 171 sq.; id. Genesis of the New England Churches. (J.H.W.)

## Pierpont, John[[@Headword:Pierpont, John]]

             an eminent American Unitarian divine, noted especially for his part in temperance and antislavery movements, was born in 1785 at Litchfield, Conn., and graduated at Yale College in 1804. The years immediately after his leaving college were occupied in teaching, a part of the time at the South aid afterwards in New England, and he then studied law and settled at Newburyport. The war of 1812 interfered with his professional prospects, and he forsook the law for business, but met with indifferent success both at Boston and Baltimore, and in 1818 he entered the Cambridge Divinity School. Less than a year after this time he was installed as pastor of the Hollis Street Unitarian Church at Boston, succeeding the Reverend Dr. Holley, and for twenty-five years he held the pastorate of that church. At first he was successful, popular, and strongly beloved by his people, but the latter part of his ministry was clouded with troubles and  dissensions between himself and prominent men of his society on the temperance question, which were never amicably adjusted. While settled at Boston he visited Europe and Palestine. In 1845 he became the first pastor of the Unitarian Church at Troy, N.Y. After a four years' pastorate there he received a call to Medford, where was his last ministerial experience. After this he identified himself with the Spiritualists, having become an enthusiastic believer in animal magnetism. The breaking out of the rebellion found Mr. Pierpont at his home in Medford, but the wear and tear of over seventyfive years of life had not been sufficient to keep him quietly at his fireside while parishioners and friends were hastening to the front to uphold the government which he loved and honored. He sought a post of duty at once, and governor Andrew yielded to his request, and appointed him chaplain of the Twenty-second Regiment. The exposure of camp-life and duties on the field proved beyond his strength, and he was soon compelled to resign his place, much to his regret. Secretary Chase then appointed him to a clerkship in the treasury department, and his clerical duties were always faithfully performed, and he proved a valuable and efficient officer. He died in 1866, while yet in the employ of the government. Mr. Pierpont was a thorough scholar, a graceful and facile speaker, a poet of rare power and pathos, a most earnest advocate of the temperance and antislavery movements, and a man whose convictions, purposes, and impulses were always sincerely expressed. His strong desire for securing advancement and reform may have led him sometimes into injudicious steps, and diminished his influence for the causes he sought to advance, but his heart was always right; and temperance, freedom, and Christianity had no firmer and more consistent friend or advocate. He leaves an enviable reputation as a poet, and his pathetic "Passing Away" will live as long as our language is spoken or written. In addition to his poetical works, he published at Boston several popular school-readers, and some twenty occasional sermons and discourses. See Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors, s.v.; Christian Examiner, November 1866, art. 5; Atltantic Monthly, December 1866; Appleton's Annual Cyclopaedia, 1866, page 617. (J.H.W.)

## Pierquin, Jean[[@Headword:Pierquin, Jean]]

             a French ecclesiastic, noted especially as a writer, was born February 15, 1672, at Charleville. After taking holy orders, he was in 1699 appointed curate of Chatel, in the Ardennes, where he spent his whole life, dividing  his time between works of charity and literary pursuits. He died March 10, 1742. He published, Vie de St. Tuvin, [erlmite (Nancy, 1732, 8vo): — Dissertations physico-theologiques sur la Conception de Jesus dans le Sein de la Vierge Manie, sanmere (Paris, 1742, 12mo), in which work he gives some physical account of the manner in which the divine act of generation took place, etc. — Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, 40:128.

## Pierre, Jean Baptiste Maria[[@Headword:Pierre, Jean Baptiste Maria]]

             a French painter, was born at Paris in 1715. It is not known by whom he was instructed; but he went, when quite young, to Rome, where he remained several years. On his return to Paris he distinguished himself as a historical painter; and executed several works for the churches and public edifices, which gained him great reputation. He was appointed painter to the king, and elected member of the academy at Paris. One of his greatest works was the ceiling of the chapel of the Virgin, in the church of St. Sulpice, which has been engraved by Nicholas Dupuis. He also etched a few plates from his own designs and those of others. He died in 1789.

## Pierre, Jean Henri Grand, D.D[[@Headword:Pierre, Jean Henri Grand, D.D]]

             a minister of the National Reformed Church of France, was born at Neufchftel, Switzerland, towards the close of the last century. He was educated at Neufchatel and at the University of Tubingen, Germany; was called to be an assistant pastor with Vinet at Basle, in 1823, where his piety, zeal, and eloquence were the means of an extensive revival of religion. In 1827 he was called to Paris to take charge of the House of Missions, virtually a theological seminary, in which Dr. Pierre also acted as professor of theology and languages, being a fine classical and Hebrew scholar, as well as an able theologian, ready writer, and eloquent preacher. He was eventually called to L'Oratoire, the great Protestant Church of Paris, where he remained for twenty years. While Vinet was compared to Pascal, and Adolph Monod to Saurin, Dr. Grand Pierre was called the Bourdaloue of the revival. He visited America in 1870 in order to attend the Evangelical Alliance. He died near Basle, Switzerland, July 10, 1874. Dr. Pierre published a considerable number of works, commentaries,  sermons, etc., which had a wide circulation. His last production was a volume of sermons dedicated to his former parishioners. For many years he was editor of L'Esperance, the principal religious paper of the orthodox Protestants of France. See (N.Y.) Presbyterian, August 8, 1874. (W.P.S.)

## Pierre, ST[[@Headword:Pierre, ST]]

             SEE PETER.

## Pierson, Abraham[[@Headword:Pierson, Abraham]]

             an American Congregational divine and educator was born at Lynn, Massachusetts, in 1641. Abraham, his father, first minister of Southampton, Long Island, (born in Yorkshire, England, in 1608, died August 9, 1678), was one of the first settlers of Newark in 1677, and was the first minister of that town. He preached to the Indians of Long Island in their own language, and contributed Some Helps for the Indians in New Haven Colony to a further Account of the Progress of the Gospel in New Ensgland (1659). His son, Abraham, Jun., was educated at Harvard University, where he graduated in, 1668. After studying theology, he was ordained colleague with his father at Newark, N.J., March 4, 1672, and was minister at Killingworth, Connecticut, from 1694 until his death, March 5, 1707. Mr. Pierson was identified with the founding of Yale College, was anxiously desired for its first principal, and did instruct for a time at Killingworth, though he never moved to Saybrook, where the commencements of Yale were held in its earliest days, because his parishioners would not suffer him to leave them. He was taken ill in the  midst of the agitation regarding his college duties, and died before he could settle the case. President Clapp, in his History of Yale College, says of rector Pierson that he was "a hard student, a good scholar, a great divine, and a wise, steady, and judicious gentleman in all his conduct." See Sprague, Annals of the Amer. Pulpit, 1:116 sq.; Bacoin, Genesis of the New England Churches. (J.H.W.)

## Pietism[[@Headword:Pietism]]

             is the specific appellation of a phase of religious thought which developed itself especially within the pale of the German Lutheran Church in the 18th century. Like English Methodism, it originated in a period of indifference to religion, and, like it also, aimed to supersede dead faith, knowledge without life, form without spirit, worldliness under the cloak of religion by life — a spiritual and living faith. Like Methodism, it laid great stress on the necessity of the new birth; it prohibited certain amusements and modes of life until then considered as at least harmless; and it encouraged private assemblies of Christian persons for purposes of edification, such as the study of the Scriptures or the interchange of spiritual experiences. Like Methodism, too, it encountered at first no little ridicule, and even persecution. It was accused of being an attempt to found a new sect, and was vehemently opposed on this ground; but, unlike Methodism, tholugh it did here and there give rise to some insignificant bodies of separatists, it never broke off.from the national Church of the country, but remained as a movement within its pale.

The development of German Lutheranism, which really means German Protestantism, repeats in a most peculiar mranner the course of the general Church previous to it. As in the first four centuries the productive spirit of  the Church proposed to itself the view of Christianity as a whole, so also was the time from the beginning of the Reformation to the Augsburg Confession (q.v.) one pre-eminently creative, and it laid the foundation of the Lutheran Church as regards its confession of faith. With the endeavor pervading the 5th, 6th, and 7th centuries more distinctly to work out the single doctrines corresponds the work of the Lutheran Church up to the time of the Fornula Concordice (q.v.), by which the various differences of doctrines were to be settled. As the Church of the Middle Ages had handed down to it, as a firm foundation, the doctrinal matter produced by the fathers and sanctioned by the Church, which scholasticism then undertook to work out and digest in a systematic manner, so there arose in the 17th century — the Protestant Middle Ages — a scholasticism which put into a regular form the Lutheran confession of faith embodied in the Formula Concordiae. As in the Middle Ages,mysticisma stands side by side with the strict representatives of scholasticism, bo the Protestant mystics, Jacob Bihme (q.v.), Arndt, and others, stand by the side of an effete orthodoxy. This mystical tendency acquired an importance about the end of the 17th and the beginning of the 18th centuries. A parallel again between tliis period and that of the 14th century is obvious. In the 14th century the romantic spirit had become extinct; scholasticism had outdone itself; from France there flowed over Europe a worldly spirit; the Roman spirit had decayed; everything was in dissolution. Then from the reaction against the externalized scholasticism and secularized life there broke forth on all sides and in the most varied forms mysticism, which had in itself a Reformatory feature. In like manner after the Thirty-years' War the blossom of Germany had withered; the religious spirit, which since the period of the Reformation had been the first power in Germany, had stepped into the background; while, on the other hand, the secular spirit had been let loose, along with a powerful retinue of immorality, especially by the preponderance of France under Louis XIV. It was a dreary period in German history.

Politically the empire had fallen asunder into a numler of separate despotic little states; and the sentiment of national unity had become so nearly extinct that the loss of the fertile and beautiful Alsace to France seems to have been viewed with wonderful indifference. Socially the life of the people had greatly deteriorated. The rural population was terribly diminished in numbers and wealth; their means of communication were restricted by the destruction of their horses and the neglect of the roads;  their schools had disappeared, and were but very slowly replaced; their new houses and churches were bare and barn-like compared to the old ones; their periodical gatherings for certain purposes of local self- government or for festivities had fallen into disuse. It was a vegetating sort of existence, and the writers of the following age bear testimony to the illiteracy and coarseness of manners which prevailed towards the end of the 17th century even among the gentry of the country districts. In the towns things were but little better. The commerce of Germany had received a serious check; her merchant-princes had sunk to the level of petty traders, and adopted the manners and culture of the latter class. Her old free cities were decaying; only a few of the newer ones were growing; and what intellectual life then existed centred in them, as at Hamburg or Berlin, or at the court of any sovereign who specially protected letters, or still more at the universities. Throughout this period Germany contributed only one really great name to literature — that of Leibnitz; while in France it was the age of military glory and social brilliancy — of Racine and Moliere, of Fenelon and Bossuet, of Bayle and Voltaire. German men and women therefore found their own life mean and tiresome, and were carried away by admiration of their splendid neighbor, till it became the fashion to imitate whatever was French in manners, dress, or tone of thought, and the very language was wretchedly corrupted by the intermixture of French phrases. Of course there was a class, of which king Frederick William I of Prussia may be taken as the type, who hated foreign ways, and upheld whatever was most antiquated and unrefined as peculiarly German; but in general the tide set in favor of the foreigners. The French were now the great models, and very unfortunate ones for a people whose natural genius was so totally different. German literature reached its lowest ebb under these influences. One of the earliest signs, if not the first sign, of its revival was a rebellion against French classicism, and an admiration for the master writers of English — Shakespeare and Milton.

Religion suffered under the same depression. On the one hand was a rigid Lutheranism which had petrified what had once been living convictions into dead dogmas, and which gave its whole attention to controversies about definitions of doctrines in which.the people had ceased to feel a genuine interest. On the other hand was a genteel indifference which idolized "enlightenment" (the favorite watchword of that period), and indemnified itself for its compliance with certain outward observances by laughing at the whole affair in private. Rabener, a satirist of this period, when  characterizing the earlier part of the 18th century, says: "There was a time in Germany when no satire could be witty at the expense of anything but the Bible, and there were lively heads which had, so to speak, a complete satirical concordance in readiness, that their wit might never run dry. . . . If a groom is conscious of possessing a more cultivated mind than the dairymaid, he startles her by a jest on some text or hymn; all the servants scream with laughter, all admire him down to the very cowboy, and the poor dairymaid, whlio is not so witty, stands there abashed." When the danger seemed imminent that the great work of the Reformation would prove in vain, and that it would soon come to ruin, providential supply and guidance came in the pietistic spirit which arose. Indeed, the learned Dorner holds, with a large number of others, that this new tendency was a necessary stage in the development of Protestantism — a supplement of the Reformation — and that Spener, the father of pietism, was the veritable successor of Melancthon.

But we must first learn what pietism proposed to do before we can properly appreciate its historical importance. Pietism commenced upon the principle that the Church was corrupt; that the ministry were generally guilty of gross neglect; and that the people were cursed with spiritual death. It therefore proposed, as a theological means of improvement:

1. That the scholastic theology, which reigned in the academies, and was composed of intricate and disputable doctrines, and obscure and unusual forms of expression, should be totally abolished.

2. That polemical divinity, which comprehended the controversies subsisting between Christians of different communions, should be less eagerly studied and less frequently treated, though not eitirely neglected.

3. That all mixture of philosophy and human science with divine wisdom was to be most carefully avoided; that is, that pagan philosophy and classical learning should be kept distinct from, and by no means surpersede Biblical theology; but,

4, that, on the contrary, all those students who were designed for the ministry should be accustomed from their early youth to the perusal and study of the Holy Scriptures, and be taught a plain system of theology, drawn from these unerring sources of truth.

5. That the whole course of their education was to be so directed as to render them useful in life, by the practical power of their doctrine and the commanding influence of their example. But it was not intended to confine these reforms to students and the clergy. Religious persons of every class and rank were encouraged to meet in what were called Biblical colleges, or colleges of piety (we might call them prayer-meetings), where some exercised in reading the Scriptures, singing, and prayer, and others engaged in the exposition of the Scriptures; not in a dry and critical way, but in a strain of practical and experimental piety, whereby they were mutually edified. This practice, which always more or less obtains where religion flourishes (as, for instance, at the Reformation), raised the same sort of outcry as at the rise of Methodism; and those who entered not into the spirit of the design were eager to catch at every instance of weakness or imprudence, to bring disgrace on that, which, in fact, brought disgrace upon themselves, as lukewarm and formal Christians. "In so saving, Master, thou reproachest us also."

The person who began this religious movement was John Arndt (1555- 1621), who wrote The True Christian, a work as useful religiously as Bunyan's Pilgrim's Progress or Doddridge's Religion in the Soul. Spener followed (1635-1705). The private religious meetings which he established about 1675, Collegia Pietatis, were the origin of the application of the name pietism to the movement. One of his pupils was the saintly A.H. Francke (q.v.). Paul Gerhard, the well-known author of the German hymns, also belonged to the same party. The revival feeling spread rapidly through Germany, where the institution of the "Collegia," being in complete accord with the national instinct, soon attained great popularity. Up to 1686 pietism had spread without exciting commotion, no persecution having yet been attempted. But when in this year Spener removed to Dresden, and several of his students made bold to lecture at the University of Leipsic, in imitation of their leader's practice, giving in their lectures particular prominence to the correction of the errors contained in Luther's translation of the Bible, the great body of Lutherans, who had been accustomed to regard this translation as little short of inspired, took umbrage at such freedom of criticism, and at the practice of these Pietists who lectured in the popular tongue. All kinds of adverse rumors were circulated, they were maligned in many ways, and complaints were made to the university authorities. When these popular agitations were ignored, there followed tumults of so violent a character as to spread throughout  Leipsic the seeds and principles of mutiny and sedition, and finally the matter was forced to public trial. Of course the pious and learned men above mentioned were, indeed, declared free from the errors and heresies that had been laid to their charge, but were, at the same time, prohibited from carrying on the plan of religious instruction they had undertaken with such zeal. It was during these troubles and divisions that the invidious designation Pietists was first invented; it may at least be affirmed that it was not commonly known before this period. It was at first applied by some giddy and inconsiderate persons to those who frequented the Biblical colleges, and lived in a manner suitable to the instructions and exhortations that were addressed to them in these seminaries of piety.

It was afterwards made use of to characterize all those who were either distinguished by the excessive austerity of their manners, or who, regardless of truth and opinion, were only intent upon practice, and turned the whole vigor of their efforts towards the attainment of religious feelings and habits. But as it is the fate of all those denominations by which peculiar sects are distinguished to be variously and often very improperly applied, so the title "Pietist" was frequently given in common conversation to persons of eminent wisdom and sanctity, who were equally remarkable for their adherence to truth and their love of piety; and not seldom to persons whose motley characters exhibited an enormous mixture of profligacy and enthusiasm, and who deserved the title of delirious fanatics better than any other denomination. This contest was by no means confined to Leipsic, but spread with incredible celerity through all the Lutheran churches in the different states and kingdoms of Europe. For from this time, in all the cities, towns, and villages where Lutheranism was professed, there started up, all of a sudden, persons of various ranks and professions, of both sexes, who declared that they were called by a divine impulse to pull up iniquity by the root; to restore to its primitive lustre and propagate through the world the declining cause of piety and virtue; to govern the Church of Christ by wiser rules than those by which it was at present directed; and who, partly in their writings and partly in their private and public discourses, pointed out the means and measures that were necessary to bring about this important revolution. Several religious societies were formed in various places, which, though they differed in some circumstances, and were not all conducted and composed with equal wisdom, piety, and prudence, were, however, designed to promote the same general purpose. In the mean time these unusual proceedings filled with uneasy and alarming apprehensions both those who were intrusted  with the government of the Church and those who sat at the helm of the state. These apprehensions were justified by this important consideration, that the pious and well-meaning persons who composed these assemblies had indiscreetly admitted into their community a number of extravagant and hot-headed fanatics, who foretold the approaching destruction of Babel (by which they meant the Lutheran Church), terrified the populace with fictitious visions, assumed the authority of prophets honored with a divine commission, obscured the divine truths of religion by a gloomy kind of jargon of their own invention, and revived doctrines that had long before been condemned by the Church. The most violent debates arose in all the Lutheran churches; and persons whose differences were occasioned rather by mere words and questions of little consequence than by any doctrines or institutions of considerable importance, attacked one another with the bitterest animosity; and in many countries severe laws were at length enacted against the Pietists. These revivers of piety proposed to carry on their plan without introducing any change into the doctrine, discipline, or form of government that were established in the Lutheran Church.

At the head of this movement stood, in Germany, the learned and pious Spener, whose sentiments were adopted by the professors of the new Academy of Halle; and particularly by Francke and Paulus Antonius, who had been invited thither from Leipsic, where they began to be suspected of pietism. Though few pretended to treat either with indignation or contempt the intentions and purposes of these good men (which, indeed, none could despise without affecting to appear the enemy of practical religion and virtue), yet many eminent Lutheran divines, and more especially the professors and pastors of Wittenberg, being of opinion that, in the execution of this laudable purpose, several unorthodox maxims were adopted and certain unwarrantable measures employed, proceeded publicly against Spener in the year 1695, and afterwards against his disciples and adherents, as the inventors and promoters of erroneous and dangerous opinions. These debates turned upon a variety of points, and therefore the matter of them cannot be comprehended under any one general head. If we consider them indeed in relation to their origin, and the circumstances that gave rise to them, we may be able to reduce them to some fixed principles. We have already said that those who had the advancement of piety most zealously at heart were possessed of a notion that no order of men contributed more to retard its progress than the clergy, whose peculiar vocation it was to inculcate and promote it. Looking upon this as the root  of the evil, it was but natural that their plans of reformation should begin here; and accordingly they laid it down as an essential principle that none should be admitted into the ministry but such as had received a proper education, were distinguished by their wisdom and sanctity of manners, and had hearts filled with divine love. Hence they proposed, in the first place, a thorough reformation of the schools of divinity; and they explained clearly enough what they meant by this reformation, as we have seen above.

As these maxims were propagated with the greatest industry and zeal, and were explained inadvertently by some without those restrictions which prudence seemed to require, these professed patrons and revivers of piety were suspected of designs that could not but render them obnoxious to censure. They were supposed to despise philosophy and learning; to treat with indifference, and even to renounce, all inquiries into the nature and foundations of religious truths; to disapprove of the zeal and labors of those who defended it against such as either corrupted or opposed it; and to place the whole of their theology in certain vague and incoherent declamations concerning the duties of morality. Hence arose those famous disputes concerning the use of philosophy and the value of human learning, considered in connection with the interests of religion; the dignity and usefulness of systematic theology; the necessity of polemic divinity; the excellence of the mystic system; and also concerning the true method of instructing the people. The second great object that employed the zeal and attention of the persons now under consideration was that the candidates for the ministry should not only for the future receive such an academical education as would tend rather to solid utility than to mere speculation, but also that they should dedicate themselves to God in a peculiar manner, and exhibit the most striking examples of piety and virtue. This maxim, which, when considered in itself, must be considered to be highly laudable, not only gave occasion to several new regulations, designed to restrain the passions of the studious youth, to inspire them with pious sentiments, and to excite in them holy resolutions, but also produced another maxim, which was a lasting source of controversy and debate, viz.: "That no person who was not himself a model of piety and divine love was qualified to be a public teacher of piety, or a guide to others in the way of salvation." This opinion was considered by many as derogatory to the power and efficacy of the Word of God, which cannot be deprived of its divine influence by the vices of its mninisters, and as a sort of revival of the long-exploded errors of the Donatists; and what rendered it peculiarly liable to an interpretation of this nature was the imprudence of some Pietists, who  inculcated and explained it without those restrictions that were necessary to render it unexceptionable. Hence arose endless and intricate debates concerning the following questions: "Whether the religious knowledge acquired by a wicked man can be termed theology?" "Whether a vicious person can, in effect, attain a true knowledge of religion?" "How far the office and ministry of an impious ecclesiastic can be pronounced salutary and efficacious?" "Whether a licentious and ungodly man cannot be susceptible of illumination?" and other questions of a like nature. These revivers of declining piety went still farther.

In order to render the ministry of their pastors as successful as possible in rousing men from their indolence, and in stemming the torrent of corruption and immorality, they judged two things indispensably necessary. The first was to suppress entirely, in the course of public instruction, and more especially in that delivered from the pulpit, certain maxims and phrases which the corruption of men leads them frequently to interpret in a manner favorable to the indulgence of their passions. Such, in the judgment of the Pietists; were the following propositions: No man is able to attain to that perfection which the divine law requires; good works are not necessary to salvation; in the act of justification, on the part of man faith alone is concerned, without good works. The second step which they took in order to give efficacy to their plans of reformation was to form new rules of life and manners, much more rigorous and austere than those that had formerly been practiced; and to place in the class of sinful and unlawful gratifications several kinds of pleasure and amusement which had hitherto been looked upon as innocent in themselves, and which could only become good or evil in consequence of the respective characters of those who used them with prudence or abused them with intemperance. Thus dancing, pantomimes, public sports, theatrical diversions, the reading of humorous and comical books, with several other kinds of pleasure and entertainment, were prohibited by the Pietists as unlawful and unseemly, and therefore by no means of an indifferent nature. The third thing on which the Pietists insisted was that, besides the stated meetings for public worship, private assemblies should be held for prayer and other religious exercises. The University of Halle, which had been founded for the avowed purpose of promoting the pietistic movement, finally became its home and centre; and the Orphanhouse established in that town by A.H. Francke, and renowned all over Europe, one of its most effective agencies. Besides, it became a living proof that pietism was not only able to combat the religious errors of the times, but also to grapple with the grave wants of common life. Is not that a good and  safe theology which, in addition to teaching truth, can also clothe the naked and feed the hungry? It has been charged against the Pietists that they wrote but little. Writing was not their mission. It was theirs to act, to reform the practical life and faith of the people, not to waste their strength in a war of books. They wrote what they needed to carry out their lofty aim; and this was perhaps sufficient. They did lack profundity of thought; but let it be remembered that their work was restorative, not initial. Yet we would not leave the impression that pietism did not exert any influence as a literary light. The theological instruction of Francke and his coadjutors in the University of Halle was very influential. During the first thirty years of its history six thousand and thirty-four theologians were trained within its walls, not to speak of the multitudes who received a thorough academic and religious instruction in the Orphan-house.

The Oriental Theological College, established in connection with the university, promoted the study of Biblical languages, and originated the first critical edition of the Hebrew Bible. Moreover, it founded missions to the Jews and Mohammedans. From Halle streams of the new life flowed out until there were traces of reawakening throughout Europe. First, the larger cities gave signs of returning faith; and the universities which were most bitter against Spener were influenced by the power of the teachings of his immediate successors. Pietism propagated its influence by means of Bengel in Wirtemberg and the University of Tubingen, and in Moravia through Zinzendorf. Arnold and Thomasius belonged to this party at the beginning of the 18th century. Oettinger at Tubingen, Crusius at Leipsic, and, to a certain extent, Buddeus also, partook of the spirit of pietism. The opposition of the old Lutheran party of other parts of Germany produced controversies which continued till about 1720 (for an account, see Weismann, Mem. Eccl. Hist. Sacr. [1745], page 1018 sq.). Zurich, Basle, Berne, and all the larger towns received it with gladness. It penetrated as far east as the provinces bordering on the Baltic Sea, and as far north as Denmark, Norway, and Sweden. Many of the continental courts welcomed it, and orphan-houses, after the model of Francke's, became the fashion of the day. The Reformed Church was influenced and impelled by it, and even England and the Netherlands indicated a strong sympathy for its practical and evangelical features. No higher tribute can be paid it than that of Tholuck, who avers "that the Protestant Church of Germany has never possessed so many zealous Christian ministers and laymen as in the first forty yars of the 18th century."

With a new generation of professors at Halle — among them C.B. Michaelis, the younger Francke, Freilinghausen, the elder Knapp, Callenberg, and Baumgarten — taking the place of their more vigorous predecessors, pietism began to lese its first power and earnest spirit The persistent inquiry into scriptural truth passed over into a tacit acquiescence of the understanding. Reliance was placed on the convictions, more than on the fruits of study. Spener had blended the emotions of the mind and heart, reason and faith, harmoniously; but the later Pietists cast off the former and blindly followed the latter. Hence they soon found themselves indulging in superstition, and repeating many of the errors of some of the most deluded Mystics. Science was frowned upon, because of its supposed conflict with the letter of Scripture. The language of Spener and 1rancke, which was full of practical earnestness, came into disuse. Definitions became loose and vague. The "Collegia," which had done so much good, now grew formal, cold, and disputatious. The missions, which had begun very auspiciously, dwindled from want of means and men. External life became pharisaical. Great weight was attached to long prayers. The duke of Coburg required the masters of schools to utter a long prayer in his presence, as a test of fitness for advancement. Pietism grew mystical, ascetic, and superstitious. Some of its advocates and votaries made great pretensions to holiness and unusual gifts. This had a tendency to bring the system into disrepute in certain quarters, though the good influences that it had exerted still existed and increased. It might disappear, but the good achieved by it would live after it. Pietism, though it ceased its aggressive power after Francke and Thomasius, was destined to exert a reproductive power long afterwards. From their day to the present, whenever there has arisen a great religious want, the heart of the people has been directed towards this same agency as a ground of hope. Whatever be said against it, it cannot be denied that it has succeeded in finding a safe lodgment in the affections of the evangelical portion of the German Church. Even in our own century the Church has had recourse to pietism as its only relief from a devastating rationalism; not the pietism of Spener and Francke, we acknowledge, but the same general current belonging to both. Its organ was the Evangelical Church Gazette, in 1827, and among the celebrities who attached themselves to it we find the names of Heinroth, Von Meyer, Schubert, Von Raumer, Steffens, Schnorr, and Olivier. Pietism lacked a homogeneous race of teachers. Here lay the secret of its overthrow. Had the founders been succeeded by men of much the same spirit, and equally strong intellect, its existence would have been guaranteed, so far as  anything religious can be promised in a country where there is a state Church to control the individual conscience. The great mistake of Lutheranism was in its failure to adopt it as its child. The sceptical germ which soon afterwards took root, gave evidence that it could cause its overthrow for a time, at least; but the evils of rationalism were partially anticipated by the practical teachings of the Pietists.

The inference has frequently been drawn that the two tendencies — the dogmatic and the pietistic — which marked the religious life of Germany at the opening of the 18th century, ministered indirectly to the production of scepticism; the dogmatic strictness stimulating a reaction towards latitude of opinion, and the unchurchlike and isolating character of pietism fostering individuality of belief. This inference is, however, hardly correct. Dogmatic truth in the corporate Church, and piety in the individual members, are ordinarily the safeguards of Christian faith and life. The danger arose in this case from the circumstance that the dogmas were emptied of life, and so became unreal; and that the piety, being separated from theological science, became insincere. Rationalism in Germany, without pietism as its forerunner, would have been fatal for centuries. But the relation of these tendencies, so plainly seen in the ecclesiastical history of Germany, is one of long standing. From the days of Neo-Platonism to the present they have existed, the good to balance the evil, faith to limit reason. They have been called by different names; but Christianity could little afford to do without it or its equivalent in the past, and the Church of the future will still cling as tenaciously and fondly to it or to its representative. A recent author who has shown a singular facility in grouping historical periods and discovering their great significance, says: "Pietism went back from the cold faith of the 17th century to the living faith of the Reformation. But just because this return was vital and produced by the agency of the Holy Spirit, it could not be termed a literal return. We must not forget that the orthodoxy of the 17th century was only the extreme elaboration of an error, the beginning of which we find as far back as Luther's time, and which became more and more a power in the Church through the influence of Melancthon. It was this: Mistaking the faith by which we believe for the faith which is believed. The principle of the Reformation was justification by faith, not the doctrine of faith and justification. In reply to the Catholics it was deemed sufficient to show that this was the true doctrine which points out the way of salvation to man. The great danger lay in mistaking faith itself for the doctrine of faith.  Therefore, in the controversies concerning justifying faith, we find that faith gradually came to be considered in relation to its doctrinal aspects more than in connection with the personal, practical, and experimental knowledge of men. In this view pietism is an elaboration of the faith of the 16th century. . . . So far from being heterodox, Spener even expressed himself in the most decided manner in favor of the doctribes of the Church. He would make faith consist less in the dogmatism of the head than in the motions of the heart; he would bring the doctrine away from the angry disputes of the schools and incorporate it into practical life. He was thoroughly united with the Reformers as to the real signification of justifying faith, but these contraries which were sought to be re-established he rejected. . . . From Spener's view a new phase of spiritual life began to pervade the heart. The orthodoxy of the state Church had been accustomed to consider all baptized persons as true believers if only they had been educated in wholesome doctrines. There was a general denial of that living, conscious, self faith which was vital in Luther, and had transformed the world. The land, because it was furnished with the Gospel and the sacraments, was considered an evangelical country. The contrast between mere worldly and spiritual life, between the living and dead members of the Church, was practically abolished, though there still remained a theoretical distinction between the visible and invisible Church. As to the world outside the pale of the Church, the Jews and heathen, there was no thought whatever. Men believed they had done their whole duty when they had roundly combated the other Christian churches. Thus lived the state Church in quiet confidence of its own safety and pure doctrine at the time when the nation was recovering from the devastations of the Thirty-years' War. 'In the times succeeding the Reformation,' says a Wurtemberg pastor of the past century, 'the greater portion of the common people trusted that they would certainly be saved if they believed correct doctrines; if one is neither a Roman Catholic nor a Calvinist, and confesses his opposition, he cannot possibly miss heaven; holiness is not so necessary after all'" (Auberlen, Die gottliche Offenbarung, 1:278-281).

The enemies of pietism have confounded it with mysticism. There are undoubted points in common, but pietism was aggressive instead of contemplative; it was practical rather than theoretical. Both systems made purity of life essential. but mysticism could not gfiard against mental disease, while pietism enjoyed a long season of healthful life. The latter was far too much engaged in relieving immediate and pressing wants to fall into  the gross errors which mark almost the entire career of the former. Pietism was mystical in so far as it made purity of heart essential to salvation; but it was the very antipodes of mysticism when organized and operating against a languid and torpid Church with such weapons as Spener and his coadjutors employed. Bohme and Spener were world-wide apart in many respects, but in purity of heart they were beautifully in unison.

A brief account of pietism is given in Hase's Church Hist. § 409; and for a fuller account, see Schrockh, Kirchengesch. seit der Ref. 8:255-291; Pusey, On German Theology, part 1 (pages 67-113); part 2, chapter 10; Amand Saintes, Crit. Hist. of Rationalism, chapter 7. Spener's character and life may be seen in Canstein's memoir of him; and in Weismann, pages 966-972. A philosophical view of pietism, as a necessary stage in the development of German religious life, is given by Dorner in the Stud. u. Krit. 1840, part 2, page 137, "Ueber den Pietismus." Kahnis, who himself quotes from it (Hist. of Germ. Prot. page 102), regards pietism as ministering indirectly to rationalism; much in the same way as bishop Fitzgerald criticised the similar evangelical movement of England (Aids to Faith, page 49, etc.). The best account of pietism is to be found in Horsbach, Spener u. seine Zeit.; Bretschneider, Die Grundlage des evangelischen Pietismus; Marklin, Darstellung u. Kritik des modernen Pietismus. See also Hurst, Hist. of Rationalism, chapters 2 and 3; Hurst's Hagenbach, Church Hist. of the 18th and 19th Centuries; Winkworth, Christian Sigers of Germany, page 257 sq.; Meth. Qu. Rev. April 1865, page 316; Bibliotheca Sacra, July 1865, page 522; 1864, page 224; Gass, Dogmengesch.; Haag, Hist. des Dogmes.

## Pietists, Catholic[[@Headword:Pietists, Catholic]]

             a name which was applied to the brethren and sisters of the pious and Christian schools founded by Nicholas Barre in 1678. They devoted themselves to the education of poor children of both sexes.

## Pietosi[[@Headword:Pietosi]]

             is the name of a celebrated Jewish family, called in Hebrew מן הענוים, which, like the families מן התפוחיםand מן הנערים, traced their origin to those Jews who were led into captivity after the destruction of Jerusalem by Titus and Vespasian. To this family belong the following:

1. BENJAMIN DE, ben-Abr., b.-Jech., b.-Abr. Rofe, of Rome, who flourished in the middle of the 13th century, is the author of שער עצ חיים, a didactic poem (Prague, 1598): — צפיוטים ושיריםreligious hymns. See Zunz, Synagogale Poesie, pages 313-315; id. Literaturgeschichte der synagog. Poesie, page 362 sq.; Steinschneider,  Catalogus Libr. Hebr. in Bibl. Bodl. page 2767 sq.; Dukes, Ozar Nachmad, 2:199.

2. JACOB DE, of Italy, wrote ברית יעקב, a great collectaneum of diverse matters (Livorno, 1800): רנו ליעקב, novellas on the treatises Chullin and Temura (ibid. 1810): — מזבה כפרה, another collectaneum (ibid.).

3. ZIDKIA DE, a brother of Benjamin, wrote הלקט שבלי, on Jewish rites and precepts (Venice, 1546; Sulzbach, 1699; Dubno, 1794). See Wolf, Bibl. Hebr. 1:1001; 3:961; 4:962; Schorr, Kritische Untersuchung uber das Werk Schibbale ha-Leketh in Zijjon (Frankforton-the-Main, 1841), 1:147 sq.; Furst. Bibl. Jud. 3:100. (B.P.)

## Pietro, Michele D[[@Headword:Pietro, Michele D]]

             an Italian prelate of note, was born January 18, 1747, at Albano. After defending in public disputation at Rome with great success some theological propositions, he was appointed professor of ecclesiastical history in the Gregorian university, and of canonical law at the Roman archi-gymnasium. He took an important share in the work of the congregation which examined the decisions of the Synod of Pistoja favorable to Jansenism, and contributed with the learned Gerdil to the redaction of the bull Auctorem fidei (1794). Pius VI, when he left Rome (1798), made him apostolical legate; and he had to give his advice in many a delicate question; for instance, in that of the oath of hatred against royalty which was exacted from French clergymen. Pius VII appointed him successively patriarch of Jerusalem, cardinal (February 23, 1801), and prefect of the Propaganda. When this pontiff was forced to leave Rome (1809), Pietro was chosen to occupy his place; but he was soon compelled to betake himself to Paris, and upon his refusal to attend the religious celebration of Napoleon's marriage with Maria Louisa, he was punished with banishment, loss of the ensigns of his dignities, and confiscation of his income. Relegated to Saumur with cardinals Gabrielli and Oprizzoni, confined in 1810 in the dungeon of Vincennes, he joined the pope in 1813 at Fontainebleau, and was again separated from him in January 1814. The political situlation finally allowed him to return to Rome, and he became grand penitentiary, prefect of the Index, bishop of Albano (1816), and of Porto and Santa-Ruffine (1820). He died at Rome July 2, 1821. This prelate, remarkable for his circumspection and flexibility, was considered  one of the luminaries of the Sacred College, for his theological lore and administrative abilities. — Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, 40:205.

## Piety[[@Headword:Piety]]

             occurs but once in the A.V.: "Let them learn first to show piety at home" (τὸν ἴδιον οικον εὐσεβεῖν, better, towards their own household," 1Ti 5:4). The choice of this word here instead of the more usual equivalents of "godliness," "reverence," and the like, was probably determined by the special sense of pietas, as "erga parentes" (Cicero, Partit. 22; Rep. 6:15; Inv. 2:22). It does not appear in the earlier English versions, and we may recognise in its application in this passage a special felicity. A word was wanted for εὐσεβεῖν which, unlike "showing godliness," would admit of a human as well as a divine object, and this piety supplied. — Smith.

Piety, or godliness, only another name for personal religion, consists in a firm belief, and in right conceptions of the being, perfections, and providence of God; with suitable affections to him, resemblance of his moral perfections, and a constant obedience to his will. The different articles included in this definition, such as knowledge, veneration, love, resignation, etc., are explained in their proper places in this work. For Perverted Piety, SEE ETHICS.

## Piga, Meletius[[@Headword:Piga, Meletius]]

             an Eastern prelate, flourished in the second half of the 16th century. He was in 1591 exarch of the Church of Constantinople, and shortly after that time was chosen to fill the chair of St. Mark's. As patriarch of Alexandria, Piga distinguished himself by great devotion to ecclesiastical studies, and as the author of one or two controversial writings for the Slavonic Church, which was exposed to the intrusion of Romanism.

## Pigenat, Francois[[@Headword:Pigenat, Francois]]

             a French preacher of the Jesuitic order, was born at Autun near the close of the 15th century. He early became a member of the Society of Jesus, and at Paris was one of the most zealous preachers of the League. In September, 1588, he was, in a somewhat quaint manner, elected curate of St. Nicolas des Champs, Legeay having been expelled by his parishioners as suspected of Huguenotism. Henry III said on that occasion that "Parisians were kings  and popes, and if you only let them have their own way, they will soon dispose of the whole spiritual and temporal power of the realm." In January 1589, Pigenat preached at Paris the funeral sermon of the duke and cardinal of Guise, assassinated at Blois by order of the king, and gave them the title of martyrs. Pigenat took a conspicuous part in all the absurd and obscene processions of the time. He organized one in his own parish, where over a thousand persons, of both sexes and every age, were marched half naked, the curate himself having only a white robe to cover him. He was one of the first to sign the deposition of Henry III, and became a member of the council of Quarante. He was by his friends claimed to be inspired, but royalist writers call him "a troublesome liar, false prophet, promoter of every kind of crime, who receives from the Spanish court numbers of doubloons for his vociferating in the chair and in the public thoroughfares." After the murder of Henry III, Pigenat transferred his animosity to Henry IV, declaring that "it was not in the power of God that the Bearnais should be converted, that the pope could not absolve him and put him on the throne, and that if he did he would be excommunicated himself." Pigenat did not live to see Henry IV make his entrance into Paris. He died in 1590. According to L'Estoile, he was not destitute of talent and imagination.

His brother, ODON PIGENAT, provincial of the Jesuits and one of the Seize, was also a chief of the League. He died at Bourges of an attack of frenzy.

A third member of the same family, JEAN PIGENAR, lived at the same time. He left Aveuglement des Politiques, Heretiques. et Maheustres, etc. (Paris, 1592, 8vo). — Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, 40:205.

## Pigeon[[@Headword:Pigeon]]

             is the rendering — but only in connection with the epithet "young" — of two very different Heb. and one Gr. word: יוֹנָה, yonah, περιστερά, a general name for any member of the dove family ("dove" everywhere, except in the Mosaic enactment, Lev 1:14; Lev 5:7; Lev 5:11; Lev 12:6; Lev 12:8; Lev 14:22; Lev 14:30; Lev 15:14; Lev 15:29; Num 6:10; Luk 2:24); but in Gen 15:9, גּוֹזָל, gozal, the young of any bird, perhaps there correctly of the dove, although in Deuteronomy 32 the "young" of the eagle is meant. The Biblical passages in which the pieon is mentioned may be classified as follows:

1. Pigeons or doves were the only birds used for sacrifices (comp. already Gen 15:9), in particular young pigeons (בְּנֵי הִיּוֹנָה, pulli columbini) and turtle-doves, which were sacrificed, sometimes with other offerings (Lev 12:6, in purifying women after childbed), sometimes alone as free-will offerings made by fire (Lev 1:14); or were prescribed in the purifications from leprosy (Lev 14:22), from personal uncleanness (Lev 15:14); that of Nazarites (Num 6:10), and of women after menstruation (Lev 15:29). But in two cases, where poverty interfered with more costly sacrifices, these were substituted (Lev 5:7 sq.; Lev 12:8. Comp. Luk 2:24). Such offerings of birds were also made by the poor in Egypt. (See Pausan. 10:32, 9. Comp. Engel, Cyprus, 2:184 sq.) For the purpose of providing these sacrifices, dealers in pigeons used to sit in the neighborhood of the Temple (Mat 21:12; Mar 11:15; Joh 2:14; Joh 2:16); and the raising of doves was from an early day a pursuit peculiar to the Jews (Isa 60:8. Comp. Rosenmuller, Morgenl. 6:283), although there were also many wild pigeons in Palestine (Eze 7:16. Comp. Schubert, 3:250), which built their nests in clefts of the rocks (Jer 48:28; Son 2:14; Robinson, 2:433), or at least sought a refuge there when chased (Psa 11:1. Comp. Iliad, 21:493 sq.; Quint. Smyrn. 12:12 sq.). See Schwebel, De columbarum cultu (Onold. 1767); Wernsdorf, De columb. sacra Syrorum (Helmst. 1761).

2. The flight of the pigeon was employed by the poet as a figure for swiftness (Psa 55:7; Hos 11:11. Comp. Soph. (Ed. Col. 1081; Eurip. Bacch. 1090; Robinson, 2:484), and is so understood by many interpreters in several passages of the New Testament (Mat 3:16; Mar 1:10; Joh 1:32) in which the Holy Spirit's descent is spoken of, but this may be doubted. The figure is carried out still further by Isaiah (Isa 60:8), and it is true that the pigeon surpasses in swiftness and directness of flight many birds of its size, without, however, being remarkable in this respect (Virg. in. 5:213 sq.; Plin. 10:52). The cause of this may be found in its long wings (Rechstein, Naturgesch. 4:2), by means of which it often escapes the birds which would prey upon it (Plin. 10:52; Phedr. 1:323; AElian, Animeal. 3:45). In songs of love, the eyes of the beloved, as expressive of attachment and of innocence, are compared with those of the dove, or, as some say, with little doves (Son 1:15; Son 4:1). And in Son 5:12 it is said, "His eyes are like doves over brooks of water, bathed in milk, resting infulness;" a very  beautiful description of the swimming apple of the eye. (The explanation of these words by Umbreit and Dipke is in better taste than that of Rosenmuller.) The voice of the dove is represented by the poets as a sigh, an expression of sorrow (הגת, Isa 28:14; Isa 59:11; Nah 2:8. Comp. Eze 7:16; Theocr. 7:141; Virg. Eclog. 1:59; Martial, 3:59, 19; and quotations from the Oriental poets in Jones, Poes Asiat. page 346 sq.; Gesen. Comment. on Isaiah 1:992). To the white and glimmering plumage reference is made in Psa 68:14; on which we remark that, according to Hasselquist (Travels, page 553), the pigeons of Palestine have usually whitish-gray feathers on the neck, head, breast, and shoulders. In the comparison used by Jesus (Mat 10:16), the dove is the image of innocence. (Comp. Schottgen and Wetstein, ad loc.)

3. Psa 55:7 was understood by the Hebrew interpreters as affording a trace of the use of carrier-pigeons among the ancient Jews; their use being common now in the East. (See Arvieux, Nachr. 5:422; Troilo, Trav. page 610 sq.; Russell, N.H. of Aleppo, 2:90; and especially Bochart, Hieroz. 2:542; J. De Sacy, La Colombe messagere, from the Arabic of Michael Sabbagh [Par. 1805]; and on the use of them in ancient times, especially in sieges, see AElian, V.H. 9:2; Plino 10:53; Front. Strateg. 3:13, 8.) But the words of this passage contain no such reference. Some would also refer to the same birds the words in Psa 56:1 (Lengerke, Ken. page 166), but without reason. (See Gesen. Thes. 1:104.) SEE DOVE; SEE TURTLE- DOVE

## Piggott, John[[@Headword:Piggott, John]]

             an English Baptist divine, flourished in the second half of the 17th century, and was very popular in his day, especially in his own religious denomination. As a religious instructor, he taught with clearness and argued with strength, exhorted with vehemence and reproved with becoming authority. He published, Account of J. Pilkington's Recantation of Romanisml (Lond. 1669, 4to): — Eight Separate Sermons (1700-1709, all 8vo): — Eleven Sermons (1714, 8vo); with the last is the sermon preached at Piggott's grave by the Reverend J. Stenneth. See Skeats, Hist. of the Free Churches of England, page 261; Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors, s.v.

## Pighius, Albert[[@Headword:Pighius, Albert]]

             whose family name was Van Campen, was born about the year 1490 at Campen, in the Netherlands. He studied first philosophy and mathematics at Louvain, then theology, on which he lectured at the latter place and at Cologne, where he had also been honored with the doctorate of divinity. He accompanied pope Adrian VI (q.v.) to Spain and Italy, and after the death of Adrian he resided at Rome, and acted on several important missions as the representative of Rome, as at Worms and Regensburg. Under pope Paul III (q.v.) he was made provost of the church of St. John at Utrecht, where he died, December 24, 1543. Although Pighius was very fierce against Protestants, yet among his own coreligionists his orthodoxy to the Catholic faith was doubted very much. Of his works we mention, Adversus Progynosticatorum vulgus, qui animas praedictiones edunt et se astrologos mentiuntur, astrologiae defensio: — De cequinoctiorum solstitiorumque inventione, nec non de ratione paschalis celebrationis et de restitutione ecclesiastici calendarii:Adversus novam Marci Beneventani astronomiam apologia: — Assertio hierarchiae ecclesiasticae lib. 6 (Cologne, 1538, and often): — and De libero hominis arbitrio et divina gratia libri x adversus Lutherum, Calvinum, et alios, to which Calvin replied in his Defensio sanae et orthodoxies doctrinae de Servitute et Liberatione humani Arbitrii advers. Calumnias Alb. Pighii Camipensis (Geneva, 1545), published in his tractatus. See Dupin, Nouvelle Bibliothique des Auteurs ecclesiastiques, etc., t. 16; Bayle, Dict. s.v.; Schweizer, Centraldogmen, 1:180; Herzog, Real-Encyklop. s.v.; Theologisches Universal-Lexikon, s.v.; Jocher, Gelehrten-Lexikon, s.v.; Hagenbach, History of Doctrines, 2:197 sq. (B.P.)

## Pigneau de Behaine, Pierre-Joseph[[@Headword:Pigneau de Behaine, Pierre-Joseph]]

             a French missionary, was born December 1741, at Origny (Thidrache). He was brought up in the College of Laon, and studied theology at the Sdminaire des Trente-Trois at Paris. After taking holy orders, he embarked at Cadiz, in the beginning of 1756, for the Oriental missions. unknown td his parents, who were opposed to his design. In 1767 he arrived at the island of Hon-Dat, near the coast of Cochin-China. The apostolic vicar of that mission, M. Piguel, bishop of Champa in partibus, gave him the direction of his college, which he was then transferring to that place. In 1768 the governor of the province KanRao, to which the island of Hon- Dat belonged, ordered him to be arrested, and sentenced him to the  cangue, with another French missionary and a Chinese priest. They endured the torment with patience, and after three months' captivity were set at large. Pigneau resumed the direction of his college, and transferred it to Pondicherry. In 1770 he was appointed bishop of Adran in partibus, and coadjutor of the apostolic vicar of Cochin-China, whom he soon after succeeded in his office. In 1774 he entered Cochin-China by the Cambodia. He found the whole country in the power of rebels, who had put to death the king and his nephew. The brother of the latter, Nguydn-Auts, who had been imprisoned, escaped and fled to the house of the bishop of Adran, where he was concealed for a month. He succeeded afterwards in bringing together a small force, took possession of Lower Cochin-China, and called to his side his benefactor, and was, in all he did, directed by his advice.

In 1783 he was beaten by the rebels, and had to flee the country. Pigneau then, taking along the pupils of his college, went to the Cambodia, and thence to Siam. Having embarked for Pondicherry, he heard. while sailing along the coast of Cambodia, that Nguyen-Auts was at a short distance on the coast; he joined him, who, with about six hundred soldiers, was reduced to the last extremity of starvation. He relieved them with his own provisions, and after spending a fortnight with them, he gained Pulo-Way, a small deserted island, situated sixty leagues from the continent. He stayed there nine months, during which time he wrote, in company with a Cochin- Chinese priest, instructions for the religious worship, and corrected several works translated from the French. In December 1784, he joined again the king of Cochin-China, and soon after went in person to solicit the assistance of Louis XVI for his friend, taking along with him the six-year- old son of the Asiatic prince. He arrived at Lorient February, 1787. His embassy was a successful one. France engaged to send four frigates and nearly two thousand soldiers to Cochin-China, and obtained in compensation the principal harbor of that country, Touron. Louis XVI appointed Pigneau his plenipotentiary, and had his prebend presented by him to Nguyen-Auts. The bishop, who had received rich presents himself, embarked for Pondicherry with the young prince, carrying to count Thomas Conway, governor-general of the French settlements, the blue cordon he had obtained for him, with the direction to prepare and command in person the projected expedition; but various obstacles, among others the Revolution, prevented it. and the hishop could only equip two little ships, which he loaded with ammunition, guns, etc. Count Conway put also at his disposition a frigate, on board of which he sailed to Cochin- China, where he joined the king in December 1789. The arrival of these  subsidies, the clever exertions of the French officers, who in a short time equipped a powerful fleet, and organized an army of six thousand soldiers after the European fashion, gave the victory to the king. The bishop was hopeful of turning to the advantage of religion the influence he had won, when he died of dysentery, October 9, 1799. In August 1861, the French government restored the tomb of Pigneau de Behaine, and proclaimed it French property. — Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, 40:224.

## Pignone, Simone[[@Headword:Pignone, Simone]]

             all Italian painter, who, according to Oretti, was born at Florence in the year 1614, studied with Fabrizio Boschi, afterwards with Passignano, and lastly with Francesco Furini, whose manner he adopted, though he improved his coloring by visiting Venice, and studying the works of the great masters, particularly those of Titian and Tintoretto. After his return to Florence he distinguished himself by several works which he executed for the churches, and which were greatly admired for the delicacy and beauty of the coloring. The most esteemed of these are, St. Michael disconfiting the Rebel Angels, in the Nunziata: St. Louis, King of France, Distributing his Wealth to the Poor, in S. Felicita; and an altar-piece, Monte Oliveto. His most admired works, however, are to be found in the collections of the nobility. These are of small size, and from sacred subjects. There are also some of his pictures in the Florentine Gallery. He was fond of painting mythological subjects, the peculiar character of which afforded a fine opportunity of displaying his marvellous skill in flesh tints. Lanzi and Carlo Maratti agree as to his being among the best of the Florentine painters of his time. His death occurred in 1698. See Spooner, Biog. Hist. of the Fine Arts, 2:695.

## Pignorius, Laurentius[[@Headword:Pignorius, Laurentius]]

             a noted Italian ecclesiastic, celebrated especially as an antiquary, was born at Padua in 1571, and flourished at Treviso, where he held a canonry. He died of the plague in 1631. He collected a cabinet of medals and other curiosities of rare extent and value. His principal work is an attempt to explain the famous Isiac Table, a relic of Egyptian antiquity, covered with figures of divinities, symbols, and hieroglyphs. The table is supposed by Warburton to belong to the latest period of ancient Egypt. Pignorius also wrote a treatise, De Servis et eorum apud veteres Ministeriis: — Antiquities of Padua, etc.

## Pik[[@Headword:Pik]]

             also called JESAIAH BERLIN, a somewhat noted Jewish rabbi, flourished at Breslau, in Silesia, where he died, May 13, 1799, after having occupied the rabbiship for about sixteen years. He wrote הגדות, or notes and corrections to the Talmud, which are generally printed in the modem editions of the Talmud: — הפלאה שבערכין, elucidations and  corrections to Nathan ben-Jechiel's (q.v.) dictionary, called Aruch, but only on the letters כ א, which were edited by R.W. Gunsburg (Breslau, 1830), while the second part, comprising the letters ת ל, which was prepared by Luzzatto and Hurwitz. was edited by Rosenkranz (Vienna, 1859): — מיני תרגימא, i.e., glossaries on the Targum of Onkelos (q.v.), edited by D. Sklower (Breslau, 1827, and Vienna, 1836): — לציון ראשין, glossaries on the Mishna, printed in the editions of the Mishna (Vienna, 1793; Prague, 1825-30; and with many additions edited by W. Eger, Altona, 1841-46). See Beer, Jiidische Literaturbriefe (Leips. 1857, page 45; reprinted from Frankel's Monatsschrift, 1853-1854); Furst, Bibliotheca Judaica, 1:110; Zunz, Die Momnatstage des Kalenderjahres (Berlin, 1872), page 27; Engl. transl. by Reverend B. Pick, in the Jewish Messenger (N.Y. 1874); Cassel, Leiftiden zur judischen Geschichte u. Literatur (Berlin, 1872), page 107; Jost, Gesch. d. Judenth. u.s. Sekten, 3:245; Steinschneider, Bibliograph. Handb. page 22; Catalogus Libr. Hebr. in Biblioth. Bodl. page 1385. (B.P.)

## Pike, Gustave Dorman, D.D[[@Headword:Pike, Gustave Dorman, D.D]]

             a Congregational minister, was born at Topsfield, Massachusetts, August 6, 1831. He graduated from Dartmouth College in 1858, and from Andover Theological Seminary in 1861, became copastor at Nashua, N.H., in 1862, pastor at East Haddlam, Connecticut, in 1865, agent of the American Missionary Association at Rochester, N.Y., in 1867, and was its secretary from 1870 until his death, January 29, 1885. He published a few missionary works. See Cong. Year-book, 1886, page 30.

## Pike, Samuel[[@Headword:Pike, Samuel]]

             an English Dissenting minister, was born at Ramsey, Wiltshire, about 1717. He became minister of a congregation at Henley-on-Thames, and in 1747 succeeded John Hill at the Three Cranes, London. He died in 1773. Pike was quite a voluminous writer. Among his many productions we mention, Thoughts on such Passages of Scripture as ascribe Affections and Passions to the Deity (Loud. 1750, 12mo): — Philosophia Sacra, or the Principles of Natural Philosophy extracted from Divine Revelation (Lond. 1753, 8vo); a scarce work, written on Hutchinsonian principles: — The Nature and Evidences of Saving Faith; being the substance of Four Sermons on Heb 11:1; Two of which were Preached at the Merchants' Lecture, Sinner's Hall. With a Preface (Lond. 1764, 8vo): — Religious Cases of Conscience answered in an Evangelical Manner, or the Inquiring Christian Instructed; to which are added Replies to Thirty- two Questions, or the Professing Christian Tried at the Bar of God's Word. To which is subjoined the Character of the Happy, Honest, and Faithful Man. By Samuel Pike and Samuel Hayward (new ed. Romsey, 1819, 8vo; last Amer. ed. with an Introd. by Dr. H.A. Boardman, Phila. 1859, 12mo): —Compendious Hebrew Lexicon (1766, 8vo; new ed. 1816, 8vo). See Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors, s.v.; Darling, Cyclop. Bibliog. s.v. (J.H.W.)

## Pikollos[[@Headword:Pikollos]]

             a deity among the ancient Wends of Slavonia, who was believed to preside over the infernal regions and the realms of the dead. He was represented as an old man with a pale countenance, and having before him three death's heads. He corresponded to Pluto of the ancient Romans, and to Siva of the Hindus. Like the latter, he desires human blood, and reigns at on ce over the manes or souls of the dead, and over the metals in the bowels of the earth.

## Piktas[[@Headword:Piktas]]

             a virtue which denotes veneration for the Deity, and love and tenderness to our friends, and especially dutifulness to parents. It received divine honors among the Romans, and was made one of their gods. Acilius Glabrio first erected a temple to this new divinity, on the spot where a woman had fed with her own milk her aged father, who had been imprisoned by order of the senate, and deprived of all aliment. The goddess is seen represented on Roman coins as a matron, throwing incense upon an altar, and her attributes are a stork and children. See Cicero, De Div. 1; Val. Maximus, 5:4; Pliny, 7:36; Zumpt, in the Class. Museum, 3:452.

## Pikullos (Pikollos, or Potollos)[[@Headword:Pikullos (Pikollos, or Potollos)]]

             was the destroying principle, the third person of the trinity among the Lithuanians, or ancient heathen Prussians, being the opposite of Potrimpos, the preserving principle. An image of this god stood at Romowe, in a hollow of the sacred oak-tree. He was represented as an old bearded man with pale face, the head bound by a white cloth. Three skulls, one of a man, another of a horse, and the third of a bull, were his symbols. Human beings, cattle, horses, and goats, were sacrificed to him, and their blood was poured out at the foot of the great oak-tree to cause its constant growth. Potrimpos was loved, Pikullos feared. He found joy in men's misery. He was not worshipped among other nations, but was compared with Pluto, and with the moon, Loke, Hel, and Odin of the Scandinavians.

## Pil(l)more (also spelled Pilmoor), Joseph, D.D[[@Headword:Pil(l)more (also spelled Pilmoor), Joseph, D.D]]

             an early Episcopal minister in America, was born at Tadmouth, Yorkshire, England, about 1734, and was educated at Kingswood, the school of John  Wesley, under whom he had been previously converted. On completing his studies, Pilmore became a lay helper in the Methodist itinerant ministry, and labored' in this way for many years through England, Scotland, and Wales. His ministerial certificate from Mr. Wesley represents him as “having grace, gifts, and success or fruit in the work.” His word was blessed everywhere. His appearance and preaching were impressive. Mr. Pilmore's manly form, tall and erect, his sympathizing spirit, earnest zeal and prayers, all united to make strong and lasting impressions. In 1769 he came to America, and preached throughout the colonies. Stevens says Pilmore had many hair-breadth escapes of life and limb in his wide journeys. At Charleston, S. C., he could find no place to use for preaching except the theatre, and while earnestly delivering a sermon, suddenly the table used for a pulpit, with the chair he occupied, all at once disappeared through a trap-door to the cellar. This was a wicked contrivance of the “baser sort.” Nothing discouraged, however, the preacher, springing upon the stage, with the table, invited the audience to the adjoining yard, adding pleasantly, “Come on, my friends, we will, by the grace of God, defeat the devil this time, and not be beat by him from our work,” and then quietly finished his discourse. The fruits of his Christian labors appeared in the conversion of many souls. Wherever he appeared large crowds attended his ministry, and listened to his Master's message. With the Wesleyan preachers generally, Pilmore retired from his ministerial work during the troublesome times of the American Revolution. In 1783 he joined the Protestant Episcopal Church, and was soon after ordained. He now became rector of Trinity (Oxford), All Saints (Lower Dublin), and St. Thomas (Whitemarsh). After the establishment of peace in this year he returned to America, and next served St. Paul's, Philadelphia, and thence removed to Christ Church, New York, of which he was chosen rector in 1804. Notwithstanding the interdiction of “Old Trinity,” he preached with great acceptance and usefulness during ten years, and then was chosen rector of St. Paul's, Philadelphia, in 1814. Mr. Pilmore's congregation in New York became well known for its evangelical piety, and some of its communicants were on terms of intimate friendship with the members of the old John Street Methodist Episcopal Church. During the year 1821 this faithful and aged minister's mental powers exhibited evidences of failure, and this, with bodily indisposition, made it necessary for him to have an assistant. The Rev. Mr. Benjamin was chosen. Continuing gradually to fail, Pilmore departed this life July 24, 1825. Dr. Pilmore was a faithful minister of God, and wherever he preached gathered a large body of communicants.  He left many bequests for charitable purposes. He is the author of a Narrative of Labors in South Wales (1825), and of a Description of Travels and Trials and Preaching in the Colonies of New York, New Jersey, Delaware, Pennsylvania, Maryland, and Virginia, which was never published. See Sprague, Annals of the Amer. Pulpit, v, 266; Disosway, in the N. Y. Methodist, No. 178; Lives of ‘Eminent Philadelphians (1859). p. 801. (J. H. W.)

## Pilarik, Stephen[[@Headword:Pilarik, Stephen]]

             a Hungarian ecclesiastic of some distinction, was born at Otschova in 1615. He was the son of a Protestant clergyman, and also devoted himself to the ministry, and his talent as a preacher soon got him a widespread reputation. In the year 1663, while travelling, he was captured by Tartars, who reduced him to slavery. He died February 8, 1693, at Neusalza. His principal writings are, Currus Jehovae mirabilis (Wittenberg, 1678, 4to); and Turcico-Tartarica crudelitas (Buda, 1684, 4to), a touching account of his captivity. His son, also called Stephen, who died in 1710, left some works. now forgotten. — Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, 40:229.

## Pilate, Pontius[[@Headword:Pilate, Pontius]]

             (Πόντιος Πίλατος, Graecized from the Latin Pontius Pilatus), the Roman procurator or resident as governor of Judaea during the period of our Lord's public ministry and passion, and chiefly known in history from his connection with the Crucifixion. In the following account we combine Scriptural notices with information from other ancient resources and modern examination.

I. His Name. — His praenomen or first name is unknown. His nomen or family name indicates that he was connected, by descent or adoption, with the gens of the Pontii, first conspicuous in Roman history in the person of C. Pontius Telesinus, the great Samnite general. The cognomen Pilatus has received two explanat tions.

(1.) As armed with the pilum or javelin (comp. "pilata agmina," Virg. AEn. 12:121);

(2.) As contracted from pileatus. The fact that the pileus or cap was'the badge of manumitted slaves (comp. Suetonius, Nero, c. 57;  Tiber. c. 4), makes it probable that the epithet marked him out as a libertus, or as descended from one.

II. His Office. — Pilate was the sixth Roman procurator of Judaea (Mat 27:2; Mar 15:1; Luk 3:1; Joh 18:29). under whom our Lord taught, suffered, and died (Act 3:13; Act 4:27; Act 13:28; 1Ti 6:13). The testimony of Tacitus on this point is no less clear than it is important; for it fixes beyond a doubt the time when the foundations of our religion were laid. "The author of that name (Christian) or sect was Christ, who was capitally punished in the reign of Tiberius by Pontius Pilate" (Auctor nominis ejus Christus, Tiberio imperitante, per Procuratorem Pontium Pilatum supplicio affectus est). Aprocurator (ἐπίτροπος, Philo, Leg. ad Caium, and Josephus, War, 2:9, 2; but less correctly ἡγεμών, Mat 27:2; and Josephus, Ant. 18:3, 1) was generally a Roman knight, appointed to act under the governor of a province as collector of the revenue, and judge in causes connected with it. Strictly speaking,procuratores Ccesaris were only required in the imperial provinces, i.e., those which, according to the constitution of Augustus, were reserved for the special administration of the emperor, without the intervention of the senate and people, and governed by his legate. In the senatorial provinces, governed by proconsuls, the corresponding duties were discharged by quaestors. Yet it appears that sometimes procuratores were appointed in those provinces also, to collect certain dues of the fiscus (the emperor's special revenue), as distinguished from those of the cerarium (the revenue administered by the senate). Sometimes in a small territory, especially in one colntiguous to a larger province, and dependent upon it, the procurator was head of the administration, and had full military and judicial authority, though he was responsible to'the governor of the neighboring province. Thus Judaea was attached to Syria upon the deposition of Archelaus (A.D. 6), and a procurator appointed to govern it, with Caesarea for its capital. Already, during a temporary absence of Archelaus, it had been in charge of the procurator Sabinus; then, after the ethnarch's banishment, came Coponius; the third procurator was M. Ambivius; the fourth Annius Rufus; the fifth Valerius Gratus; and the sixth Pontius Pilate (Josephus, Ant. 18:2, 2), who was appointed A.D. 25-6, in the twelfth year of Tiberius. He held his office for a period of ten years (Josephus, Ant. 18:10, 2). The agreement on this point between the accounts in the New Testament and those supplied by Josephus is entire and satisfactory. It has been exhibited in detail by the learned, accurate, and  candid Lardner (t 1503-89, Lond. 1827). These procurators had their headquarters at Caesarea, which is called by Tacitus Judeece caput; but they took up their temporary abode at Jerusalem on occasion of the great feasts, as a measure of precaution against any popular outbreak. SEE PROCURATOR.

III. His Life. —

1. Of the early history of Pilate we know nothing; but a German legend fills up the gap strangely enough. Pilate is the bastard son of Tyrus, king of Mayence. His father sends him to Rome as a hostage. There he is guilty of a murder; but being sent to Pontus, rises into notice as subduing the barbarous tribes there, receives in consequence the new name of Pontius, and is sent to Judaea. It has been suggested that the twenty-second legion, which was in Palestine at the time of the destruction of Jerusalem, and was afterwards stationed at Mayence, may have been in this case either the bearers of the tradition or the inventors of the fable (comp. Vilmar, Deutsche Nationalliteratur, i, 217).

2. His Official Career. — (1.) His Administration in General. — One of Pilate's first acts was to remove the headquarters of the army from Caesarea to Jerusalem. The soldiers of course took with them their standards, bearing the image of the emperor, into the Holy City. Pilate had been obliged to send them in by night, and there were no bounds to the rage of the people on discovering what had thus been done. They poured down in crowds to Caesarea, where the procurator was then residing, and besought him to remove the images. After five days of discussion he gave the signal to some concealed soldiers to surround the petitioners and put them to death unless they ceased to trouble him; but this only strengthened their determination, and they declared themselves ready rather to submit to death than forego their resistance to an idolatrous innovation. Pilate then yielded, and the standards were by his orders brought down to Caesarea (Josephus, Ant. 28, 3,12; War, ii. 9, 2-4). No previous governor had ventured on such an outrage. Herod the Great, it is true, had placed the Roman eagle on one of his new buildings; but this had been followed by a violent outbreak, and the attempt had not been repeated (Ewald, Geschichte, 4, 509). The extent to which the scruples of the Jews on this point were respected by the Roman governors is shown by the fact that no effigy of either god or emperor is found on the money coined by them in Judaea before the war under Nero (ibid. v, 33, referring to Deuteronomy Saulcy, Recherches sur la Numismatique judaique, pt. viii, ix). Assuming this, the denarius with Casar's image and superscription of Matthew 23 must have been a coin from the Roman mint, or that of some other province. The latter was probably current for the common purposes of life. The shekel alone was received as a Temple-offering. See ABOMINATION OF DESOLATION.

Coin of Judaea struck under Pontius Pilate.

Obverse: Τιβερίου Καίσαρος (“Of Tiberius Caesar”), with the legend r 16, i.e. A.D. 99, the year of our Lord's crucifixion. Reverse: Ι᾿ουλία Καίσαπος (“Julia [mother] of Caesar”), with three ears of corn tied together. Probably a quadrans, equivalent to two “mites” (Mat 11:29).

On two other occasions Pilate nearly drove the Jews to insurrection; the first when, in spite of this warning about the images, he hung tip in his palace at Jerusalem some gilt shields inscribed with the names of deities, which were only removed by an order from Tiberius (Philo, Ad Caium, § 38, ii, 589); the second when be appropriated the revenue arising from the redemption of vows (Corban: comp. Mark vii, 11) to the construction of an aqueduct. This order led to a riot, which he suppressed by sending among the crowd soldiers with concealed daggers, who massacred a great number, not only of rioters, but of casual spectators (Josephus, War, ii, 9. 4). Ewald suggests that the Tower of Siloam (Luk 13:4) may have been part of the same works, and that this was the reason why its fall was looked upon as a judgment (Gesch. vi, 40). The Pharisaic reverence for whatever was set apart for the Corban (Mar 7:11), and their scruples as to admitting into it anything that had an impure origin (Mat 27:6); may be regarded, perhaps, as outgrowths of the same feeling. See CORBAN.

To these specimens of his administration, which rest on the testimony of profane authors, we must add the slaughter of certain Galilaeans, which was told to out Lord as a piece of news (ἀπαγγέλλοντες Luk 13:1), and on which he founded some remarks on the connection between sin and calamity. It must have occurred at some feast at Jerusalem, in the outer court of the Temple, since the blood of the worshippers was mingled with their sacrifices; but the silence of Josephus about it seems to show that riots and massacres on such occasions were so frequent that it was needless to recount them all. Ewald suggests that the insurrection of which Mark speaks (xv, 7) must have been that connected with the appropriation of the Corban (supra), and that this explains the eagerness with which the people demanded Barabbas's release. He infers further, From Barabbas's name, that he was the son of a rabbi ,Abba was a rabbinic title of honor), and thus accounts for the part taken in his favor by the members of the Sanhedrim. See BARABBAS.

(2.) His special Connection with Jesus. — It was the custom for the procurators to reside at Jerusalem during the great feasts, to preserve order, and accordingly, at the time of our Lord's last Passover, Pilate was occupying his official residence in Herod's palace; and to the gates of this palace Jesus, condemned on the charge of blasphemy, was brought early in the morning by the chief priests and officers of the Sanhedrim, who were unable to enter the residence of a Gentile, lest they should be defiled, and unfit to eat the Passover (Joh 18:28). Pilate therefore came out to learn their purpose, and demanded the nature of the charge. At first they seem to have expected that lie would have carried out their wishes without further inquiry, and therefore merely described our Lord as a κακοποιὀς (disturber of the public peace); but as a Roman procurator had too much respect for justice, or at least understood his business too well to consent to such a condemnation, and as they knew that he would not enter into theological questions, any more than Gallio afterwards did on a somewhat similar occasion (Act 18:14), they were obliged to devise a new charge, and therefore interpreted our Lord's claims in a political sense, accusing him of assuming the royal title, perverting the nation, and forbidding the payment of tribute to Rome (Luk 23:3; an account plainly presupposed in John 28:33). It is evident that from this moment Pilate was distracted between two conflicting feelings: a fear of offending the Jews, who had already grounds of accusation against him, which would be greatly strengthened by any show of lukewarmness in punishing an offence against the imperial government, and a conscious conviction that Jesus was innocent, since it was absurd to suppose that a desire to free the nation from Roman authority was criminal in the eyes of the Sanhedrim. Moreover, this last feeling was strengthened by his own hatred of the Jews, whose religious scruples had caused him frequent trouble, and by a growing respect for the calm dignity and meekness of the sufferer. First he examined our Lord privately, and asked him whether he were a king. The question which he in return put to his judge, “Sagest thou this of thyself, or did others tell it thee of me?” seems to imply that there was in Pilate's own mind a suspicion that the prisoner really was what lie was charged with being; a suspicion which shows itself again in the later question, “Whence art thou?” (Joh 19:8), in the increasing desire to release him (Joh 19:12), and in the refusal to alter the inscription on the cross (Joh 19:22). In any case Pilate accepted as satisfactory Christ's assurance that his kingdom was not of this world, that is, not worldly in its nature or objects, and therefore not to be founded by this world's weapons, though he could not understand the assertion that it was to be established by bearing witness to the truth. His famous reply, “What is truth?” was the question of a worldly-minded politician, skeptical because he was indifferent, one who thought truth an empty name, or at least could not see “any connection between ἀληθεια and βασιλεία, truth and policy” (Dr. C. Wordsworth, Contra. ad loc.). With this question he brought the interview to a close, and came out to the Jews and declared the prisoner innocent. To this they replied that his teaching had stirred up all the people from Galilee to Jerusalem. The mention of Galilee suggested to Pilate a new way of escaping from his dilemma, by sending on the case to Herod Antipas, tetrarch of that country, who had come up to Jerusalem to the feast, while at the same time this gave him an opportunity for making overtures of reconciliation to Herod, with whose jurisdiction he had probably in some recent instance interfered. But Herod, though propitiated by this act of courtesy, declined to enter into the matter, and merely sent Jesus back to Pilate dressed in a shining kingly robe (ἐσθν'τα λαμράν, Luk 23:11), to express his ridicule of such pretensions, and contempt for the whole business. So Pilate was compelled to come to a decision, and first, having assembled the chief priests and also the people, whom he probably summoned in the expectation that they would be favorable to Jesus, he announced to them that the accused had done nothing worthy of death, but at the same time, in hopes of pacifying the Sanhedrim, he proposed to scourge him before he released him. But as the accusers were resolved to have his blood, they rejected this concession, and therefore Pilate had recourse to a fresh expedient. It was the custom for the Roman governor to grant every year, in honor of the Passover, pardon to one condemned criminal. The origin of the practice is unknown, though we may connect it with the fact mentioned by Livy (v, 13) that at a Lectisternium “vinctis quoque dempta vincula.” Pilate therefore offered the people their choice between two, the murderer Barabbas, and the prophet whom a few days before they had hailed as the Messiah. To receive their decision he ascended the βἢμα, a portable tribunal which was carried about with a Roman magistrate to be placed wherever lie might direct, and which in the present case was erected on a tessellated pavement (λιθόστρωτον) in front of the palace, and called in Hebrew Gabbatha, probably from being laid down on a slight elevation (גָּבַהּ, “to be high”). As soon as Pilate had taken his seat, he received a mysterious message from his wife, according to tradition a proselyte of the gate (θεοσεβής), named Procla or Claudia Procula (Evang. Nicod. ii), who had “suffered many things in a dream,” which impelled her to entreat her husband not t, condemn the Just One. But he had no longer any choice in the matter, for the rabble, instigated of course by the priests, chose Barabbas for pardon, and clamored for the death of Jesus; insurrection seemed imminent, and Pilate reluctantly yielded. But before issuing the fatal order he washed his hands before the multitude, as a sign that he was innocent of the crime, in imitation probably of the ceremony enjoined in Deuteronomy 21, where it is ordered that when the perpetrator of a murder is not discovered, the elders of the city in which it occurs shall wash their hands, with the declaration, “Our hands have not shed this blood, neither have our eyes seen it.” Such a practice might naturally be adopted even by a Roman, as intelligible to the Jewish multitude around him. As in the present case it produced no effect, Pilate ordered his soldiers to inflict the scourging preparatory to execution; but the sight of unjust suffering so patiently borne seems again to have troubled his conscience, and prompted a new effort in favor of the victim. He brought him out bleeding from the savage punishment, and decked in the scarlet robe and crown of thorns which the soldiers had put on him in derision, and said to the people, “Behold the man!” hoping that such a spectacle would rouse them to shame and compassion. But the priests only renewed their clamors for his death, and, fearing that the political charge of treason might be considered insufficient, returned to their first accusation of blasphemy, and quoting the law of Moses (Lev 24:16), which punished blasphemy with stoning. declared that he must die “because he made himself the Son of God.” But this title υἱὸβ θεοὕ augmented Pilate's superstitious fears, already aroused by his wife's dream (ηἄλλον ἐφοβήθη, Joh 19:7); he feared that Jesus might be one of the heroes or demigods of his own mythology; he took him again into the palace, and inquired anxiously into his descent (“Whence art thou?”) and his claims, but, as the question was only prompted by fear or curiosity, Jesus made no reply. When Pilate reminded him of his own absolute power over him, he closed this last conversation with the irresolute governor by the mournful remark: “Thou couldst have no power at all against me, except it were given thee from above; therefore he that delivered me unto thee hath the greater sin.” God had given to Pilate power over him, and power only, but to those who delivered him up God had given the means of judging of his claims; and therefore Pilate's sin, in merely exercising this power, was less than theirs who, being God's own priests, with the Scriptures before them, and the word of prophecy still alive among them (Joh 11:50, Joh 18:14), had deliberately conspired for his death. The result of this interview was one last effort to save Jesus by a fresh appeal to the multitude; but now arose the formidable cry, “If thou let this man go, thou art not Caesar's friend,” and Pilate, to whom political success was as the breath of life, again ascended the tribunal, and finally pronounced the desired condemnation.

The proceedings of Pilate in our Lord's trial supply many interesting illustrations of the accuracy of the evangelists, from the accordance of their narrative with the known customs of the time. Thus Pilate, being only a procurator, had no quaestor to conduct the trial, and therefore examined the prisoner himself. Again, in early times Roman magistrates had not been allowed to take their wives with them into the provinces, but this prohibition had fallen into neglect, and latterly a proposal made by Caecina to enforce it had been rejected (Tacit. Ann. iii, 33, 34). Grotius points out that the word ἀνέπεμψεν, used when Pilate sends our Lord to Herod (Luk 23:7), is “propria Romani juris vox: nam remittitur reus qui alicubi comprehensus mittitur ad judicem aut originis aut habitationis” (see Alford, ad loc.). The tessellated pavement (λιθόστρωτον) was so necessary to the forms of justice, as well as the βἢμα, that Julius Caesar carried one about with him on his expeditions (Sueton. Jul. c. 46). The power of life and death was taken from the Jews when Judaea became a province (Josephus, Ant. xx, 9, 1). Scourging before execution was a well- known Roman practice.

So ended Pilate's share in the greatest crime which has been committed since the world began. That he did not immediately lose his feelings of anger against the Jews who had thus compelled his acquiescence, and of compassion and awe for the Sufferer whom he had unrighteously sentenced, is plain from his curt and angry refusal to alter the inscription which he had prepared for the cross (ὃ γέγραφα, γέγραφα), his ready acquiescence in the request made by Joseph of Arimathsea that the Lord's body might be given up to him rather than consigned to the common sepulchre reserved for those who had suffered capital punishment, an his sullen answer to the demand of the Sanhedrim that the sepulchre should be guarded. (Matthew 23:65, ἔχετε κουστωδιαν ὑπἁγετε, ἀσφαλίσασθε ώς οἴδατε. Ellicott would translate this, “Take a guard,” on the ground that the watchers were Roman soldiers, who were not under the command of the priests. But some might have been placed at their disposal during the feast, and we should rather expect λὰβετε if the sentence were imperative.)

(3.) His Eventual Fate. — Here, as far as Scripture is concerned, our knowledge of Pilate's life ends. But we learn from Josephus (Ant. xviii, 4, 1) that his anxiety to avoid giving offence to Caesar did not save him from political disaster. The Samaritans were unquiet and rebellious. A leader of their own race had promised to disclose to them the sacred treasures which Moses was reported to have concealed in Mount Gerizim. Pilate led his troops against them, and defeated them easily enough. The Samaritans complained to Vitellius, now president of Syria, and he sent Pilate to Rome to answer their accusations before the emperor (ibid. 2). When lie reached Rome he found Tiberius dead and Caius (Caligula) on the throne, A.D. 36. Eusebius adds (Mist. Eccl. ii, 7) that soon afterwards. “wearied with misfortunes,” he killed himself. As to the scene of his death there are various traditions. One is that he was banished to Vienna Allobrogum (Vienne on the Rhone), where a singular monument, a pyramid on a quadrangular base, fifty-two feet high, is called Pontius Pilate's tomb (Smith, Dict. of Class. Geog. art. Vienna). Another is that he sought to hide his sorrows on the mountain by the lake of Lucerne, now called Mount Pilatus; and there, after spending years in its recesses, in remorse and despair rather than penitence, plunged into the dismal lake which occupies its summit. According to the popular belief, “a form is often seen to emerge from the gloomy waters, and go through the action of one washing his hands; and when he does so dark clouds of mist gather first round the bosom of the Infernal Lake (such it has been styled of old), and then, wrapping the whole upper part of the mountain in darkness, presage a tempest or hurricane, which is sure to follow in a short space” (Scott, Anne of Geierstein, ch. i). (See below.)

Pilate's wife is also, as might be expected, prominent in these traditions. Her name is given as Claudia Procula (Niceph. Mist. Eccl. i, 30). She had been a proselyte to Judaism before the crucifixion (Evang. Alicod. c. 2). Nothing certain is known as to her history, but the tradition that she became a Christian is as old as the time of Origen (Hom. in Matthew 35). The Greek Church has canonized her. The dream has been interpreted by some as a divine interposition; by others as a suggestion of the devil, who wished to prevent the Saviour's death; by others as the unconscious reflection of her interest in the reports which had reached her regarding Jesus. The description of Jesus as “that just man” (τψ῞ δικαίψ ἐκείνψ), it is remarked by Schaff. recalls the celebrated unconscious prophecy of Plato, in his Republic, as to the δίκαιος who was, after enduring all possible sufferings, to restore righteousness. In the earlier periods, and indeed so long as the commonwealth subsisted, it was very unusual for the governors of provinces to take their wives with them (Senec. Deuteronomy Controv. 25), and in the strict regulations which Augustus introduced lie did not allow the favor, except in peculiar and specified circumstances (Seuton. Aug. 24). The practice, however, grew to be more and more prevalent, and was customary in Pilate's time. It is evident from Tacitus that at the time of the death of Augustus, Germanicus had his wife Agrippina with him in Germany (Annal. i, 40, 41; comp. iii, 33-59; Josephus, Ant. xx, 10, 1; Ulpian, iv, 2). Indeed, in the beginning of the reign of Tiberius, Germanicus took his wife with him into the East. Piso, the prefect of Syria, took his wife also along with him at the same time (Tacit. Annal. ii, 54. 55). “But,” says Lardner (i, 152), “nothing can render this (the practice in question) more apparent than a motion made in the Roman senate by Severus Caesina, in the fourth consulship of Tiberius, and second of Drusus Caesar (A.D. 21), that no magistrate to whom any province was assigned should be accompanied by his wife, except the senate's rejecting it, and that with some indignation” (Tacit. Annal. iii, 33, 34). The fact mentioned incidentally, or rather implied, in Matthew, being thus confirmed by full and unquestionable evidence, cannot fail to serve as a corroboration of the evangelical history. (Comp. Paulus, Comm. iii, 723; Kuinöl, In loc. Mat.; Gotter, Deuteronomy Conjugis Pilati Somnio. Jena, 1704; Kluge, Deuteronomy Somnio Uxoris Pil. Hal. 1720; Herbart, Examen Somnii Uxoris Pil. Oldenb. 1735.)

IV. His Character. — The character of Pilate may be sufficiently inferred from the sketch given above of his conduct at our Lord's trial. By some he has been depicted as one of the worst of tyrants; by others, who have passed to the opposite extreme, his faults have been unduly palliated or denied. Tertullian speaks of him as virtually a Christian at heart (“jam pro sua conscientiâ Christianum,” Apol. c. 21); and the Ethiopian Church has even made him a saint. We have no reason to suppose that, so far as his general administration went, it differed greatly from that of the other Roman governors of Judaea. He was a type of the rich and corrupt Romans of his age; a worldly-minded statesman, conscious of no higher wants than those of this life, yet by no means unmoved by feelings of justice and mercy. His conduct to the Jews, in the instances quoted from Josephus, though severe, was not thoughtlessly cruel or tyrannical, considering the general practice of Roman governors, and the difficulties of dealing with a nation so arrogant and perverse. Certainly there is nothing in the facts recorded by profane authors inconsistent with his desire, obvious from the Gospel narrative, to save our Lord. But all his better feelings were overpowered by a selfish regard for his own security. He would not encounter the least hazard of personal annoyance in behalf of innocence and justice; the unrighteous condemnation of a good man was a trifle in comparison with the fear of the emperor's frown and the loss of place and power. While we do not differ from Chrysostom's opinion that he was παράνομος (Chrysost. i, 802, Adv. Judoeos, vi), or that recorded in the Apostolical Constitutions (v, 14), that he was ἄνατὸπος we yet see abundant reason for our Lord's merciful judgment, “He that delivered me unto thee hath the greater sin.” At the same time his history furnishes a proof that worldliness and want of principle are sources of crimes no less awful than those which spring from deliberate and reckless wickedness. The unhappy notoriety given to his name by its place in the two universal creeds of Christendom is due, not to any desire of singling him out for shame, but to the need of fixing the date of our Lord's death, and so bearing witness to the claims of Christianity as resting on a historical basis (August. Deuteronomy Fide et Symb. c. v, vol. vi, p. 156; Pearson, On the Creed, p. 239, 240, ed. Burt, and the authorities quoted in note c).

That the conduct of Pilate was highly criminal cannot be denied. But his guilt was light in comparison with the atrocious depravity of the Jews, especially the priests. His was the guilt of weakness and fear, theirs the guilt of settled and deliberate malice. His state of mind prompted him to attempt the release of an accused person in opposition to the clamors of a misguided mob; theirs urged them to compass the ruin of an acquitted person by instigating the populace, calumniating the prisoner, and terrifying the judge. If Pilate yielded against his judgment under the fear of personal danger, and so took part in an act of unparalleled injustice, the priests and their ready tools originated the false accusation, sustained it by subornation of perjury, and when it was declared invalid enforced their own unfounded sentence by appealing tot he lowest passions. Pilate, it is clear, was utterly destitute of principle. He was willing, indeed, to do right, if lie could do right without personal disadvantage. Of gratuitous wickedness he was perhaps incapable, certainly in the condemnation of Jesus he has the merit of being for a time on the side of innocence. But he yielded to violence, and so committed an awful crime. In his hands was the life of the prisoner. Convinced of his innocence, he ought to have set him at liberty, thus doing right regardless of consequences. But this is an act of high virtue which we hardly require at the hands of a Roman governor of Judaea; and though Pilate must bear the reproach of acting contrary to his own declared convictions, yet lie may equally claim some credit for the apparently sincere efforts which lie made in order to defeat the malice of the Jews and procure the liberation of Jesus.

If now we wish to sum up the judgment of Pilate's character, we easily see that he was one of that large class of men who aspire to public offices, not from a pure and lofty desire of benefiting the public and advancing the good of the world, but from selfish and personal considerations, from a love of distinction, from a love of power, from a love of self-indulgence; being destitute of any fixed principles, and having no aim but office and influence, they act right only by chance and when convenient, and are wholly incapable of pursuing a consistent course, or of acting with firmness and self-denial in cases in which the preservation of integrity requires the exercise of these qualities. Pilate was obviously a man of weak, and therefore, with his temptations, of corrupt character. The view given in the Apostolical Constitutions (v, 14), where unmanliness (ἀνανδρία) is ascribed to him, we take to be correct. This want of strength will readily account for his failing to rescue Jesus from the rage of his enemies, and also for the acts of injustice and cruelty which he practiced in his government-acts which, considered in themselves, wear a deeper dye than does the conduct which he observed in surrendering Jesus to the malice of the Jews. This same weakness may serve to explain to the reader how much influence would be exerted on this unjust judge, not only by the stern bigotry and persecuting wrath of the Jewish priesthood, but especially by the not concealed intimations which they threw out against Pilate that, if he liberated Jesus, he was no friend of Tiberius, and must expect to have to give an account of his conduct at Rome. That this was no idle threat, nothing beyond the limits of probability, Pilate's subsequent deposition by Vitellius shows very plainly; nor could the procurator have been ignorant either of the stern determination of the Jewish character, or of the offence he had by his acts given to the heads of the nation, or of the insecurity, at that very hour, when the contest between him and the priests was proceeding regarding the innocent victim whom they lusted to destroy, of his own position in the office which he held, and which, of course, he desired to retain. On the whole, then, viewing the entire conduct of Pilate, his previous iniquities as well as his bearing on the condemnation of Jesus — viewing his own actual position and the malignity of the Jews — we cannot, we confess, give our vote with those who have passed the severest condemnation on this weak and guilty governor.

The number of dissertations on Pilate's character and all the circumstances connected with him, his “facinora,” his “Christum servandi studium,” his wife's dream, his supposed letters to Tiberius, which have been published during the last and present centuries, is quite overwhelming. On this point the student may consult with advantage dean Alford's Commentary; Ellicott, Historical Lectures on the Life of our Lord, sect. vii; Neander's Life of Christ, § 285 (Bohn); Ewald, Geschichte, v, 30, etc. See also Miller, Deuteronomy enixiss. Pil. Christ. servand. stud. (Hamb. 1751); Tobler, in Pfenniger, Samml. z. christl. Mag. III, ii, (Zurich, 1782); Niemeyer, Charakt. i, 129 sq.; Paulus, Comment. iii, 697 sq.; Lücke, on John six. Comp. Schuster, in Eichhorn's Biblioth. d. bibl. Lit. x, 823; Olshausen, in answer to Tholuck's low valuation of Pilate, Comment. ii, 504 sq. The reader will find a discriminating analysis in Stier, Reden Jesu, vi, 318-382 (ii, 619 sq. of the American translation), and in Dr. Hanna's Last Day of Our Lord's Passion, p. 77-148. See also the Zeitschr. f. wissensch. Theol. 1871, vol. iv.

V. Apocryphal Accounts. — We learn from Justin Martyr (Apol. i, 76, 84), Tertullian (Apol. c. 21), Eusebius (Hist. Eccles. ii, 2), and others, that Pilate made an official report to Tiberius of our Lord's trial and condemnation; and in a homily ascribed to Chrysostom, though marked as spurious by his Benedictine editors (Hon. viii, in Pasch. viii, 968, D.), certain ὐπομνήματα (Aeta, or Commentarii Pilati) are spoken of as wellknown documents in common circulation. That he made such a report is highly probable, and it may have been in existence in Chrysostom's time; but the Acta Pilati now extant in Greek, and two Latin epistles from him to the emperor (Fabric. Apocr. i, 237, 298; iii, 111, 456), are certainly spurious. The number of extant “Acta Pilati,” in various forms, is so Urge as to show that very early the demand created a supply of documents manifestly spurious, and we have no reason for looking on any one of those that remain as more authentic than the others. The taunt of Celsus that the Christians circulated spurious or distorted narratives under this title (Origen, c. Cels.), and the complaint of Eusebius (Hilt. Eccles. ix, 5) that the heathens made them the vehicle of blasphemous calumnies, show how largely the machinery of falsification was used on either side. Such of these documents as are extant are found in the collections of Fabricius, Thilo, and Tischendorf. Some of them are but weak paraphrases of the Gospel history. The most extravagant are perhaps the most interesting, as indicating the existence of modes of thought at variance with the prevalent traditions. Of these anomalies the most striking is that known as the Paradosis Pilati (Tischendorf, Evang. Apoc. p. 426). The emperor Tiberius, startled at the universal darkness that had fallen on the Roman empire on the day of the crucifixion, summons Pilate to answer for having caused it. He is condemned to death, but before his execution he prays to the Lord Jesus that he may not be destroyed with the wicked Hebrews, and pleads his ignorance as an excuse. The prayer is answered by a voice from heaven, assuring him that all generations shall call him blessed. and that he shall be a witness for Christ at his second coming to judge the twelve tribes of Israel. An angel receives his head, and his wife dies filled with joy, and is buried with him. Startling as this imaginary history may be, it has its counterpart in the traditional customs of the Abyssinian Church, in which Pilate is recognised as a saint and martyr, and takes his place in the calendar on the 25th of June (Stanley, Eastern Church, p. 13; Neale, Eastern Church, i, 806). The words of Tertullian, describing him as “jam pro sua conscientia Christianus” (Apol. c. 21), indicate a like feeling, and we find traces of it also in the Apocryphal Gospel, which speaks of him as “uncircumcised in flesh, but circumcised in heart” (Evang. Nicod. i, 12, in Tischendorf, Evang. Apoc. p. 236).

According to another legend (Mrs Pilati, in Tischendorf's Evang. Apoc. p. 432), Tiberius, hearing of the wonderful works of healing that had been wrought in Judaea, writes to Pilate, bidding him to send to Rome the man that had this divine power. Pilate has to confess that he has crucified him; but the messenger meets Veronica, who gives him the cloth which had received the impress of the divine features, and by this the emperor is healed. Pilate is summoned to take his trial, and presents himself wearing the holy and seamless tunic. This acts as a spell upon the emperor, and he forgets his wonted severity. After a time Pilate is thrown into prison, and there commits suicide. His body is cast into the Tiber, but as storms and tempests followed, the Romans take it up and send it to Vienne. It is thrown into the Rhone; but the same disasters follow, and it is sent on to Losania (Lucerne or Lausanne?). There it is sunk in a pool, fenced round by mountains, and even there the waters boil or bubble strangely. The interest of this story obviously lies in its presenting an early form (the existing text is of the 14th century) of the local traditions which connect the name of the procurator of Judaea with the Mount Pilatus that overlooks the lake of Lucerne. The received explanation (Ruskin, Modern Painters, v, 128) of the legend, as originating in a distortion of the descriptive name Mons Pileatus (the “cloud-capped”), supplies a curious instance of the genesis of a myth from a false etymology; but it may be questioned whether it rests on sufficient grounds, and is not rather the product of a pseudocriticism, finding in a name the starting-point, not the embodiment of a legend. Have we any evidence that the mountain was known as “Pileatus” before the legend? Have we not, in the apocryphal story just cited, the legend independently of the name? (comp. Vilmar, Deutsche Nationalliteratur, i, 217). The extent to which the terror connected with the belief formerly prevailed is somewhat startling. If a stone were thrown into the lake, a violent storm would follow. No one was allowed to visit it without a special permission from the authorities of Lucerne. The neighboring shepherds were bound by a solemn oath, renewed annually, never to guide a stranger to it (Gessner, Descript. Mont. Pilat. [Zurich, 1555], p. 40). The spell was broken in 1584 by Johannes Müller, curd of Lucerne, who was bold enough to throw stones and abide the consequences (Golbery, Univers pittoresque de la Suisse, p.327). It is striking that traditions of Pilate attach themselves to several localities in the south of France (comp. Murray's Hand-book for France, Route 125).

But whatever we may think of these legends, or even of the apocryphal works that have come down to our own times, there can be little doubt that the original documents referred to by the early Church fathers were genuine (Hencke, Opusc. A cad. p. 201 sq.). Such is the opinion of Winer (Realwörterb.). Lardner, who has fully discussed the subject, decides that “it must be allowed by all that Pontius Pilate composed some memoirs concerning our Saviour, and sent them to the emperor” (vi. 610). Winer adds,” What we now have in Greek under this title (Pilate's Report; see Fabricii Apocr. i, 237, 239; iii, 456), as well as the two letters of Pilate to Tiberius, are fabrications of a later age.” So Lardner: “The Acts of Pontius Pilate, and his letter to Tiberius, which we now have, are not genuine, but manifestly spurious.” We have not space here to review the arguments which have been adduced in favor of and against these documents; but we must add that we attach some importance to them, thinking it by no means unlikely that, if they are fabrications, they are fabricated in some keeping with the genuine pieces, which were in some way lost, and the loss of which the composers of our actual pieces sought as well as they could to repair. If this view can be sustained, then the documents we have may serve to help us in the use of discretion to the substance of the original Acts. At all events, it seems certain that an official report was made by Pilate; and thus we gain another proof that “these things were not done in a corner.” Those who wish to enter into this subject should first consult Lardner (ut sup.), and the valuable. references he gives. See also Altman, Deuteronomy Epist. Pil. ad Tiber. (Bern. 1755); Van Dale, Deuteronomy Orac. p. 609 sq.; Schmidt, Einleitung ins N. T. ii, 249 sq. Of especial value is Hermansson, Deuteronomy Pontio Pilot. (Upsala, 1624); also Burger, Deuteronomy Pontio Pilat. (Misen. 1782). The latest work on the subject is that of Lipsius, Die Pilatus-Acten, kritisch untersucht (Kiel, 1871). See ACTS OF PILATE.

On the general subject of this article, the reader may refer to Germar, Docetur ad loca P. Pilati facinora coet. (Thorun, 1785); Lengheimich, Deuteronomy Pilati patris: (s. I. 1677); Gotter, Deuteronomy Conjugis Pilati Somnio (Jen. 1704); Kluge, Deuteronomy Somnio Uxoris Pilati (Hal. 1720); Herbart, Examen Somnii Ux. Pil. (Oldenb. 1735); Distell, Deuteronomy Solute Uxoris Pilati (Alt. 1772); Moonier, Deuteronomy Pilati in Causa Servat. agendi ratione (1825); Warneck, Pont. Pil. ein Gemälde (Goths, 1867); Theol. and Lit.Tournal. April, 1861. Hase, in his Leben Jesu, p. 203, 205 (third ed.), affords valuable literary references on this, as on so many other N.T. subjects. See also the monographs referred to by Volbeding, Index Programmatum, p. 58, 59. See JESUS CHRIST.

Pilate's Staircase. This celebrated staircase is contained within a little chapel near the church of St. John Lateran, at Rome. It consists of twenty- eight white marble steps, and it is alleged by Romanists that this is the holy staircase which Christ several times ascended and descended when he appeared before Pilate, and that it was carried by angels from Jerusalem to Rome. Multitudes of pilgrims at certain periods crawl up the steps of this staircase on their knees, with rosaries in their hands, and kissing each step as they ascend. On reaching the top, the pilgrim must repeat a short prayer. The performance of this ceremony is regarded as peculiarly meritorious, and entitling the devout pilgrim to a plenary indulgence. It was during this act of devotion that Martin Luther, then a monk, was startled by the remembrance of the text, “The just shall live by faith.” He instantly saw the folly of such performances; and fleeing in shame from the place, became from that time a zealous reformer. By the Romanists this staircase is called Scala Santa, or holy staircase.

## Pildash[[@Headword:Pildash]]

             (Heb. Pildash', פַּלְדָּשׁ, according to Furst, for פֶּלֶד אֵשׁ, flame of fire; Sept. Φαλδές), the sixth named of the eight sons of Nahor, Abraham's brother, by his niece and wife, Milcah (Gen 22:22). B.C. cir. 2046. “The settlement of his descendants has not been identified with any degree of probability. Bunsen (Bibelwerk, Gen 22:22) compares Ripalthas, a place in the north-east of Mesopotamia; but the resemblance of the two names is probably accidental” (Smith).

## Pile-Tower, Or Pele-Tower[[@Headword:Pile-Tower, Or Pele-Tower]]

             an architectural term, seems to have signified a small fortress, dwelling, or tower, capable of being defended against any sudden marauding expedition. Church towers appear to have been sometimes used for the same purpose. Some of these towers, which were used for habitations, have had additions made to them subsequent to their erection. Heifer-haw tower, near Alnwick, and a tower in Corbridge churchyard, were probably pele-towers only. Pile, a fortress, occurs only in names of places in the Isle of Man, Lancashire, and the neighboring parts, but it is an archaic term not exclusively northern.

## Pileha[[@Headword:Pileha]]

             (Heb. Pilcha', פַּלְחָא, the slice, or worship; Sept. Φαλαεύ), the head of one of the Jewish families who sealed the covenant with Nehemiah (Neh 10:24 [Heb. 25]). B.C. 445.

## Piles[[@Headword:Piles]]

             SEE HAEMORRHOIDS.

## Pileser[[@Headword:Pileser]]

             SEE TIGLATH-PILESER.

## Pilet, Jean Alexandre Samuel[[@Headword:Pilet, Jean Alexandre Samuel]]

             a Reformed theologian, was born at Yverdon, Switzerland, September 19, 1797. He studied at Lausanne, and was ordained in 1821. In the same year he was called to Morges as director of the college, and in 1828 succeeded Louis Henri Manuel as pastor of the French Reformed Church at Frankfort-on-the-Main. In 1834 he returned to Switzerland, and was in 1836 appointed professor of Biblical literature at Genoa. He died April 5, 1865. Pilet was one of the Old-Test. translators of the French Bible, called the Version de Lausanne. See Chretien Evangeliqae (1868); — A. De Montet, Diction. Biogr. des Genevois et des Valudois qui se sont Distingqus, etc. (Lausanne, 1878); Lichtenberger, L'cyclop. des Sciences Religieuses, s.v. (B.P.)

## Pilgrim[[@Headword:Pilgrim]]

             is used in the A. V. only in the old sense of sojourner, for παρεπίδημος (Heb 11:13; 1Pe 2:11; “stranger,” 1Pe 1:1). Similarly in the O.T. “pilgrimage” occurs as a rendering of מָגוּר, maguir, which signifies a stay, or an abode in a foreign country, travels (en. 17:8).  Metaphorically, it is applied to the sojourning on earth; thus the patriarch Jacob says to Pharaoh, “The days of the years of my pilgrimage are a hundred and thirty years (Gen 47:9). The Psalmist likewise says, “Thy statutes have been my songs in the house of my pilgrimage” (Psa 119:54).

## Pilgrim (2)[[@Headword:Pilgrim (2)]]

             a German prelate of mediaeval times, flourished from 970 to 991. He was first engaged in missionary work among the Hungarians. He held different ecclesiastical positions, and at last was made bishop of Passau. In 974 he drew up for pope Benedict VI a remarkable report concerning the spread of Christianity in Hungary, but the paper was somewhat exaggerated and probably prepared by Pilgrim to further some particular interest of his own. The truth is that, like his predecessors, he was striving to assert his independence of the archbishopric of Salzburg; and he defended the dignity and rights of that ancient metropolis, the long since dilapidated city of Lorch (Laureacum), whose diocese stretched onward to Pannonia. “And so we may suppose,” says Neander, “that in his efforts to convince the pope (from whom, in fact, he obtained the fulfillment of his wishes) how necessary the restoration of this metropolis was to Pannonia and to its subordinate bishoprics, he allowed himself to be betrayed into a somewhat exaggerated representation of this new sphere of labor in Hungary.” See Neander, History of the Christian Church, 3, 331 sq.; Kurtz, Lehrbuch d. Kirchengesch. (7th ed.) 1, 294; Theolog. Univ. — Lex. s.v. (B. P.)

## Pilgrim Fathers[[@Headword:Pilgrim Fathers]]

             a name often given to the early settlers of New England. The ship “Mayflower,” that bore the first of them, left Plymouth Sept. 6, 1620, and on Dec. 6 the passengers landed on a rock in Cape Cod harbor. The men engaged in the formation of the New England colonies have seldom been surpassed in sagacity and prowess, in piety and benevolent exertion. Many of them were men of education and rank; they were eminently free from the low and degrading vices of the statesmen of that age. The political trust committed to them was felt to be an awful deposit. It was their constant aim, one which they carried with them to the council-chamber, and bore back with them to the closet in their religious exercises, that each colonist should exhibit the lofty mien of a freeman, and wear the dignity of an heir to heaven; that he should bow the knee to none but God, and bear no yoke but his who is meek and lowly in heart. The grief of bidding farewell to friends, country, and home lid not produce in them a sentimental lethargy, but was borne with manly courage and Christian heroism. In the long and tedious voyage their hearts sank not. Their spirit did not fail them in the midst of those difficulties and dangers with which foreign adventure abounds. The sultry climate, the swamp and the forest, the solitary encampment, and the whoop of the savage, were calmly and successfully encountered. Like their leaders, the majority of them were men of God. The men that landed from the “Mayflower” on the rock of Plymouth felt themselves to be “chosen vessels,” and the consciousness of their solemn consecration was the deepest sensation of their religious experience. The preservation of the ordinances of religion was a principal endeavor with them. The first trees of the virgin forest were felled for the sanctuary— “a man was famous according as he had lifted up axes upon the thick trees.” Truly did they vow, “If I forget thee, O Jerusalem, let my hand forget her cunning.” Their inner life nourished itself by frequent days of fasting and prayer. These were seasons of coveted enjoyment. Their firmness might be somewhat stern, their rigidness of observance might generate formality, yet their heart was with God, his law their guide, his glory their aim. In every crisis they inquired at the oracle of Jehovah; in seasons of deliverance they  entered his courts with praise— “a multitude that kept holiday;” in times of impending danger they placed themselves under the protection of him to whom the shields of the earth belong. They were a people worthy of those high-souled patriots who were their leaders, both in civil polity and religion. Few statesmen of that day had the purity of Winthrop, few ministers the learning of Cotton, the endowments of Hooker, or the self- sacrificing spirit of Roger Williams. SEE PURITANS.

## Pilgrim, Johann Ulrich[[@Headword:Pilgrim, Johann Ulrich]]

             an engraver on wood, and the supposed inventor of engraving in chiaro- oscuro. Little is known of him or of his works, except a few prints, which are marked with two pilgrims' staves crossed between the initials Jo. V. Among the ten prints mentioned by Bartsch are these: Christ on the Cross, with the Magdalen kneeling at its foot, and the Virgin and St. John standing one on either side; The Virgin, seated in a garden, with the Infant on her knee; The Virgin, half-length, with the Infant in her arms; St.  Jerome in the Desert, with a book in one hand and a stone in the other; and St. Sebastian, tied to a tree.

## Pilgrim, religious[[@Headword:Pilgrim, religious]]

             SEE PILGRIMAGES.

## Pilgrimage of Grace, the[[@Headword:Pilgrimage of Grace, the]]

             In the time of Henry VIII, it is said that by the dissolution of the lesser monasteries about ten thousand persons became (rather from choice than necessity, for they had the option of being transferred to the larger houses) applicants for public bounty. These persons, traversing the kingdom, by the detail of their sufferings created extensive dissatisfaction, and popular feeling was with them. Many of the people also sympathized with the inmates of nunneries, some of whom they were taught to regard as ladies of gentle lives and kind deeds, whose monastic charities were necessarily suspended when their communities were dispersed. An attempt was made to suppress the growing disturbance by restoring thirty of the less disorderly of the suppressed houses. But the storm broke out first in Lincolnshire, and subsequently in Yorkshire, where forty thousand men marched with crucifixes and banners before them, calling their expedition the Pilgrimage of Grace, and avowing their object to be the removal of low-born counselors (Cromwell, the chancellor, was the son of a blacksmith at Putney), the suppression of heresy, and the restitution of the Church. These rebel forces, however, melted away without any action; and their leader Aske, upon a repetition of the outbreak, was beheaded for treason. Many of the abbots and friars were supposed to be implicated in the pilgrimage.

## Pilgrimages[[@Headword:Pilgrimages]]

             are exercises of religious discipline, which consist in journeying to some place of reputed sanctity, frequently in discharge of a vow.

Christian Pilgrimages. — The idea of any peculiar sacredness being attached to special localities under the Christian dispensation was very strikingly rebuked by Christ in his conversation with the woman of Samaria, as recorded in John 4; and nowhere is the principle on this subject more plainly laid down than in the Lord's statement on that occasion: “The hour cometh, and now is, when the true worshippers shall worship the Father in spirit and in truth: for the Father seeketh such to worship him.” In proportion, however, as Christianity receded from the apostolic age, it gradually lost sight of the simplicity and spirituality which marked its primitive character, and availed itself of carnal expedients for the purpose  of elevating the imagination and kindling the devotion of its votaries. Hence, in the 4th century, many, encouraged by the example of the emperor Constantine, whose superstitious tendencies were strong, resorted to the scenes of the Savior's life and ministry for the nourishing and invigoration of their religious feelings and desires. Helena, the mother of Constantine, set the first example of a pilgrimage to Palestine, which was soon extensively imitated; partly, as in the case of Constantine, with a desire to be baptized in the Jordan, but still more from a veneration for the spots which were associated with the events of the history of Christ and his apostles. Thus a superstitious attachment to the Holy Land increased so extensively that some of the most eminent teachers of the Church, as Jerome and Gregory of Nyssa, openly disapproved these pilgrimages. The most frequent resort of pilgrims was Jerusalem, but to this were afterwards added Rome, Tours, and Compostella. As to the last-named place, we find that in the year 1428, under the reign of Henry VI, abundance of licenses were granted by the crown of England to captains of English ships for carrying numbers of devout persons to the shrine of St. James; provided, however, that those pilgrims should first make oath not to take anything prejudicial to England, nor to reveal any of its secrets, nor to carry out with them any more gold or silver than would be sufficient for their reasonable expenses. In that year 926 persons went from England on the said pilgrimage. In our own times the greatest numbers have resorted to Loretto (q.v.), in order to visit the chamber of the Blessed Virgin, in which she was born, and brought up her son Jesus till he was twelve years of age! or to Paray le Monial (q.v.), to pay homage to the Virgin Marie à la Coque (q.v.).

In the Middle Ages pilgrimages were regarded as a mark of piety, but, as might have been expected, they gave rise to the most flagrant abuses. We find accordingly pope Boniface, in a letter to Cuthbert, archbishop of Canterbury, in the 8th century, desiring that women and nuns might be restrained from their frequent pilgrimages to Rome. The second Council of Chalons also, which was held in A.D. 813, denounces in no measured terms the false trust reposed in pilgrimages to Rome, and also to the church of St. Martin at Tours. “There are clergymen,” complains this ecclesiastical synod, ‘“who lead an idle life, and trust thereby to be purified from sin, and to fulfill the duties of their calling; and there are laymen who believe that they may sin or have sinned with impunity because they undertook such pilgrimages; there are great men who, under this pretext,  practice the grossest extortion among their people; and there are poor men who employ the same excuse to render begging a more profitable employment. Such are those who wander round about, and falsely declare that they are on a pilgrimage; while there are others whose folly is so great that they believe that they become purified from their sins by the mere sight of the holy places, forgetting the words of St. Jerome, who says that there is nothing meritorious in seeing Jerusalem, but in leading a good life there.” It was between the 11th and the 13th centuries, however, that the rage for pilgrimages came to its height. About the commencement of the period now referred to the idea extensively prevailed throughout Europe that the thousand years mentioned in the Apocalypse were near their close, and the end of the world was at hand. A general consternation spread among all classes, and many individuals, parting with their property and abandoning their friends and families, set out for the Holy Land, where they imagined that Christ would appear to judge the world. While Palestine had been in the hands of the caliphs, pilgrimages to Jerusalem had been encouraged as offering them an ample source of revenue; but no sooner had Syria been conquered by the Turks, in the middle of the 11th century, than pilgrims to the Holy Land began to be exposed to even species of insult. The minds of men in every part of Christendom were now inflamed with indignation at the cruelties and impositions of the Mohammedan possessors of the holy places; and in such circumstances the Church enthusiasts found little difficulty in originating the Crusades (q.v.), and for two centuries vast armies of pilgrims poured into the Holy Land. It was easier for the Crusaders, however, to make their conquests than to preserve them; and accordingly, before the 13th century had passed away, the Christians were driven out of all their Asiatic possessions, and the holy places fell anew into the hands of the infidels.

In almost every country where Romanism prevails pilgrimages have been and still are common. In England, at one time, the shrine of Thomas K. Becket, and in Scotland that of St. Andrew, was the favorite resort of devout pilgrims. But even down to the present day there are various places in Ireland where stations and holy wells attract crowds of devout worshippers every year; and many parts of that country are sacred to extraordinary worship and pilgrimage. From the beginning of May till the middle of August every year crowds of popish penitents resort to an island near the center of Lough Fin, or White Lake, in the county of Donegal, to the amount of three or four thousand. These are mostly of the poorer sort,  and many of them are proxies for those who are richer; some of whom, however, together with some of the priests and bishops, on occasion make their appearance there. When the pilgrim comes within sight of the holy lake he must uncover his hands and feet. and thus walk to the water-side, and is taken to the island for sixpence. Here are two chapels and fifteen other houses, to which are added confessionals, so contrived that the priest cannot see the person confessing. The penance varies according to the circumstances of the penitent, during the continuance of which (sometimes three, six, or nine days) he subsists on oatmeal sometimes made into bread. He traverses sharp stones on his bare knees or feet, and goes through a variety of other forms, paying sixpence at every different confession. When all is over the priest bores a gimlet-hole through the top of the pilgrim's staff, in which he fastens a cross peg; gives him as many holy pebbles out of the lake as he cares to carry away, for amulets to be presented to his friends, and so dismisses him, an object of veneration to all other papists not thus initiated, who no sooner see the pilgrim's cross in his hands than they kneel down to get his blessing. But France, even in modern times, remains the special patron of Roman Catholic devotees. Thus the N.Y. Tribune correspondent writes under Aug. 27, 1875, from Paris: “If half a million was a correct estimate the faithful will tell you that it was too low of the number of those who had already this year, at the date of my 10th of July letter, gone on foot or wheels to pay their devotions at this, that, and the other French shrine, by this it should be near a million and a half. We are now in the height of the pilgrimage season. Never in modern times, if in any time, was there another like it for brisk and multitudinous pious peregrination. One day it is 100,000 devotees about Notre Dame de la Garde; on another 20,000 at Canmbrai, 10,000 at Notre Dame de Liesse, at La Salette, and Lourdes, besides great days and extraordinary occasions. The affluence is constant, with a sprinkling of miraculous cures from the thaumaturgic springs of the last-named places. There is hardly a diocese whose bishop does not exalt the merits of some local shrine for convenience of tender-footed or short-winded devotees of his flock.” In Belgium also the same priestly management prevails. The chief object is, of course, the attraction of immense flocks of pilgrims from all parts of the world to enrich from their offerings the depleted coffers of the papacy, and to incite the popular mind to renewed ardor in the promotion of all the objects at which Romanism has been wont to aim. SEE ROMANISM.

Peculiar usages have prevailed from time to time among the pilgrims of Christianity. Thus the English pilgrim's weeds consisted of a hood with a cape, a low-crowned hat with two strings, a staff or bourdon four or five feet long, made originally of two sticks swathed together, a bottle strung at their waist-belt, and scrip. Those whose pilgrimage was self-imposed walked barefooted, and begged their daily bread, let their beards grow, and wore no linen. The palmer was distinguished by two leaflets of palm; the pilgrim to Mount Sinai wore the St. Catharine's wheel; he who went to Rome came back with a medal, graven with the cross-keys, or vernicle; the pilgrim to Compostella brought home the scallop-shell of Galicia; those who went to Walsingham were distinguished by a badge; and from Canterbury the pilgrim carried, as a memorial, an ampulla full of Canterbury water, which was mingled with one tiny drop of k Becket's blood. Latimer mentions “the piping, playing, and curious singing, to solace the travail and weariness of pilgrims.” At Gloucester the pilgrims' door, with its colossal warders, remains in the south arm of the transept. In the holy wars the French Crusaders were distinguished by a red, English by a white, and Flemings by a green cross. Penitents paid Peter's pence as a composition for a pilgrimage to Rome, or commuted it by a visit to Peterborough, St. Alban's, or St. David's. In 1064, persons going to visit a saint had the protection of the Church. At Hereford, a canon might be absent on a pilgrimage in England for three weeks; and once in his life for seven weeks to visit St. Denis; ten weeks, Rome and Compostella; eight, Pontegnes; and one year, Jerusalem. In some Continental countries pilgrims and priests sometimes inscribed their names on the altars which they visited. These were called inscripta, or literata, but must not be confounded with those bearing the dono's name; the first instance of the latter custom occurred in the case of Pulcherius at Constantinople, as Sozomen relates. The pilgrim's tomb sometimes bore the print of two bare feet, as emblematical of his safe return. The pilgrims, having been first shriven, prostrated themselves before the altar while prayers were said over them, and stood up to receive the priest's benediction on their scrips and staves, which he sprinkled with holy water and delivered into their hands. If they were going to Jerusalem, a cross was marked upon their garment; the ceremonial terminated with a solemn mass. In 1322 a priest who betrayed a confession had to go on a pilgrimage as a penance. In 1200 monks were forbidden to become pilgrims. “Divers men and women,” said W. Thorpe ill the 15th century, “have with them both men and women that can well sing wanton songs, some other have bagpipes, so that in every town, what  with the noise of their singing and with the sound of their piping, and with the jingling of their Canterbury bells, and with the barking out of dogs after them, they make more noise than if the king came there away with all his clarions and many other minstrels.” The staff had sometimes a bronze socket, inscribed with these words in Latin, “May this cross direct thy journey in safety.”

Jewish Pilgrimages. — Among the Jews pilgrimages to Jerusalem are made by the most devoted only. The Polish and Russian Jews, greatly oppressed in their homes, occasionally seek relief by a journey to the city of Zion, there to pray for the speedy coming of the Messiah. That sect of Judaism known as the Chasidim have their yearly processions to Sandez, the nursery of the most absurd superstition. The time for this pilgrimage is generally on the first days of the month of Elul. As soon as the sound of the cornet proclaims the approach of the new year the Chasidim of Galicia and Russian Poland hasten in large numbers to Sandez, to manifest their adoration and veneration by rich presents to the rabbi working miracles, who presides at Sandez. About that time the city authorities and the rabbi assume a very friendly relation, and the quiet life of the place changes into activity by the increase of strangers. The streets are filled with Chasidim, who come from afar off to open their heart and confide their secret wishes to the wonder-working man.

Mohammedan Pilgrimages. — In Mohammedan countries, pilgrimages are much in vogue. The pilgrimage to Mecca (q.v.) is not only expressly commanded in the Koran, but is regarded by the Arabian prophet as indispensable to all his followers. In his view, a believer neglecting this duty, if it were in his power to perform it, might as well die a Christian or a Jew. The Persians, however, instead of subjecting themselves to a toilsome pilgrimage to Mecca, look upon the country of which Babylon formerly, and now Baghdad, is the chief city, as the holy land in which are deposited the ashes of Ali and the rest of the holy martyrs. Not only do the living resort thither, but many bring along with them the dead bodies of their relatives, to lay them in the sacred earth. Pilgrimage is a duty binding upon all Moslems, both men and women. Inability is the only admitted ground of exemption, and Mohammedan casuists have determined that those who are incapable must perform it by deputy, and bear the expense of these substitutes. What is principally reverenced in Mecca, and gives sanctity to the whole, is a square stone building, called the Kaaba (q.v.). Before the time of Mohammed this temple was a place of worship for the idolatrous  Arabs, and is said to have contained no less than three hundred and sixty different images, equaling in number the days of the Arabian year. They were all destroyed by Mohammed, who sanctified the Kaaba, and appointed it to be the chief place of worship for all true believers. The Mussulmans pay so great a veneration to it that they believe a single sight of its sacred walls, without any particular act of devotion, is as meritorious in the sight of God as the most careful discharge of one's duty for the space of a whole year in any other temple. To this temple every Mohammedan who has health and means sufficient ought once, at least, in his life to go on a pilgrimage; nor are women excused from the performance of this duty. The pilgrims meet at different places near Mecca, according to the different parts from whence they come during the months of Shawal and Dhu'lhaja, being obliged to be there by the beginning of the latter; which month, as its name imports, is peculiarly set apart for the celebration of this solemnity. The men put on the ibram or sacred habit, which consists only of two woolen wrappers, one wrapped about the middle, and the other thrown over their shoulders, having their heads bare, and a kind of slippers which cover neither the heel nor the instep, and so enter the sacred territory on their way to Mecca. While they have this habit on they must neither hunt nor fowl (though they are allowed to fish), which precept is so punctually observed that they will not kill vermin if they find them on their bodies: there are some noxious animals, however, which they have permission to kill during the pilgrimage, as kites, ravens, scorpions, mice, and dogs given to bite. During the pilgrimage it behooves a man to have a constant guard over his words and actions; to avoid all quarreling or ill language, all converse with women, and all obscene discourse; and to apply his whole attention to the good work he is engaged in.

The pilgrims being arrived at Mecca, immediately visit the temple, and then enter on the performance of the prescribed ceremonies, which consist chiefly in going in procession round the Kaaba, in running between the Mounts Safa and Meriva, in making the station on Mount Arafat, and slaying the victims and shaving their heads in the valley of Mina. In compassing the Kaaba, which they do seven times, beginning at the corner where the black stone is fixed, they use a short, quick pace the first three times they go round it, and a grave, ordinary pace the last four; which, it is said, was ordered by Mohammed, that his followers might show themselves strong and active, to cut off the hopes of the infidels; who gave out that the immoderate heats of Medina had rendered them weak. The aforesaid quick pace, however, they are not obliged to use every time they perform this piece of devotion,  but only at some particular times. As often as they pass by the black stone they either kiss it, or touch it with their hand, and kiss that. The running between Safa and Meriva is also performed seven times, partly with a slow pace and partly running; for they walk gravely till they come to a place between two pillars; and there they run, and afterwards walk again, sometimes looking back, and sometimes stopping, like one who had lost something, to represent Hagar seeking water for her son; for the ceremony is said to be as ancient as her time. On the 9th of Dhu'lhaja. after morning prayer, the pilgrims leave the valley of Mina, whither they come the day before, and proceed in a tumultuous and rushing manner to Mount Arafat and Mina, and there spend the night in prayer and reading the Koran. The next morning by daybreak they visit el-Mashar el-Karam, or the sacred monument; and, departing thence before sunrise, haste by Batn-Mohasser to the valley of Mina, where they throw seven stones at three marks or pillars, in imitation of Abraham, who, meeting the devil in that place, and being by him disturbed in his devotions, or tempted to disobedience when he was going to sacrifice his son, was commanded by God to drive him away by throwing stones at him; though others pretend that this rite is as old as Adam, who also put the devil to flight in the same place and by the same means. The ceremony being over, on the same day, the 10th of Dhu'lhaja, the pilgrims slay their victims in the said valley of Mina, of which they and their friends eat part, and the rest is given to the poor. These victims must be either sheep, goats, kine, or camels; males, if either of the two former kinds, and females if either of the latter, and of a fit age. The sacrifices being over, they shave their heads and cut their nails, burying them in the same place; after which the pilgrimage is looked upon as completed, though they again visit the Kaaba to take their leave of that sacred building. The pilgrimage to Mecca was interrupted for a quarter of a century by the Carmathians, and in our own day it has been again interrupted by the Wahabis, and these in turn were defeated by Mohammed Ali, who revived the pilgrimage and attended with his court. In the year 1873. 200,000 pilgrims visited the holy places. But in the present year (1877) pilgrimages to Mecca have been revived in marvelous force, owing to the contest of Turkey with Russia, and it is expected that nearly one half million people, if not more, will bring tribute to the Kaaba, the treasures of which, amounting to over 200,000,000 piasters, or $50,000,000, have been placed at the disposal of the sultan of Turkey, and are to be used in the defense of the Mussulman's faith.  Heathen Pilgrimages. — Among heathen nations, also, pilgrimages are practiced. In Japan, more especially, all the different sects have their regular places of resort. The pilgrimage which is esteemed by the Sintuists as the most meritorious is that of Istje, which all are bound to make once a year, or at least once in their life. Another class of pilgrims are the Siunse, who go to visit in pilgrimage the thirty-three principal temples of Canon, which are scattered over the empire. Besides these regular pilgrimages, the Japanese also undertake occasional religious journeys to visit certain temples in fulfillment of certain vows. These pilgrims travel alone, almost always running, and, though generally very poor, refuse to receive charity from others (comp. McFarland, Japan, p. 211).

Hinduism has its pilgrimages on a grand scale. Thousands and tens of thousands annually repair to the temple of Jaggernaut (q.v.). Equally famed as the resort of multitudes of Hindu pilgrims is the island of Ganga Sagor, where the holiest branch of the Ganges (q.v.) is lost in the waters of the Indian Ocean. To visit this sacred river hundreds of thousands annually abandon their homes, and travel for months amid many hardships and dangers, and should they reach the scene of their pilgrimage, it is only in many cases that they may plunge themselves and their unconscious babies into the troubled but, in their view, purifying waters, offering themselves and their little ones as voluntary victims to the holy river. Among the numberless sacred spots in Hindostan may be mentioned Jumnontri, a village on the banks of the Jumna, which is so famed as a place of pilgrimage that those who resort thither are considered as thereby almost entitled to divine honors. The holy town of Hurdwar may also be noticed, to which pilgrims resort from every corner of the East where Hinduism is known; and of such efficacy is the water of the Ganges at this point that even the guiltiest may be cleansed from sin by a single ablution. The Hindus also attach great importance to pilgrimages to the holy temples at Benares and other sacred shrines. Sometimes these are performed on sandals with small spikes inserted, every step causing pain to the pilgrim. In other cases, the whole distance of hundreds of miles is traveled by the infatuated fakir tumbling over and over, like a wagon-wheel, without ever standing on his feet; for the greater the pain and suffering with which the pilgrimage is accomplished, the greater is the merit attached to its performance. It often happens that poor pilgrims perish on the road for want of food, or in consequence of sufferings arising from the severe penalty which they inflict upon themselves. But instead of this being a  warning to others, it is considered highly meritorious to fall in the effort to fulfill a vow made in honor of their idol gods. The Buddhists, though not so devoted to pilgrimages as the Hindus, are not without their places of sacred resort. One of the most noted is Adam's Peak, in Ceylon, where Gotama Buddha is supposed to have left the impression of his foot. The summit of the peak is annually visited by great numbers of pilgrims. The Lamaists of Thibet also make an annual pilgrimage to Lha-Ssa for devotional purposes.

Dr. Johnson gives us some observations on pilgrimage, which are so much to the purpose that we shall here present them to the reader: “Pilgrimage, like many other acts of piety, may be reasonable or superstitious, according to the principles upon which it is performed. Long journeys in search of truth are not commanded; truth, such as is necessary to the regulation of life, is always found where it is honestly sought; change of place is no natural cause of the increase of piety, for it inevitably produces dissipation of mind. Yet since men go every day to view the fields where great actions have been performed, and return with stronger impressions of the event, curiosity of the same kind may naturally dispose us to view that country whence our religion had its beginning. That the Supreme Being may be more easily propitiated in one place than another is the dream of idle superstition; but that some places may operate upon our own minds in an uncommon manner is an opinion which hourly experience will justify. He who supposes that his vices may be more successfully combated in Palestine, will, perhaps, find himself mistaken; yet he may go thither without folly: he who thinks they will be more freely pardoned dishonors at once his reason and his religion” (Johnson's Rasselas). See Encyclop. Brit. s.v.; Gardner, Faiths of the World, s.v.; British Quar. Rev. July, 1875, art. 5; Mediceval and Modern Saints, p. 112, 159; Baptist Quar. April, 1875, art. 7; Cutts, Scenes and Characters of the Middle Ages (Lond. 1873), essay 3; Lea, Sacerdotal Celibacy; Butler, Church History, 1, 410, 447; Riddle, Hist. of the Papacy; Gieseler, Ecclesiastical History; Mosheim, Ecclesiastical History, vol. 2; Walcott, Sacred Archceöl. s.v.

## Pilgrims and Strangers[[@Headword:Pilgrims and Strangers]]

             SEE SIONITES.

## Pilgrims, Poor[[@Headword:Pilgrims, Poor]]

             an order of Roman Catholic devotees, which originated about the year 1500. They commenced in Italy, but passed into Germany, where they wandered about as mendicants, barefooted and bareheaded.

## Pilkington, James[[@Headword:Pilkington, James]]

             a noted Anglican prelate, who flourished in the great Reformation period of the 16th century, was born of an ancient gentleman's family at Rivington, in Lancashire, in 1520. He was educated at St. John's College, Cambridge, and after graduation took holy orders. Under the reign of king Edward he distinguished himself as one of the disputants against transubstantiation, but under the reign of bloody Mary he was obliged to leave the country, as he was very decided in his Protestant proclivities. He lived for a while at Zurich, and then at Basle. When suffered to return, in 1558, after the accession of Elizabeth, he was made master of his alma mater. He interested himself in educational affairs generally throughout the kingdom, and in his native place established a free-school, which he himself endowed. In 1561 he was elevated to the bishopric of Durham, and became noted for his tolerant views. Thus, in 1564, he advocated indulgence to Nonconformists, and to all who scrupled to observe practices or assume obligations having any appearance of popish tendency. Bishop Pilkington died in 1575. He published, Exposition of the Prophet Haggeus (Lond. 1560, 8vo): — and on Obadiah (1560), Nehemiah (Camb. 1585, 4to), Ecclesiastes, Epistle of Peter, and of Paul to the Galatians: — Def of the Engl. Service; and, besides, many sermons. His Works were edited, with biographical notices, for the Parker Society, by the Rev. James Scholefield, regius professor of Greek, Cambridge (Camb. 1842, 8vo). See Strype's Cranmer, Parker, and Grindal; Hardwick, Hist. of the Ref. p. 219 et al.; Soames, Elizabethan Ch. History, p. 22, 49, 605; Burnet, Hist. of the Ref.; Hook, Eccles. Biog. 8, 92. (J. H. W.)

## Pilkington, Matthew[[@Headword:Pilkington, Matthew]]

             an English divine, flourished near the middle of the last century as prebend of Lichfield. He is especially noted as a secular writer. He is also the author of Evangelical History and Harmony (Lond. 1747, fol.), which is executed with great care, and is of some value: —A Rational Concordance (Nottingh. 1749, 4to), which is now extremely scarce: and Remarks upon several Passages of Scripture (Camb. and Lond. 1759, 8vo), which, according to Orme (Bibl. Bibl. s.v.), “contains a considerable portion of valuable matter.” Pilkington also published several of his sermons (1733, 4to; 1755, 8vo), etc.

## Pillar[[@Headword:Pillar]]

             is a term frequently occurring in the Scriptures, especially of the O.T., where it is used in different senses, and as the rendering of several Heb. and Gr. words, which need to be distinguished both in their meaning and application.

I. Original Words so Translated. —

1. From the root נָצִב, natsdb, to station, come the following: מִצֵּבָה, Matstsebâh (rendered “pillar” everywhere in Genesis, and in Exo 24:4; Deu 12:3; Isa 19:19; elsewhere “image”), a column or image of stone; מִצֶּבֶת, matstsebeth, a monumental” pillar” (Gen 35:14; Gen 35:20; 2Sa 18:18), once the trunk or stump of a tree (“substance,” Isa 6:13); מֻצָּב, mutstsab, according to some a military post (as in Isa 29:3, “mount”), or garrison, according to others a terminal mark (Jdg 9:6); נְצַיב, netsib, a statue (only Gen 19:26, “pillar”), or military officer or garrison (as elsewhere rendered).

2. From other roots: עִמּוּד, ammnud, lit. something upright (from עָמִד, to stand), a column (the usual word for “pillar,” and invariably so rendered in the A. V., but meaning an elevated stand or platform in 2Ki 11:14; 2Ki 23:3); מַסְעָד, mis'dd, a support (from סָעִד, to prop), a balustrade (only 1Ki 10:12); מָצוּק, matsuk, a column (from צוּק, to set up) as a support (fig. 1Sa 2:8), or tropically a crag (“situate,” 1Sa 14:5); אֹמְנָהomenah (from אָמִן, to stay up), a column (only 2Ki 18:16); and תַּימְרָה, timerah, a column, in the form of an artificial palm-tree (Son 3:6; Joe 2:30 [Heb. 3; 3]).

3. In the N.T.: only στύλος, a column or support (Gal. 2, 9; 1 Tim. 3, 15; Rev 3:12; Rev 10:1).

II. Uses. — The essential notion of a pillar is that of a shaft or isolated pile, either supporting or not supporting a roof.

1. Monumental. — Perhaps the votive object was the earliest application of the pillar. This in primitive times consisted of nothing but a single stone or  pile of stones. Instances are seen in Jacob's pillars (Gen 28:18; Gen 31:46; Gen 31:51-52; Gen 35:14); in the twelve pillars set up by Moses at Mount Sinai (Exo 24:4); the twenty-four stones erected by Joshua (Jos 4:8-9; see also Isa 19:19, and Jos 24:27). SEE STONE. The trace of a similar notion may probably be found in the holy stone of Mecca (Burckhardt, Trav. 1, 297). The erection of columns or heaps of stone to commemorate any remarkable event was universal before the introduction of writing or inscription, and it is still employed for that purpose by many savage nations. SEE GALEED. Monumental pillars have thus been common in many countries and in various styles of architecture. Such were perhaps the obelisks of Egypt (Fergusson, p. 6, 8, 115, 246, 340; Ibn- Batuta, Trav. p. 111; Strabo, 3, 171, 172; Herod. 2, 106; Amm. Marc. 17, 4; Josephus, Ant. 1, 2, 3, the pillars of Seth). SEE PYRAMID.

The stone Ezel (1Sa 20:19) was probably a terminal stone or a waymark. SEE EBENEZER.

The “place” set up by Saul (1Sa 15:12) is explained by St. Jerome to be a trophy, Vulg. fornicem triumphalem (Jerome, Quaest. Hebr. in lib. 1, Reg. 3, 1339). ,The word used is the same as that for Absalom's pillar, יָד, yad (lit. a hand), called by Josephus χεῖρα (Ant. 7:10, 3), which was clearly of a monumental or memorial character, but not necessarily carrying any representation of a hand in its structure, as has been supposed to be the case. So also Jacob set up a pilla: over Rachel's grave (Gen 35:20; and Robinson, 1, 218). The monolithic tombs and obelisks of Petra are instances of similar usage (Burckhardt, Syria, p. 422; Roberts, Sketches, p. 105; Irby and Mangles, Travels, p. 125). SEE ABSALOM'S TOMB.

2. Architectural. — Pillars form an important feature in Oriental architecture, partly perhaps as a reminiscence of the tent with its supporting poles, and partly also from the Use of flat roofs, in consequence of which the chambers were either narrower or divided into portions by columns (Jdg 16:25). The tent-principle is exemplified in the open halls of Persian and other Eastern buildings, of which the fronts, supported by pillars, are shaded by curtains or awnings fastened to the ground outside by pegs, or to trees in the garden-court (Est 1:6; Chardin, Voy. 7:387; 9:469, 470, and plates 39,81; Layard, Nin. and Bab. p. 530, 648; Burckhardt, Notes on Bed. 1, 37). Thus Moses was commanded to spread the veil of the tabernacle on four pillars (Exo 26:32, etc.). Thus also a figurative mode of describing heaven is as a tent or canopy supported by  pillars (Psa 104:2; Isa 40:22), and the earth as a flat surface resting on pillars (1Sa 2:8; Psa 75:3). SEE TENT.

It has already been remarked that the word “place,” in 1Sa 15:12, is in Hebrew “hand.” In the Arab tent two of the posts are called yed or “hand” (Burckhardt, Bed. 1, 37). SEE HAND.

The general practice in Oriental buildings of supporting flat roofs by pillars, or of covering open spaces by awnings stretched from pillars, led to an extensive use of them in construction. In Indian architecture an enormous number of pillars, sometimes amounting to 1000, is found. A similar principle appears to have been carried out at Persepolis. At Nineveh the pillars were probably of wood, SEE CEDAR, and it is very likely that the same construction prevailed in the “house of the forest of Lebanon,” with its hall and porch of pillars (1Ki 7:2; 1Ki 7:6). The “chapters” of the two pillars Jachin (q.v.) and Boaz resembled the tall capitals of the Persepolitan columns (Layard, Nin. and Bab. p. 252, 650; Nineveh, 2, 274; Fergusson, Handb. p. 8, 174, 178, 188, 190, 196, 198, 231-233; Roberts, Sketches, No. 182, 184, 190, 198; Euseb. Vit. Const. 3, 34, 38; Burckhardt, Trav. in Arabia, 1, 244, 245). SEE HOUSE.

3. Idolatrous. — The word Matstsebâh, “pillar,” is generally rendered “statue” or “image” (e.g.Deu 7:5; Deu 12:3; Deu 16:22; Lev 26:1; Exo 23:24; Exo 34:13; 2Ch 14:3; 2Ch 31:1; Jer 43:13; Hos 3:4; Hos 10:1; Mic 5:13). This agrees with the usage of heathen nations, practiced, as we have seen, by the patriarch Jacob, of erecting blocks or piles of wood or stone, which in later times grew into ornamental pillars in honor of the deity (Clem. Alex. Coh. ad Gent. c. 4; Strom. 1, 24). Instances of this are seen in the Attic Hermae (Pausan. 4:33, 4), seven pillars significant of the planets (3, 21, 9; also 7:17, 4, and 22, 2; 8:37); and Arnobius mentions the practice of pouring libations of oil upon them, which again recalls the case of Jacob (Adv. Gent. 1, 335, ed. Gauthier). SEE ASHERAH; SEE PHALLUS.

The termini or boundary-marks were originally, perhaps always, rough stones or posts of wood, which received divine honors (Ovid, Fast. 2, 641, 684). SEE IDOL.

But other circumstances contributed to make stones an object of worship. Such phenomena as the rocking stones worshipped by the British Druids would naturally excite the astonishment of an ignorant people, and many  commentators are of opinion that the מִשְׁכַּית אֶבֶן, eben mashkith, image of stone, which the Jews were forbidden to erect (Lev 26:1), was one of those bowing or rocking stones, especially as the phrase is used in opposition to מִצֵּבָה, matstsebâh which signifies “a standing pillar.” Those rare phenomena, aëroliths, still more easily became objects of idolatry; they were generally of a similar kind to that mentioned by Herodian, as being consecrated to the sun under his name of Elaiagabalos, and preserved in his magnificent temple in Syria; “in which,” says the historian, “there stands not any image made with hands, as among the Greeks and Romans, to represent the god, but there is a very large stone, round at the bottom, and terminating in a point of a conical form, and a black color, which they say fell down from Jupiter.” SEE DIOPETES. Sacred pillars or stones were indeed frequently worshipped instead of statues by idolatrous nations, and traces of this preposterous veneration may still be found in various countries. SEE DIANA. The erection of monoliths or monumental pillars was forbidden to the Israelites, but it appears that they were permitted to erect cairns or piles of stone to preserve the recollection of great events, as Joshua did at Gilgal (q.v.), that it might be a memorial of his miraculous passage over the Jordan. SEE CROMLECH.

4. Lastly, the figurative use of the term “pillar,” in reference to the cloud and fire accompanying the Israelites on their march (Exo 33:9-10; Neh 9:12; Psa 99:7), or as in Son 3:6 and Rev 10:1, is plainly derived from the notion of an isolated column not supporting a roof. SEE PILLAR OF CLOUD AND FIRE. A pillar is also an emblem of firmness and steadfastness (Jer 1:18; Rev 3:12), and of that which sustains or supports (Gal 2:9; 1Ti 3:15). In the Apocrypha we find a similar metaphor (Sir 36:24): “He that getteth a wife beginneth a possession, a help like unto himself, and a pillar of rest.” SEE ARCHITECTURE.

PILLAR is in architectural language the column supporting the arch. In the Norman style the pillars are generally massive, and are frequently circular, with capitals either of the same form or square; they are sometimes ornamented with channels, orfiutes, in various forms, spiral, zigzag, reticulated, etc. In plain buildings a square or rectangular pillar, or pier, is  occasionally found; a polygonal, usually octagonal, pillar is also used, especially towards the end of the style, and is generally of lighter proportions than most of the other kinds. But, besides these, clustered or compound pillars are extremely numerous and much varied; the simplest of them consists of a square with one or more rectangular recesses at each corner, but a more common form is one resembling these, with a small circular shaft in each of the recesses, and a larger one, semicircular, on two (or on each) of the faces: most of the compound pillars partake of this arrangement, though other varieties are by no means rare.

In the Early English style plain circular or octagonal shafts are frequently used, especially in plain buildings, but many other and more complicated kinds of pillars are employed; the commonest of these consists of a large central shaft, which is generally circular, with smaller shafts (usually four) round it; these are frequently made of a finer material than the rest, and polished, but they are often worked in courses with the central part of the pillar, and are sometimes filleted; in this style the pillars are very constantly banded.

In the Decorated style the general form of clustered pillars changes from a circular to a lozenge-shaped arrangement, or to a square placed diagonally, but many other varieties are also to be met with. They sometimes consist of small shafts surrounding a larger one, and are sometimes molded; the small shafts and some of the moldings are often filleted; plain octagonal pillars are also very frequently employed in village churches: towards the end of this style a pillar consisting of four small shafts separated by a deep hollow and two fillets is common, as it is also in the Perpendicular style, but the hollows are usually shallower, and the disposition of the fillets is different.

A plain octagonal pillar continues in use throughout the Perpendicular style, though it is not so frequent as at earlier periods, and its sides are occasionally slightly hollowed. In Decorated work a few of the moldings of the piers occasionally run up into the arches and form part of the archivolt, as at Bristol Cathedral, but in Perpendicular buildings this arrangement is much more common, and in some cases the whole of the moldings of the pillars are continued in the arches without any capital or impost between  them: the forms are various, but in general arrangement they usually partake of a square placed diagonally; sometimes, however, they are contracted in breadth so as to become narrower between the archways (from east to west) than in the opposite direction: the small shafts attached to the pillars in this style are usually plain circles, but are occasionally filleted, and in some instances are hollow-sided polygons.

## Pillar Of Cloud[[@Headword:Pillar Of Cloud]]

             (עִמּוּד הֶעָנָן, column of the cloud, Exo 33:9-10), otherwise called Pillar of Fire (עִמּוּד הָאֵשׁ, Exo 13:22), was the active form of the symbolical glory-cloud, betokening God's presence to lead his chosen host, or to inquire and visit offenses, as the luminous cloud of the sanctuary exhibited the same under an aspect of repose. The cloud, which became a pillar when the host moved, seems to have rested at other times on the tabernacle, whence God is said to have “come down in the pillar” (Num 12:5; so Exo 33:9-10). SEE PILLAR.

It preceded the host, apparently resting on the ark, which led the way (Exo 13:21; Exo 40:36, etc.; Num 9:15-23; Num 10:34). So by night the cloud on the tabernacle became fire, and the guiding pillar a pillar of fire. SEE BEACON.

Modern Germans explain it of a natural appearance, or of the holy fire carried before the host from off the altar; but it is clearly spoken  of as miraculous, and gratefully remembered in after ages by pious Israelites (Psa 105:39; Psa 78:14; Wisdom of Solomon 10:17) as a token of God's special care of their fathers. Isaiah has a remarkable allusion to it (Isa 4:5), as also Paul (1Co 10:4; 1Co 10:2; see Pfau, De nube Israelitas baptizante, Viteb. s. a.). A remarkable passage in Curtius (5:2, § 7), descriptive of Alexander's army on the march, mentions a beacon hoisted on a pole from head-quarters as the signal for marching (“a fire was observed by night, a smoke in the day-time”). This was probably an adoption of an Eastern custom. See also an account of an appearance of fire by night in the expedition of Timoleon to Italy (Diod. Sic. 16:66). Similarly the Persians used, as a conspicuous signal, an image of the sun enclosed in crystal (Curtius, 3. 3, § 9). —Caravans are still known to use such beacons of fire and smoke, the cloudlessness and often stillness of the sky giving the smoke great density of volume and boldness of outline. SEE EXODE.

## Pillar Saints[[@Headword:Pillar Saints]]

             devotees who stood on the tops of lofty pillars for many years in fulfillment of religious vows. The first who originated this practice was Simeon, a native of Syria, who was born about A.D. 390. In early youth he entered a monastery near Antioch, where he devoted himself to the most rigid exercises of mortification and abstinence. Having been expelled from the monastery for his excessive austerities, he retired to the adjacent mountain, where he took up his residence first in a cave, and then in a little cell, where he immured himself for three years. Next he removed to the top of a mountain, where he chained himself to a rock for several years. His fame had now become so great that crowds of visitors thronged to see him. “Incommoded by the pressure of the crowd,” we are told, “he erected a pillar on which he might stand, elevated at first six cubits, and ending with forty. The top of the pillar was three feet in diameter, and surrounded with a balustrade. Here he stood day and night in all weathers. Through the night, till 9 A.M., he was constantly in prayer, often spreading forth his hands and bowing so low that his forehead touched his toes. A bystander once attempted to count the number of these successive prostrations, and he counted till they amounted to 1244. At 9 o'clock A.M. he began to address the admiring crowd below, to hear and answer their questions, to send messages and write letters, etc., for he took concern in the welfare of the churches, and corresponded with bishops, and even emperors. Towards evening he suspended his intercourse with this world, and betook himself again to converse with God till the following day. He generally ate but once a week, never slept, wore a long sheepskin robe, and a cap of the same. His beard was very long, and his frame extremely emaciated. In this manner he is reported to have spent thirty-seven years, and at last, in his sixty-ninth year, to have expired unobserved in a praying attitude, in which no one ventured to disturb him till after three days, when Anthony, his disciple and biographer, mounting the pillar, found that his spirit had departed, and his holy body was emitting a delightful odor. His remains were borne in pomp to Antioch, in order to be the-safeguard of that unwalled town, and innumerable miracles were performed at his shrine. His pillar also was so venerated that it was literally enclosed with chapels and monasteries for some ages. Simeon was so averse to women that he never allowed one to come within the sacred precincts of his pillar. Even his own mother wag debarred this privilege till after her death, when her corpse was brought to him, and he now restored her to life for a short time that  she might see him, and converse with him a little before she ascended to heaven.” Another Simeon Stylites is mentioned by Evagrius as having lived in the 6th century. In his childhood he mounted his pillar near Antioch, and is said to have occupied it sixty-eight years. The example of Simeon was afterwards followed, to a certain extent at least, by many persons in Syria and Palestine, and pillar saints were found in tie East even in the 12th century: when the Stylites, as they were termed by the Greeks, were abolished. This order of saints never found a footing the West, and when one Wulfilaieus attempted to commence the practice in the German territory of Treves, the neighboring bishops destroyed his pillar, and prevented him from carrying his purpose into effect.

## Pillar of cloud and Fire[[@Headword:Pillar of cloud and Fire]]

             According to Exo 13:21 sq. (Exo 14:24; Num 14:14; Neh 9:12; Neh 9:19), the Israelites during their journey from Egypt through the desert were accompanied in the day by a pillar of cloud, and at night by a pillar of fire (Heb. עִמּוּד עָנָן, עִמּוּד אֵשׁ, Sept. στύλος νεφέλης, πυρός), as a guide (comp. esp. Exo 40:36 sq.) and protection (comp. Psalm 105:89; Wis 10:17), and this waited over the tabernacle while the people rested (Exo 40:34 sq.; Num 9:15 sq.). The narrative represents Jehovah himself as in this cloud (comp. also Num 14:14), and as speaking from it to Moses (Exo 33:9 sq.; Num 12:5; Deu 31:15). Later writers explain this of the “wisdom” of God (σοφία, Wis 10:17), or the divine Logos (q.v.; comp. Philo, Opera, 1, 501). Toland, again, and after him many others, explained this appearance naturally, and referred it to the fire carried in a vessel before the host, which in the day served as a guide and signal by its smoke, and at night by its brightness. Von der Hart carried this opinion so far as to hold that this fire carried before the Israelites was the sacred fire preserved upon the altar from the time of Abraham (Ephemnerid. Philol. Discurs. 6, 109 sq.; and Philol. Vindic. Helmst. 1696. For the controversy on this view, see Rosenmuller on Exo 13:21; comp. Forster, in Eichhorn's Repert. 10, 132 sq.). This custom is actually observed by caravans in the East at the present day (Harmer, Observ. 1, 438 sq.; Descript. de l'Egypte, 8, 128), and it became at an early day customary with armies hi the East, especially in traversing an unknown region (Curt. 3, 3, 9; v, 2, 7; but the passages sometimes quoted, Veget. Mil. 3, 5; Frontin. Strateg. 2, 25, do not refer to this. Comp. esp. on the custom, Faber, Archaöl. p. 244 sq.; Wolfenb. Fragm. p. 103 sq.; Bauer, Hebr. Mythol. 1, 281 sq.). Meanwhile we must not forget that it is the evident intention of the historian to narrate a miracle (comp. also Psalms 78, 14; Psalms 105, 39; comp. Diod. Sic. 16, 66; Clem. Alex. Strom. 1, 150). The following monographs on this subject are unimportant: Krause, De  columna ignis ac nubis (Viteb. 1707); Friderici, De col. ign. et nub. (Leips. 1689); Sahm, De column. ignz. ac nub. (Gedan. 1702); Münden, De column. nub. et igne (Goslar, 1712), and many others. Following this national recollection, Isaiah (4, 5) has employed the figure of a cloud of smoke and fire hovering over Zion and the Temple as a symbol of the presence of Jehovah, in his picture of the blessedness of the theocracy (comp. Ewald, Isr. Gesch, 2, 167 sq.). SEE SHEKINAH.

## Pillar of salt[[@Headword:Pillar of salt]]

             SEE LOT.

## Pillar, Plain of the[[@Headword:Pillar, Plain of the]]

             (אֵלוֹן מֻצָּב; Sept. τῇ βαλανῳ τῇ εὑρετῇ τῆς στάσεως; Alex. omits τῇ εὑρετῇ; Vulg. quercum quae stabat), or rather “oak of the pillar” — that being the real signification of the Hebrew word eldn; a tree which stood near Shechem, and at which the men of Shechem and the house of Millo assembled, to crown Abimelech, son of Gideon (Jdg 9:6). There is nothing said by which its position can be ascertained. It possibly derived its name of Mutstsab from a stone or pillar set up under it; and reasons have already been adduced for believing that this tree may have been the same with that under which Jacob buried the idols and idolatrous trinkets of his household, and under which Joshua erected a stone as a testimony of the covenant there re-executed between the people and Jehovah. SEE MEONENIM. There was both time and opportunity during the period of commotion which followed the death of Joshua for this sanctuary to return into the hands of the Canaanites, and the stone left standing there by Joshua to become appropriated to idolatrous purposes as one of the matstsebâhs in which the religion of the aborigines of the Holy Land delighted. SEE IDOLATRY. The terms in which Joshua speaks of this very stone (Jos 24:27) almost seem to overstep the bounds of mere imagery, and would suggest and warrant its being afterwards regarded as endowed with miraculous qualities, and therefore a fit object for veneration. Especially would this be the case if the singular expression, “It hath heard all the words of Jehovah our God which he spake to us,” were intended to indicate that this stone had been brought from Sinai, Jordan, or some other scene of the communications of Jehovah with the people. The Samaritans still show s range of stones on the summit of Gerizim as those brought from the bed of Jordan by the twelve tribes. SEE OAK.

## Pilled[[@Headword:Pilled]]

             (Gen 30:37-38) is a rendering of פָּצִל, patsal, to strip of the bark, being the same as “strakes,” i.e. streaks, in the same connection. PEELED (Isa 18:2; Eze 29:18), however, is a different word in the original, מָרִט, maradt, signifying to polish. The verb “to pill” appears in Old English as identical in meaning with “to peel=to strip,” and in this sense is used in the above passages from Genesis. Of the next stage in its meaning as =-plunder, we have traces in the word “pillage,” pilfer. If the difference between the two forms be more than accidental, it would seem as if, in the English of the 17th century, “peel” was used for the latter signification. The ‘people scattered and peeled” are generally interpreted to mean those that have been plundered of all they have. Comp.

“Peeling their prisoners.” —Milton, P. R. 4.

“To peel the chiefs, the people to devour.” —Dryden, Homer, Iliad (Richardson).

The soldiers of Nebuchadnezzar's army (Eze 29:18), however, have their shoulder peeled in the literal

sense. The skin is worn off with carrying earth to pile up the mounds during the protracted siege of Tyre. SEE TYRE.

## Pillow[[@Headword:Pillow]]

             is the rendering in the A.V. of three very different Hebrew and one Greek word. The proper term is in the plur. מְרִאֲשֹׁת, meraashôth (Gen 28:11; Gen 28:18, elsewhere “bolster”), which denotes simply a place for laying the head. In that passage we read that “Jacob took of the stones of that place [Haran], and put them for his pillows, and lay down in that place to sleep.” The Hebrew word would be more properly rendered “towards the head.” Similarly our Lord employed either the bench or possibly some cushion or rug upon it, when asleep upon the boat (προσκεφάλαιων, Mar 4:38). SEE BED. The כֶּסֶת, ke'seth (also in the plur.), of Eze 13:18; Eze 13:20, however, designates a cushion or soft pad used in some way for magical enticement, perhaps one of the meretricious luxuries of the females alluded to. SEE ARMHOLE. In 1Sa 19:13; 1Sa 19:16, the Heb. word is כְּבַיר, kebir, something braided or plaited, hence usually thought to be a quilt or mattress. SEE BOLSTER.

What kind of pillows the Hebrews used we have no means of knowing, but the ancient Egyptians had pillows of wood formed to receive the head when resting on their couches, and these no doubt had a cushion stuffed with feathers, or other soft material. Specimens of these wooden pillows may be seen in the British Museum (Wilkinson, Anc. Egyptians, 1, 71). “Hardy travelers, like Jacob (Gen 28:11; Gen 28:18) and Elijah (1Ki 19:6), sleeping on the bare ground, would make use of a stone for this purpose; and soldiers on the march had probably no softer resting-place (1Sa 26:7; 1Sa 26:11-12; 1Sa 26:16). Possibly both Saul and Elijah may have used the water-bottle which they carried as a bolster, and if this were the case, David's midnight adventure becomes more conspicuously daring. The ‘pillow' of goats' hair which Michal's cunning put in the place of the bolster in her husband's bed (19:13, 16) was probably, as Ewald suggests,  a net or curtain of goats' hair, to protect the sleeper from the mosquitoes (Gesch. 3, 101, note), like the ‘canopy' of Holofernes.” SEE SLEEP.

## Pillsbury, Benjamin, D.D[[@Headword:Pillsbury, Benjamin, D.D]]

             a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born at Boscawen, N.H., October 25,1824. He graduated in 1847 from Wesleyan University, and in 1850 from Yale Theological Seminary. He entered. the New York East Conference in 1848, and served as pastor and presiding elder until his death, February 28, 1887. See Minutes of Annual Conferences (Spring), 1887, page 93.

## Pillsbury, Ithamar[[@Headword:Pillsbury, Ithamar]]

             an American Presbyterian evangelist and missionary, was born in Dracutt, Mass., Aug. 22, 1794. His parents being both very pious, his early discipline and religious training were very strict and thorough. He prosecuted his academic course under many difficulties and discouragements being obliged to interrupt his studies from time to time and to engage in teaching, in order to raise funds. He entered Union Academy, in Plainfield, N. H., in 1815; graduated at Yale College in October, 1822; studied theology in New York under the direction of Rev. Drs. Gardiner Spring and E. W. Baldwin; was licensed in October, 1824, and on June 19,1825, was at his own request and by the unanimous vote of the Presbytery ordained as an evangelist. For several months after he labored as city missionary in and around the cities of New York and Boston. The character and results of his labors in those two cities laid the foundation for that extensive system of religious effort which aims at the spiritual good of the poor and destitute, known as City Missions. Desirous of a pastoral charge, in September 1827, he accepted an invitation to supply the Church at Smithtown, Long Island, for one year, but continued to labor in that capacity until April 1830, when he was installed their regular pastor. At his own request, in 1863 this relation was dissolved, and until May 1834, he spent the time in traveling as an agent of the American Sunday-School Union. In 1835 he was appointed a commissioner to the General Assembly at Pittsburgh, Pa., after which he started on a tour of exploration to the state of Illinois, with a view to the founding of a colony. In September of the same year he returned to New York, and succeeded in organizing a company with a capital of some $40,000, to be invested “in the purchase of land, and the establishment of a colony for promoting the cause of education and piety in the state of Illinois.” From this time onward to the end of his life he was identified with the West, especially in all that pertained to the growth and prosperity of the Presbyterian Church. To the scheme of Christian colonization he gave much thought, time, labor, and prayer. From the spring of 1836 his labors as a missionary and an evangelist fairly set in; and with untiring energy and devotion he addressed himself to his work. He organized fourteen churches, and assisted at the organization of several others. In 1837 was organized the Church at Andover, in the Andover colony, and in 1841 he was installed its pastor,  and continued to minister unto it until September 1849. In May, 1850, he was installed pastor at Princeton, Bureau Co., where he had previously organized a Church; in 1853 he was chosen president of McDonough College, at Macomb; in 1855 he began to labor as stated supply in the Presbyterian Church at Macomb; in 1860 he returned to Andover, and took charge of the Church which he founded there. He died April 20, 1862. Mr. Pillsbury was a prudent and wise counselor, a sincere and constant friend, and an able and faithful minister of the Gospel. See Wilson, Presb. Hist. Almanac, 1863, p. 195. (J. L. S.)

## Pilmore, John[[@Headword:Pilmore, John]]

             a Scotch prelate, was consecrated bishop of Moray, April 3, 1325, and continued bishop there for thirty-seven years. He died in the castle of Spynie in 1362. See Keith, Scottish Bishops, pages 140, 187.

## Pilot[[@Headword:Pilot]]

             (חֹבֵל, chobel, Eze 27:8; Eze 27:27-29), literally a steersman, a mariner, is also rendered in our version (Jon 1:6) “ship-master;” but in the passage in Ezekiel it is used in a figurative sense for the chief rulers or counsellors of the Tyrians. SEE SHIP.

## Pilsbury, Phineas[[@Headword:Pilsbury, Phineas]]

             Elder, a famous early American Baptist minister, flourished in Maine in 1804. He was uneducated, in the ordinary acceptation of the term, but was called “a son of thunder” on account of his boldness and ability. He was extremely eccentric, and many curious incidents in his personal history are told, but nothing can be related here of any interest to the general inquirer.

## Pilsen, Francis[[@Headword:Pilsen, Francis]]

             a Flemish painter and engraver who flourished at Ghent about the middle of the 18th century. He studied under Robert van Audenarde. Little is known of his painting; but there are a few prints by him, among which are the following: Virgin and Infant Jesus; Conversion of St. Bavon; a St. Firancis, after Rubens; The Martyrdom of St. Blaize, after G. de Crayer.

## Piltai[[@Headword:Piltai]]

             (Heb. Piltay', פַּלְטִי, my deliverances; Sept. Φελετί), the representative of the priestly house of Moadiah, or Maadiah, in the time of Joiakim, the son of Jeshua; apparently one of the priests who returned to Jerusalem with Nehemiah (Neh 12:17). B.C. 445.

## Pilzarro, Abraham Israel[[@Headword:Pilzarro, Abraham Israel]]

             of Amsterdam, a Jewish litterateur, was of Portuguese origin, and flourished in Italy near the opening of this century. He wrote Discursos y exposiciosnes sobre la vara de Jeuda, an exposition of Jacob's prophecy, entitled “the Scepter of Judah,” in which he complains of the unfair manner in which Christians expound the Scriptures, of their unfitness for such a task, and the danger of conflicting their interpretations. On account of its odious contents it was suppressed by the leaders of the congregation (a MS. copy of this work is to be found in the Saracin Library). See De Rossi, Dizionario storico degli mautori Ebrei, p. 264; id. Bibl. Jud. Antichrist. (Parma, 1800), p. 92; Wolf, Bibl. Hebr. 3, 42; De Long, Bibl. Sacra, 2, i94 (where the author is called Bizaro); Lindo, Hist. of the Jews in Spain and Portugal, p. 369. (B. P.)

## Pimentel, Abraham ha-Kohen[[@Headword:Pimentel, Abraham ha-Kohen]]

             a Jewish rabbi, flourished about the middle of the 17th century. He was a pupil of Saul Mortera, and afterwards rabbi at the academy Keter Tora of Amsterdam, and lastly rabbi of the congregation of the Sephardim at Hamburg. He wrote מנחת כחןon Jewish rites, in three parts (Amsterd. 1668): — academic treatises in the Portuguese language, under the title Questoens et discoursos academicos, que compoz et recitan na illustre Academia תורה כתרetjuntamente alguns sermons compostos por o dito (Hamb. 1688). See Wolf, Bibl. Hebr. 1, 97; 3, 58 sq.; De Rossi, Dizionario storico degli autori Ebrei, p. 264 (Germ. transl. by Hamberger); First, Bibl. Jud. 3, 101. (B. P.)

## Pin[[@Headword:Pin]]

             (יָתֵד, yathed), a tent-pin, spoken of the copper pegs driven into the ground to hold the cords of the court (Exo 27:19; Exo 35:18; Exo 38:20; Exo 38:31; Exo 39:40; Num 3:37; Num 4:32), or for any other purpose (Jdg 16:14; Eze 15:3), being the same word elsewhere usually rendered “nail” (Jdg 4:21-22; v, 26; Ezr 9:8; Isa 22:22; Isa 22:25; Zec 10:4), occasionally “stake” (Isa 33:20; Isa 54:2), once “paddle” (Deu 23:13). SEE NAIL.

Pins, in the modern sense of the word, used for fastening the dress, were no doubt in use among the Hebrews, as we know they were among the Egyptians, but they were frequently made of bone or wood, and bore a considerable resemblance to skewers, as did those used even in England till a comparatively recent period. The forms of the Egyptian pins may be seen in the British Museum. “Pins and needles were among the articles of the toilet which have occasionally been found in the tombs. The former are frequently of considerable length, with large gold heads; and some, of a different form, tapering gradually to a point, merely bound with gold at the upper end, without any projecting head (seven or eight inches in length), appear to have been intended for arranging the plaits or curls of hair, like those used in England in the days of Elizabeth for nearly the same purpose” (Wilkinson, Anc. Egypt. 2, 344). SEE CRISPING-PIN.

## Pin (2)[[@Headword:Pin (2)]]

             (acus) in ecclesiastical use. Pins made of precious metal, and, in later mediaeval times, enriched with jewels, were used for attaching the archiepiscopal (or papal) pallium to the planeta or casula (chasuble). The earliest mention of these is, probably, the description given by Joannes Diaconus of the pallium of Gregory the Great. Their first use, therefore, must probably date between the close of the 6th and the beginning of the 9th century. Innocent assigns to these pins a certain mystical significance.

## Pinart, Michel[[@Headword:Pinart, Michel]]

             a French Orientalist, was born in July, 1659, at Sens. His parents died when he was very young, and left him penniless. Admitted by the protection of the abbé Boileau, grand-vicar at Sens, in the community of Germain Gillot, he learned there Latin. Greek, and the elements of Hebrew. He was sufficiently proficient in the latter language to be able to help father Thomassin in his Glossoire. He obtained a situation as tutor at the College Mazarin, and in 1712 was appointed theologist of the chapter of Sens. He had been a member of the Academie des Inscriptions since 1706. The “Collections” of this company and the “Journal des Savans” contain several memoirs of him. He died at Sens July 3,1717. — - Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Géneralé, 40, 248.

## Pinault, Pierre Oliver[[@Headword:Pinault, Pierre Oliver]]

             a French writer who flourished in the second half of last century, was a member of the Parliament of Paris, and is the author of, Jugement par-te sun les Jesuites par les grands hommes de l'Eglise et de l'Etat (1761, 12mo): — La nouvelle philosophie devoilee (1770, 12mo): — and Origine des maux de l'Eglise (1787, 12mo). He published a new edition of Hericourt's Lois ecclesiasfiques de France (1771, fol.), and some translations of Portuguese and Italian works. -Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Géneralé, 40, 248.

## Pinchon, Guillaume[[@Headword:Pinchon, Guillaume]]

             a French prelate of note, was born in the parish of St. Alban. near St. Brieuc, in 1184. He took holy orders in 1207, and was made canon of St. Brieuc; then of St. Gatien de Tours; and, in 1220, bishop of St. Brieuc. Pierre Mauclerc, duke of Brittany, made an attempt at that time to encroach upon the secular rights which the bishops of the province enjoyed in their bishoprics, and he issued ordinances by which the clergy were deprived of their most important privileges. Guillaume, acting in accord with the other prelates of the duchy, excommunicated Mauclerc, who, having assembled a number of his barons at Redon, decided that the bishops should be banished. Guillaume retired to Poitiers, where he acted, for some time, as coadjutor of Philippe, bishop of that city, during a severe illness of this prelate (1229). His rights having been recognized by Pierre Mauclerc, he returned to his see in 1231, and kept busy during the rest of his life in reforming the abuses which had spread among the clergy during his absence, and continuing the reconstruction of his cathedral. Guillaume Pinchon died at St. Brieuc July 29, 1234. He was canonized by Innocent III in 1247. His complete relics were discovered in 1847 in the cathedral. The Church of St. Brieuc and of Treguier devotes to his memory the 29th of July. — Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Géneralé, 40, 248.

## Pinckard, Patrick M[[@Headword:Pinckard, Patrick M]]

             a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born near the opening of the present century. He was converted about 1840, and in 1844 entered the itinerant ranks of the Methodist ministry, and preached successfully until 1870 within the bounds of the Missouri Conference. During this long term of ministerial life he was employed in circuit, station, and district work; also in the agency of Central College, and, later, as the depositary in St. Louis of the Book-house of Missouri Methodism, in all of which places of trust and responsibility he gained the approval, confidence, and esteem of his brethren and the Church. He-died Sept. 23, 1871. See Minutes of Annual Conf. M. E. Church, South, 1872, p. 738.

## Pinckney Lectures[[@Headword:Pinckney Lectures]]

             are a series of sermons, for the foundation of which Charles Pinckney, chief-justice of South Carolina under the provincial government (father of the late general C. C. Pinckney), provided. He died in 1758, and by his last will directed that two sermons, in May and November, annually, being on  the first Wednesday after the second Tuesday in each of these months, should be preached in St. Philip's Church, Charleston, on the “greatness of God, and his goodness to all creatures,” with the view, as he states, “to encourage and promote religious and virtuous principles and practices among us, and to raise an ardent love of the Deity in us; and in order to excite an emulation in my wealthy countrymen, whose abilities and fortunes will better enable them thereto, for establishing lectures among us, in humble imitation of those founded by the Hon. Mr. Boyle in Great Britain.” For effecting these pious purposes, the will states, “I do hereby charge my said mansion and land and buildings in Colleton Square, devised to my eldest son, with the payment of five guineas yearly, and every year forever, unto such lectures.”

## Pinckney, Miles[[@Headword:Pinckney, Miles]]

             SEE CARR, THOMAS (1).

## Pinczovians[[@Headword:Pinczovians]]

             a Socinian sect, so named after the town of Pinczow, Poland, where its leaders resided. The Pinczovians were usually called “Unitarian Brethren,” but they deserved to be called Arians (q.v.) rather than Socinians (q.v.). It is true, some of the principal doctors among them were inclined towards those views of Jesus Christ which afterwards were the common views of the Socinian sect; but the greater part of them agreed with the Arians, and affirmed that the Savior was produced by God the Father before the foundation of the world, but that he was greatly inferior to the Father, and so also the Holy Spirit was begotten, and is inferior to the Father. This is very clearly taught by George Schomann in his Testamentum, published by Sand (p. 194-5): “Sub id fere tempus (A.D. 1566) ex rhapsodiis Lcelii Socini quidam fratres dicerunt. Dei filium non esse secundam Trinitatis personam patti coessentialem et coaequalem, sed hominem Jesum Christum, ex Spiritu Sancto conceptum, ex virgine Maria natum, crucifixum et resuscitatum; a quibus nos commoniti, sacras litteras perscrutari, persuasi sumus.” These words most clearly show that the Pinczovians (as they were called before they separated from the Reformed in 1565) professed to believe in a Trinity of some sort, and did not divest Jesus Christ of all divinity. Besides, Schomann was a doctor of great authority among them; and in the year 1565 (as he himself informs us), he contended at the convention of Petricow (pro uno Deo patri) for one God the Father, in opposition to the Reformed, who, he says (Deum trinum defendebant), maintained a threefold God. Yet in the following year he, with others, was induced by the papers of Laelius Socinus to so alter his sentiments that he denied Christ to be a divine person. He, therefore, with  his Pinezovian flock, before this time must necessarily have been, not a Socinian, but an Arian. SEE POLAND. (J. H. W.)

## Pindar, John Hothersall[[@Headword:Pindar, John Hothersall]]

             an English divine, was born in 1794. He graduated at Caius College, Cambridge, in 1816, and became principal of Codrington College, Barbadoes. He was afterwards canon residentiary and prebendary of Wells Cathedral, and principal of Wells Theological College, which latter office he resigned in 1865. He died at West Malvern, Eng., April 16, 1868. He published a volume of Sermons on Common Prayer: — Sermons on the Ordination Service: Sermons on the Holy Days of the Church: — Expository Discourses on the Epistle to Timothy; and some Lectures. — Appleton's Annual Cyclop. 8, 592.

## Pinder, Thomas[[@Headword:Pinder, Thomas]]

             a Wesleyan preacher of some note, was born at West Stockwith, near Gainsborough, Eng., Sept. 22, 1774. He was converted through Methodist agency in 1795 at Sheffield. He felt called of God to the work of the holy ministry, and in 1799 was appointed to the Thetford Circuit. Thence for thirty-five years he labored on in a most exemplary discharge of his pastoral and ministerial functions. In all the circuits in which he traveled he was highly and deservedly esteemed, both in his public and private capacity. As a preacher, though not great, he was striking, faithful, and impressive. As a pastor, he was most tender and sympathizing. He died Aug. 27, 1835. — Wesl. Meth. Mag. 1836, p. 719; 1838, art. 1.

## Pine-tree[[@Headword:Pine-tree]]

             The word “pine” occurs in our translation three times, but in neither case is the pine of our northern regions referred to in the original. The first  instance is in Neh 8:15 (Sept. ξύλον κυπαρίσσινον. Vulg. lignum pulcherrimum), where the Hebrew wordsעֵוֹ שֶׁמֶן, ets shemen, are rendered “pine-branches.” though the phrase is generally understood to denote the wild olive-tree. SEE OLIVE. The second and third instances are in Isa 41:19 (Sept. πεύκη, Vulg. pinus) and 60:13 (Sept. βραθυδαάρ, Vulg. ulmus), where the Hebrew word is תַּדְּהָר, tidhar, which Gesenius conjectures to denote the oak (from its hardness and durability, root, דָּהִר); but the old translators waver between beech, pine, cypress, larch, etc., and by modern interpreters it has been variously explained to be the Indian plane, the larch, and the elm (Celsius, Hierob. 2, 271). SEE ASH-TREE; SEE BOX-TREE; SEE CEDAR-TREE.

The Sept. rendering in Isa 41:19, βραθυδαάρ, appears to have arisen from a confused amalgamation of the words berosh and tidhar, which follow each other in that passage. Of these berosh is sometimes rendered “cypress,” and might stand for “juniper.” That species of juniper which is called savin is in Greek βραθύ. The word δαάρ is merely an expression in Greek letters for tidhar (Pliny, 24:11, 61; Schleusner, s.v.; Celsius, Hierob. 1, 78). In the Chaldee paraphrase the word murneyan, commonly thought to mean the elm, is used as the synonym of tidhar. But no similar name having been discovered in any of the cognate languages, no proofs can be adduced in favor of one more than another. The name tidhara, meaning “three-cornered,” is applied in India to a species of Euphorbia (E. antiquoum); but this is not likely to be the plant alluded to in Scripture. But the rendering “pine” seems least probable of any, as the root implies either curvature or duration, of which the latter is not particularly applicable to the pine, and the former remarkably otherwise. On the other hand, Thomson (Land and Book, 2, 266 sq.) supposes that berôsh (בְּרוֹשׁ) ought to be rendered pine instead of fir, as usual in the A. V.; referring it to the “stone-pine,” which still covers the sandy ridges of Lebanon and Hermon, and is called snubar by the Arabs. SEE FIR.

## Pineda, Juan de (1)[[@Headword:Pineda, Juan de (1)]]

             a learned Franciscan monk, was born at Seville in 1557. After entering the order at the age of fourteen, he was carefully advanced in classical learning, and then instructed in theology. As a student, he bore the reputation of great erudition, especially in the Greek, Hebrew, and Oriental languages. He was placed at the head of the Inquisition in Andalusia, and was commissioned by cardinal Zapata to visit the principal libraries of Spain, in order to register those works which might be obnoxious to the Roman Catholic religion. The result of his inquiry was an Index novus Librorum Prohibitorum (Seville, 1631), published by order of cardinal Zapata, grand-inquisitor of Spain. Pineda published a version of Theodore Peltar's Catena Graecorum Patrum in Proverbia Salomonis. He also  published Commentarius in Job (Madrid, 1597, 2 vols, fol.): — Praelectio sacra in Canticum Canticorum (Seville, 1602): — Salomo Prcevius, sive de Rebus Salononis Regis (Lyons, 1609, libri octo): — Commentarius in Ecclesiasten (Antwerp, 1620). He died at Seville Jan. 27, 1637. Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Géneralé, 40, 261.

## Pineda, Juan de (2)[[@Headword:Pineda, Juan de (2)]]

             another Spanish divine, was born at Medina del Campo in the 16th century, and has frequently been confounded with the preceding. He belonged to the Order of the Jesuits, and published Historia maravillosa de S. Juan- Baptista (Salamanca, 1574, 4to): — La Monarquia Ecclesiastica, o Historia Universal del Mundo (ibid. 1588, 14 vols. fol.; Barcelona, 1594, 1620); Agricultura Christiana que contiene 35, dialogos familiares (ibid. 1589, 2 vols. fol.). Many other works of his remain unpublished. — Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Géneralé, 40, 262.

## Pinedo, Thomas de[[@Headword:Pinedo, Thomas de]]

             (called in the synagogue Isaac), a noted Jewish litterateur of the 17th century, was born in 1614 in Spain, but was obliged to leave his native country and seek a refuge in Amsterdam from inquisitorial persecution. He was more famed for his proficiency in Greek and the ancient classics than as a Jewish theologian. He was descended from the family of Pillheiro of Francoso, in Portugal. His education he received at Madrid, where he was indebted to the training of the Jesuits for his literary attainments, of whom he speaks in grateful remembrance. He had already reached a mature age when the suspicions of the Inquisition obliged him to quit the scene of his studies and the society of his learned friends in the capital of Spain, to live in safety in the United Provinces. He belonged to those few who were fortunate enough to evade in safety the clutches of the Inquisition. He differs from Orobio de Castro in this especially, that he never in any of his writings attacked the Christian religion, but, on the contrary, frequently took pleasure in acknowledging its beneficial influences upon society, though he did not spare the tribunal of the Inquisition, of which he says: “Me pudet pigetque prodidisse hoc de gente Christiana.” At Amsterdam he finished and published, in 1678, his edition of Στέφανος περὶ πολέων: Stephanus de Urbibus quemr Primus Thomas de Pinedo Lusitanus Latii jure donabat et observationibus scrutinio variarum linguarum ac praecipue Hebraicae, Phoniciae, Graecae, et Latinae dialectis illustrabat,  and dedicated the work to the marquis of Mondejos, of the house of Mendoza, ever devoted to the encouragement of literature. Pinedo's work, which is very valuable for Jewish history and archaeology, and was lately edited with a preface by Dindorf (Leips. 1825, 4 vols.), shows that the author was well acquainted with Jewish literature. Besides Josephus, which forms the basis of the whole, Pinedo quotes Benjamin de Tudela's Itineraries; David Zemach (p. 482, 584); R. Salomo Jarchi, s.v. Antiochia, “quem Hebraei per rosetheboth Rasi vocant, celeberrimus in S. S. commentator;” Kimchi's Commentary on Genesis (p. 497); Ibn- Ezra's Commentary on Esther (p. 583); Maimonides, Moreh Nebuchim; R. Azariah, Min Haadomim (p. 583). In two passages Pinedo mentions the name of Jesus, viz., when speaking of Bethlehem, he says, after having given the explanation of the text: “Sed multo magis urbem nobilitarunt Davidis et Jesu Nazareni natales;” and then, when speaking of Galilee, he adds: “Quia Jesus Nazarenus frequenter in hac regione versabatur, ideo Julianus, ὁ Παραβάτης, eum per contemptum Galilceum et Christianos Galilleos vocabat. Sic enim vocabantur prius Christiani, qui sub imperatore Claudio, relicto Nazarceorum et Galilceorum nomine, Christiani dicti sunt, ut testatur Suidas.” Pinedo died Nov. 13,1679, and the noble marquis whom we have mentioned above warmly expressed in a letter to the Judseo-Spanish poet, De Barrios, his regret at the death of Pinedo, and more especially at his dying in the profession of Judaism. Pinedo not only left in his Στέφανος a minument “aere perennius,” but also wrote his own epitaph in the following words'

Advertite Mortales. Hic jacet Thomas de Pinedo Lusitanus Qui primum Orientem vidit In Lusitanive oppido Francoso. Ortus Ex nobili illus regni familia Paterna Pinheiro, materna Fonseca Madriti penes patruum educatus Literis apud Jesuitas operam dedit. Domo profugus Nullius criminis ac invidiae reus Has oras appulit. Antequam abiret ad plures In sui memoriam  Hoc cenotaphium per Stephanum sibi excitavit. Id volebat vos scire. Valete.

See Fürst, Bibl. Jud. 3, 102; De Rossi, Dizionario storico degli autori Ebrei, p. 264 sq. (Ger. transl. by Hamburger); Wolf, Bibl. Hebr. 1, 397; 3, 278; Da Costa, Israel and the Gentiles, p. 433 sq.; Gratz, Gesch. d. Juden, 10, 200; Kayserling, in Frankel's Monatsschrift, 1858, p. 191 sq.; id. Geschichte der Juden in Portugal (Leips. 1867), p. 301. (B. P.)

## Pinelli, Luca[[@Headword:Pinelli, Luca]]

             an Italian theologian, born at Melfi. His family, one of the twenty-four chief of Genoa, gave the republic two doges, Agostino, son of Filippo, elected 1555, and Agostino, son of Alessandro, elected 1609. He was admitted in 1562 into the Company of Jesus; was a professor of theology at Ingolstadt and Pont-a-Mousson, and rector at Florence, Perugia, and Palermo. Pinelli died at Naples Aug. 25, 1607. His theological writings enjoyed a favor which is not extinguished altogether even in our own day. They have been reprinted and translated a number of times. Some of them must be referred to here: Meditazioni del Sacramento (Brescia, 1599, 12mo; translated into French, Pieux entretiens, etc., Tournay, 1850, 18mo): — Gersone, avvero della perfezione religiosa, lib. 4; the most recent editions of this often republished work are, in Italian, Rome, 1839, 8vo; in Latin, 1710, 16mo; in French, 1847, 18mo, etc.: — —Meditazione della Veryine Maria (Brescia, 1599, 12mo; translated into Portuguese by Antonio Vaz de Sousa): — De Sacramento Paenitentice (Cologne, 1602,12mo): — Trafato dele altra vita e dello stato delli anime in essa (Venice, 1604, 8vo): — Meditationes de IV hominis novissimis, quae sunt mors, judicium, infernus, paradisus (Cologne, 1605, 12mo): — Trattato della Messa (Naples, 1606,12mo). The spiritual works of father Pinelli appeared first at Venice (1604, 12mo); but the Latin edition of Cologne (1604, 3 vols. 12mo) is the most complete. — Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Géneralé, 40, 265.

## Pinftus[[@Headword:Pinftus]]

             is mentioned by Eusebius (Hist. Eccles. 4, 29, 31) as bishop of Cnossus, in the isle of Crete, and as a contemporary of Dionysius of Corinth (q.v.). According to the notices given by Eusebius, Dionysius addressed an epistle to Pinytus, exhorting him that, concerning abstinence (ἁγνεία), not to lay too heavy a yoke on the brethren (τοῖς ἀδελφοῖς), but rather pay regard to the weakness of the majority. It seems that Pinytus tried to promote in his congregation a Montanistic or Gnostico ascetic tendency. Pinytus, however, persevered in his course, and replied to Dionysius that it was time to offer to his congregation a stronger meat than milk. Some have thought that the point of difference between Dionysius and Pinytus was rather concerning celibacy, which the latter intended to introduce among his clergy; but this is a mistake. In other respects, Eusebius speaks of this rejoinder of Pinytus as containing the best proof of the latter's orthodoxy, his care for the salvation of the souls committed to his charge, his rhetoric, and understanding of divine things. See Herzog, Real-Encykl. s.v.; Theol. Univ. — Lex. s.v.; Jicher, Gelehrt. — Lex. s.v.; Eusebius, Hist. Eccles, 4:29,31. (B. P.) Piombo, Fra SEBASTIANO DEL, an eminent Italian painter, noted in the history of sacred art, was born in 1485 at Venice, whence he was called also “Veneziano.” His surname, according to Lanzi, was Luciano, though it does not appear that he was known by it in his own time, or that he ever marked his pictures with it. On his principal performance in oil, the Raising of Lazarus, the words “Sebastianus Venetus faciebat” appear in characters no doubt traced by himself. He was a skilful musician, particularly on the lute, but abandoned that science for painting, the rudiments of which he acquired under Bellini, but afterwards became the disciple of Giorgione, whose style of coloring he carefully studied and successfully imitated. He first distinguished himself as a portrait-painter, to which his powers were peculiarly adapted. His portraits are boldly designed and full of character; the heads and hands are admirably drawn, with an exquisite tone of color and extraordinary relief.

The first historical picture which established his reputation was the altar- piece in the church of San Gio. Crisostomo at Venice, which, from its richness and harmony of coloring, has frequently been mistaken for a work by his master Giorgione. Sebastiano was invited to Rome by Agostino  Chigi, a rich merchant who traded at Venice, by whom he was employed in ornamenting his palace of the Farnesina, in conjunction with Baldassare Peruzzi, where Raffaelle had painted his celebrated Galatea. Thus painting in competition, he found his own deficiency of invention, to remedy which he studied the antique, and obtained the instruction and assistance of Michael Angelo. Indeed it is said that that illustrious painter, growing jealous of the fame of Raffaelle, availed himself of the powers of Sebastiano as a colorist in the hope that, assisted by his composition, Piombo might become a successful rival. Michael Angelo accordingly furnished the designs for the Pieta in the church of the Conventuali at Viterbo, and the Transfiguration and the Flagellation in San Pietro in Montorio at Rome, the execution of' which, however, in consequence of Piombo's tedious mode of proceeding, occupied six years. The extraordinary beauty of the coloring, and the grandeur of Michael Angelo's composition and design in these celebrated productions, were the objects of universal surprise and applause.

At this time cardinal Julian de' Medici commissioned Raffaelle to paint his picture of the Transfiguration, and being desirous of presenting an altar-piece to the cathedral of Narbonne, of which he was archbishop, he engaged Sebastiano to paint a picture of the Raising of Lazarus, of the same dimensions. Vasari states that in the composition of this work he was assisted by Michael Angelo; and in the magnificent collection of drawings belonging to Sir Thomas Lawrence there were two careful sketches of the Lazarus, made by Michael Angelo, and several slighter ones of other parts of the design. On its completion the picture was publicly exhibited at Rome, in competition with the Transfiguration, and it excited general admiration, although thus brought into direct competition with the crowning glory of Raffaelle's pencil. It was sent to the cathedral of Narbonne, for which it was painted, and remained till the middle of the 18th century, when it was removed by the regent of France into the Orleans collection. Having been brought to England with the rest of that collection in 1792, it was pure chased for two thousand guineas, and is now deposited in the National Gallery at London. It was painted on wood, but has been transferred to canvas; its size is twelve feet six inches high, and nine feet six inches wide. After the death of Raffaelle, Piombo was called the first painter in Rome. He was greatly patronized by pope Clement VII, who conferred upon him the office of keeper of the papal signet, which was the cause of his name, Del Piombo, in allusion to the lead of the seal. This position rendering it necessary that he should assume a religious habit, he abandoned the profession of a painter, and was  thenceforth called Fra Sebastiano del Piombo. His works were numerous;- some fine ones are in Madrid and St. Petersburg; many are in Venice, and they are seen in several Continental galleries. The last work was the chapel of the Chigi family, in Santa Maria del Popolo, which he left imperfect, and it was afterwards finished by Francisco Salviati. He died of a fever, at Rome, in 1547. He is said to have been the inventor of painting upon walls with oil-color, and of preventing the colors from becoming dark by applying, in the first instance, a mixture of mastic and Grecian pitch, or, according to some authorities, a plaster composed of quick-lime, pitch, and mastic. See Spooner, Biog. Hist. of the Fine Arts, s.v.; Clement, Painters, Sculptors, Architects, etc., s.v.

## Pinkerton, Robert, D.D[[@Headword:Pinkerton, Robert, D.D]]

             a Scotch Congregational minister, was born in 1780. He left Scotland in 1805 as missionary among the tribes of the Caucasus, under the patronage of the Edinburgh Missionary Society. In 1809 he took up his residence at Moscow, and, in company with Drs. Paterson and Henderson. undertook the visitation of the Russian empire with the view of putting the Bible, into universal circulation. When those labors were suspended by imperial authority, Dr. Pinkerton travelled over the entire continent of Europe for the purpose of organizing societies for the dissemination of the Bible, both in Protestant and Catholic countries. He died April 7, 1859. See (Lond.) Cong. Year-book, 1860, page 204.

## Pinkham, John[[@Headword:Pinkham, John]]

             a veteran Free-will Baptist minister, was born at Dover, N.H., January 25, 1808. When he was two years of age his parents moved to Casco, Maine,  where he was converted at the age of sixteen, and at eighteen became a public exhorter. In 1830 he was ordained pastor of the Church at Sandwich, N.H., where he remained for seven years, and then removed to Gilford, where, for eight years, his labors were greatly blessed. His next settlement, of five years, was at Alton. He was, for the next two years, a resident of Dover, and spent most of the time in assisting pastors in revival work. He then returned to Casco, chiefly occupied as an evangelist. He died there, January 8, 1882. See Morning Star, March 1, 1882. (J.C.S.)

## Pinkney, William, D.D., LL.D[[@Headword:Pinkney, William, D.D., LL.D]]

             a Protestant Episcopal bishop, was born at Annapolis, Maryland, April 17, 1810. After graduating from St. John's College, in his native city, he became a rector in Somerset County in 1836, at Bladensburg in 1838, and at Washington in 1855; was consecrated assistant bishop of Maryland October 6, 1870, and became sole bishop October 17, 1879. He died July 4, 1883. Bishop Pinkney was decidedly evangelical.

## Pinnacle[[@Headword:Pinnacle]]

             In the account of our Lord's temptation (Mat 4:5), it is stated that the devil took him to Jerusalem, “and set him on a [rather the] pinnacle of the Temple” (ἐπὶ τὸ πτερύγιον τοῦ ἱεροῦ). The part of the Temple denoted by this term has been much questioned by different commentators, and the only certain conclusion seems to be that it cannot be understood in the sense usually attached to the word (i.e. the point of a spiral ornament),  as in that case the article would not have been prefixed. Grotius, Hammond, Doddridge, and others take it in the sense of balustrade or pinnated battlement. But it is now more generally supposed to denote what was called the king's portico, which is mentioned by Josephus (A nt. 15:11, 5), and is the same which is called in Scripture “Solomon's porch.” Of this opinion are Wetstein, Kuinil, Parkhurst, Rosenmüller, and others. Krebs, Schleusner, and some others, however, fancy that the word signifies the ridge of the roof of the Temple; and Josephus (Ant. 15:11,:5) is cited in proof of this notion. But we know that iron spikes were fixed all over the roof of the Temple to prevent the holy edifice from being defiled by birds (Joseph. Was, v, 5, 6), and the presence of these spikes creates an objection, although the difficulty is perhaps not insuperable, as we are told that the priests sometimes went to the top of the Temple (Midcoth, ch. 4; T. Bab. tit. Taanith, fol. 29). Dr. Bloomfield asks: “May it not have been a lofty spiral turret, placed somewhere about the center of the building, like the spire in some cathedrals, to the topmost lookout of which the devil might take Jesus ?” (Recens. Synopt. in Mat 4:5). We answer, no: steeples do not belong to ancient or to Oriental architecture, and it is somewhat hazardous to provide one for the sole purpose of meeting the supposed occasion of this text. Lightfoot, whose opinion on this point is entitled to much respect, declares his inability to judge whether the part denoted should be considered as belonging to the holy fabric itself or to some building within the holy circuit. If the former, he can find no place so fitting as the top of the אולם, or porch of the Temple; but if the latter, the royal porch or gallery (στοὰ βασιλική) is the part he would prefer. He adds that, above all other parts of the Temple, the porch thereof, and indeed the whole pronaos, might not unfitly be called τὸ πτερύγιον τοῦ ἱεροῦ, the wing (for that is the literal meaning) of the Temple, “because like wings it extended itself in breadth on each side, far beyond the breadth of the Temple.” If therefore the devil had placed Christ on the very precipice of this part of the Temple, he may well be said to have placed him “upon the wing of the Temple; both because this part was like a wing to the Temple itself, and because that precipice was the wing of this part” (Hot. Hebr. ad Mat 4:5). Against this interpretation, however, it stems decisive that Jesus, not being a priest, could not have gained admittance to the Temple proper; unless, indeed, we understand that he was transported thither and back again miraculously. With regard to the other alternative, it is only necessary to cite the description of Josephus to show that the situation was at least not inappropriate to Satan's object:  “On the south part (of the court of the Gentiles) was στοὰ βασιλική, ‘the royal gallery,' that may be mentioned among the most magnificent things under the sun; for above the profoundest depth of the valley, Herod constructed a gallery of a vast height, from the top of which, if any one looked down, he would become dizzy, his eyes being unable to reach so vast a depth.” The same Greek word is used in the Sept. version to render,

1. כָּבָ, kandah, a wing or border, e.g. of a garment (Num 15:38; 1Sa 15:27; 1Sa 24:4);

2. סְנִפַּיר, senappir, the fin of a fish (Lev 11:9. So Arist. Anim. 1, 5, 14);

3. קָצָה, katsdh, an edge; A.V. end (Exo 28:26). Hesychius explains πτερύγιον as ἀκρωτήριον. Perhaps in any case τὸ πτερύγιον means the battlement ordered by law to be added to every roof. It is in favor of this that the word kandph is used to indicate the top of the Temple (Dan 9:27; Hammond, Grotius, Calmet, De Wette, Lightfoot, Hor. Hebr. ad Matthew 4). Eusebius tells us that it was from “the pinnacle” (τὸ πτερύγιον) that St. James was precipitated, and it is said to have remained until the 4th century (Euseb. Hist. Eccles. 2, 23; Williams, Holy City, 2, 338). SEE TEMPLE.

PINNACLE is an architectural term used to designate a small turret or tall ornament, usually tapering towards the top, and much used in Gothic architecture as a termination to buttresses, etc. Pinnacles are not used in the Norman style, though there exist a few small turrets, of late date, with pointed terminations, which appear to be their prototypes, as at the west end of Rochester Cathedral, and the north transept of the church of St. Stephen at Caen.

In the Early English style they are not very abundant; they are found circular, octagonal, or square; some are perfectly plain, as at the east end of Battle Church, Sussex; others are surrounded with small shafts, as at Peterborough and Wells; and in some instances the tops are crocketed. Towards the latter part of this style the system of surmounting each face of the shaft with a small pediment was introduced, and about the same period the shafts began to be occasionally made of open-work, so as to form niches for statues.

Decorated pinnacles are very numerous; they have the shafts sometimes formed into niches, and sometimes paneled or quite plain, and each of the sides almost invariably terminates in a pediment; the tops are generally crocketed, and always have finials on the points: in form they are most usually square, but are sometimes octagonal, and in a few instances hexagonal and pentagonal; occasionally, in this style, square pinnacles are placed diagonally.

In the Perpendicular style they do not in general differ much from those of the Decorated; polygonal forms are not very frequently found, and square pinnacles are very much oftener placed diagonally on buttresses, etc.; they are also in rich buildings abundantly used on the offsets of buttresses, as well as at the tops: instead of the small pediments over the sides of the shaft, it is sometimes finished with a complete molded cornice or capping, out of which the top of the pinnacle rises, and sometimes in the place of a top of this kind the figure of an animal holding a vane, or some other device, is used: there are a few examples of pinnacles in this style with ogee-shaped tops. In the fine Perpendicular towers the pinnacles are often the most striking feature. Examples are seen on Merton and Magdalen towers in Oxford, and many of the towers in Somersetshire.

## Pinner, Moses[[@Headword:Pinner, Moses]]

             a Jewish author, who died at Berlin in 1880, doctor of philosophy, is the author of, Compendium des babylonischen Talmud (Berlin, 1832): — Talmud Babli Tractat Berachot mit interpunctirtem Texte, mit hebr. Commentar nebst deutscher Uebersetzung (1842): — Prospectus der alten hebr. und rabbinischen Manuscripte nebst einem Facsimile des Propheten Habakuk (Odessa, 1845): — Offenes Sendschreiben an die Nationen Europa's und an die Stande Noswegen's (1848): — Aufruf an die orthodoxen Rabbiner Europa's (1858): — Geschichte der neuen Reformen der jud. Gemeinde in Berlin mind ihre Bekampfung (1857). See Furst, Bibl. Jud. 3:103; Zuchold, Bibl. Theol. 2:996. (B.P.)

## Pinney, John Brooke, LL.D[[@Headword:Pinney, John Brooke, LL.D]]

             a Presbyterian minister, was born at Baltimore, Maryland, December 25, 1806.. He graduated from the University of Georgia in 1828, having studied law while in college; graduated from Princeton Theological Seminary in 1832; was ordained by the Presbytery of Philadelphia the same year. and soon after went to Africa in the service of the American Colonization Society as agent for the colony of Liberia. He returned in 1847, and was installed pastor of the Presbyterian Church at Washington, Pa., where he remained until his appointment as secretary of the New York  State Colonization Society, a position which he occupied from 1848 to 1863, and again several years later. He made two visits to Africa to promote the interests of the colony of Liberia. His entire life was devoted to the welfare of the African race, and he engaged in his work with indomitable zeal and energy. He hadi worn himself out long before his end came, but, though infirm, he labored to the last. He died at his plantation, near Ocala, Florida, December 25, 1882, and was buried under the shade of the oaks near his house, six black men acting as pall-bearers. See Necrol. Report of Princeton Theol. Sem. 1883, page 25. (W.P.S.)

## Pinon[[@Headword:Pinon]]

             (Heb. Pinon', פַּינֹו. prob. i. q. Punon; Sept. Φεινών; Vulg. Phinon), one of the “dukes” of Edom; that is, head or founder of a tribe of that nation (Gen 36:41; 1Ch 1:52). By Eusebius and Jerome (Ononzasticon, Φινῶν, and Fenon) the seat of the tribe is said to have been at Punon, one of the stations of the Israelites in the Wilderness; which again they identify with Phaeno, “between Petra and Zoar,” the site of the famous Roman copper-mines. No name answering to Pinon appears to have been yet discovered in Arabic literature or among the existing tribes. SEE PUNON.

## Pins, Jean de[[@Headword:Pins, Jean de]]

             a French prelate noted for his diplomatic career, was born at Toulouse towards 1470. He was the third son of Gaillard de Pins, and studied under  the guidance of his eldest brother at Toulouse, Poitiers, Paris, and in Italy, where he became proficient in Greek and Latin letters through the lessons of Philippo Bersaldo the elder. In 1497 he embraced the clerical profession; returned to Italy, where he spent five years, and was in 1511 appointed clerk-counselor at the parliament of his native city. Antoine Duprat, with whom he was closely acquainted, took him to Italy, and had him appointed counselor at the parliament founded by Francis I at Milan. He there managed some very intricate matters with so much prudence and dexterity that the king sent him on an embassy to Venice in 1516, and to Rome in 1520. On both occasions he showed extraordinary aptitude for political negotiations, and displayed great zeal for the interests of religion and the glory of his country. A pontifical brief of Dec. 27, 1520; shows that Jean de Pins was made bishop of Pamiers. But he never governed that bishopric, and was in 1523 appointed bishop of Rieux. In-1527 he founded and endowed the chapter of Saint Ybars. The most learned men of his time spoke in praise of his erudition; and cardinal Sadolet submitted to him his own works before giving them to the printer. In 1673 his bust was placed in the Salle des Toulousains Illustres, at the capitol of Toulouse. Jean de Pins wrote in most elegant Latin, and deserved the following eulogy at the hands of Erasmus, who was such a competent judge in the matter: “Potest inter Tullianae dictionis competitores numerari Johannes Pinus.” We have of him, Vita Philippi Bersaldi majoris (Bologne, 1505, 4to): — Vita Sanctae Catharinae Senzeinsis (ibid. 1505, 4to): — Divi Rochi Narbonensis Vita (Ven. and Par. 1516, 8vo): — Allobrogicae narrationis libellus (ibid. 1516, 4to); this is a kind of novel composed for the instruction of the children of the chancellor Antoine Duprat: — De vita aulica (Toulouse, 4to); this work is held in great esteem: — De claris faeminis (Par. 1521, fol.); remarkable for the elegance of the composition. Pins died at Toulouse Nov. 1, 1537. — Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Géneralé, 40, 277.

## Pinsker, Simcha[[@Headword:Pinsker, Simcha]]

             a noted recent Hebraist, was born at Tarnopol, Austrian Poland (Galicia), in 1801. He was the son of a rabbi [see SHEBACH], and was well trained in Hebrew lore. Becoming interested in the doctrines of the Chasidim (q.v.), he joined the ranks of the so-called Kotzker-Chasidim, who, in the theory of mystic views, as well as in the practice, favored worldly gayety coupled with cynical elements. At the same time he suffered himself to be drawn into the whirlpool of a noisy commercial life, which induced him to  enter upon several large speculations; his genius could not long remain imprisoned in these strange spheres, and, with the loss of his entire fortune, he finally abandoned these schemes. He took up his abode in Odessa, which was then a flourishing town, and filled the situation of Rabbinical secretary, and although the pittance of a salary which was paid him was barely enough for his existence, he was always in good spirits. But it was not to be expected that a man of Pinsker's talents should long rest content in such a limited sphere. Perceiving how miserable was the condition, in regard to culture, of the South-Russian Jews, which he had no doubt was due to a faulty, antiquated education, he determined to exert himself for the establishment of Jewish elementary schools, in which the children could receive a proper religious and secular training, suitable to those times. Odessa, being the commercial center of Southern Russia, seemed to him just adapted for such an institution, and Simcha Pinsker lost no time in communicating this important matter to his friend Isaac Horowitz, a native of Brody, who at once took great interest in the proposition. The two young men made known the object they had in view to several influential parties, and soon succeeded in gaining for their plan the conjunction of eminent men, who made all necessary arrangements with the congregation and the government, and thus readily accomplished the object. Pinsker was placed at the head of the newly founded school, and in that capacity he labored until 1840, when he removed to Vienna on a pension for the remainder of his life. Pinsker is noted, however, not simply as the founder and propagator of a high educational status among his coreligionists at Odessa, but rather as one of the best Hebraists of our day. When in 1839 Abraham Firkowitch brought from the Crimea a mass of curious and unknown manuscripts, and, among others, a codex of the later prophets. which had, like several Pentateuch fragments, with Haphtaroth and Targum, a peculiar punctuation-the vowel and accent points deviating in form, placed not under, but above the consonants-and which he presented to the Odessa Society for history and antiquities, Pinsker gave himself to the deciphering of this newly discovered system of punctuation, and never rested till, in 1842-43, he became thoroughly acquainted with the materials before him. He showed the patience of a monk of the Middle Ages, continually making researches in bibliography, biography, and literary history, and did not even shrink from commencing to study the Arabic, the language in which some of the manuscripts were composed. To acquire the latter was in those days no mean task, especially in a town like Odessa, yet Pinsker overcame all difficulties, and by his indefatigable diligence he  mastered that language also. But none of these researches and their result were communicated to the world. Pinsker was too modest a man to presume that he had anything at command worth knowing by the rest of the world until Osias Schorr applied to him for a contribution to his critical Ha-Chaluz. For this purpose, Pinsker began his labors with a communication concerning the accomplishments of two Karaites, Mose Darai and Radba (David ben-Abraham), natives of Fez, who lived during the Middle Ages, and stood in great repute for their learning.

The result of these labors grew to a great work of comprehensive contents, which he published under the name Likkute Kadmonioth (“Collections from Times of Yore”), and also under the title, The History of Karaism and the Karaite Literature. In it he describes the development of Karaism, and notes four consecutive periods: a pre-Ananitic, one of Anan himself, another of the reformer Nohawendi, and last the Karaites proper. The latter period brought about the breach concerning the Talmudic tradition, and missionaries were sent to Jewish congregations in order to call the people together to enlist them for the new doctrine. From this calling together. (Hebrew, karaa), the word Karaite, according to Pinsker, was derived. They were the people who laid the foundation-stone for completing the edifice of Biblical orthography, grammar, lexicography, and modern Hebrew poesy; and although Gaon Saadia may be considered in Rabbinical circles as the first who wrote a Hebrew grammar and a lexicon, and Dunash ben-Labrat is looked upon as the first who wrote poetry according to Arabic rules, yet there were already among the Karaites many grammarians, lexicographers and poets, who made use of the Arabic meter, and of this we find ample proofs in the Likkute. Important Karaite writings are quoted, among which the Lexicon by Radba and the Divan by Mose Darai are largely treated of. Pinsker maintains that the latter lived during the 9th century; and, if so, Darai must be considered the leader of a great poetic period, the value of whose poetical productions was highly appreciated, inasmuch as Gebirol Mose ibn-Ezra, Jehuda ha-Levi, and Abraham ibn-Ezra employed many successful similes, expressions, and even whole strophes, which accord in sound and manner with those of Darai. The Likkute found a reception which surpassed the highest expectations of the author. Hardly known previously in the republic of letters, Pinsker became all at once a celebrated name. The extraordinary compilation, the imposing erudition, the superabundance of rich material, the conscientiousness and geniality of combinations, were all calculated to cause admiration. Before the work was all published, those, as it were,  official representatives of Jewish history, Jost and Gratz, hastened to declare their acknowledgment. The former, with full admiration, in the “Ben-Chananja” (1860), and the latter in the preface of the fifth volume of his history of the Jews. Also Dr. Schmiedl (Frankel's Monatsschrift, 1861) signified his appreciation of Pinsker. In the year 1863 Pinsker published in Vienna his Mebo nikkud, or, as entitled in German, “Introduction to the Babylonic-Hebraic punctuation system, executed according to the manuscripts for history and antiquities in the Odessa Museum.” This work is a masterpiece of critical penetration into the historic developments of the vowel and accentuation points. Every line of the Likkute and Mebo sufficiently proves Pinsker's inquiring mind as a grammarian, and it was one of his favorite ideas to publish a system of Hebrew grammar, which he was on the point of carrying out when his health began to fail him; and the more he tried to bid defiance to nature, the more inexorably the overtaxed mind took revenge on him. He died Oct. 29, 1864. He left in MS. more than eighty works, the most of them having reference to Rabbinical or Karaite authors, such as Jephet ben-Ali, Aron the First, Abraham ibn-Ezra, Maimonides-the books Abodah and Corbanoth-Kalonymos ben-Kalonyms, Mordecai Contini, Delmedigo, and many others. They treat of punctuation, accentuation, the Masorah, theoretic and practical grammar, lexicography, concordances, comparisons in philology, exegesis, bibliography, Biblical geography, and numerous other subjects. His loss is greatly mourned among Hebraists, for had he lived he would probably have given a completeness to his works which no one else is able to supply. (J. H. W.)

## Pintelli, Baccio[[@Headword:Pintelli, Baccio]]

             a noted Italian architect, is supposed to have been a Florentine. He was very active in Rome in the pontificate of Sixtus IV (1471-1484), for whom he built, in 1473, the Capella Sistina, which contains some of the greatest works of modern painting. It is a simple rectangular oblong, with a vaulted roof: 132 feet 8 inches long, 43 feet wide, and 57 feet 10 inches high. The fresco of the Last Judgment, by Michael Angelo, painted in 1533-1541, for pope Paul III, on the altar-wall, is 47 feet 1 inch in height, and 43 feet wide. It is the especial chapel of the pope, and the Church ceremonies of the first Sunday in Advent and of the Holy Week are always performed in it; the scrutiny also of the votes for the popedom takes place in this chapel, when the Conclave is held in the Vatican. Before the execution of the Last Judgment, two horizontal series of paintings went around the chapel below the windows, of which there are six on each side; the upper is a series from  the Old and New Testaments, illustrating the acts of Moses and of Christ; the second, or lower, consists of imitations of hangings, with the arms of Sixtus IV. The side walls remain as they were originally painted and on great festivals of the Church the painted hangings used to be formerly covered by the tapestries made for the purpose from the celebrated cartoons of Raffaelle which are now preserved in the corridor in the museum of the Vatican, built for them by Leo XII; they were placed in the museum by Pius VII in 1814, in the apartments of Pius V.

There are twenty-two tapestries in all, but only ten are in the style and of the size of the cartoons at Hampton Court; the rest were not ordered or purchased for the Sistine Chapel. The subject of these ten is the history of the apostles; and besides the seven at Hampton Court there are the following three: the Martyrdom of St. Stephen; St. Paul in Prison at Philippi during the Earthquake; and the Conversion of St. Paul. The ten cartoons of these tapestries were executed in 1515 and 1516 by the order of Leo X, and Raffaelle received for them about fifteen pounds each. The second set of tapestries of the Life of Christ, which are larger than the others, are supposed, from their style and their bad drawing, to have been executed from cartoons made by Flemish masters, probably Van Orlay and Michael Coxis, from small sketches by Raffaelle, and certainly not from cartoons from Raffaelle's own hands. The two sets are called Della Scuolea Nuova and Della Scuola Vecchia, those ordered by Leo X being of the “Scuola Vecchia.” The ceiling of the Sistine Chapel is decorated with the frescos executed in 1512 by Michael Angelo, illustrating the creation of man, the fall, and the early history of the world. Michael Angelo intended to paint the Fall of Lucifer on the wall opposite the Last Judgment, but this design was never carried into execution. The whole series of illustrations would have represented the complete cycle of the creation and fall of man, and his final salvation, if this last design had been executed: it would have offered one vast “speculum humanae salvationis,” as such a series was termed by the early artists of the Roman Catholic Church: it repeatedly occurs in early manuscripts. Pintelli was the principal architect of Sixtus, and he executed several other important works for this pope. Between the years 1472 and 1477 Pintelli erected the church and convent of Santa Maria del Popolo, in the church of which he built a beautiful chapel for Domenico della Rovere, cardinal of San Clemente, and, according to Vasari, nephew of Sixtus IV: he built a palace for the same cardinal at the Borgo Vecchio. About 1473- 1475 he built the old Library of the Vatican: Platina was installed by Sixtus as librarian in 1475. Pintelli restored also the hospital of Santo Spirito in  Sassia, which was burned down in 1741. He built also the Ponte Sisto over the Tiber; the churches San Pietro in Vinculis, Sant' Agostino, Santa Maria della Pace, and Sant' Apostolo (since rebuilt); and probably San Pietro in Montorio and San Jacopo were built from his designs. In 1480 Pintelli strengthened the celebrated church and convent of San Francisco at Assisi by raising enormous buttresses against the northern walls. Dr. Gaye (Kunstblatt, 1836) attributes some other works in Rome to Pintelli, and he has shown that after the death of Sixtus, in 1484, he went to Urbino to continue the ducal palace of Urbino, which Lucianus Lauralna of Slavonia had been engaged upon from 1468 until 1483, for Federico II, duke of Urbino. Pintelli may have remained at Urbino until 1491, when he built the church of Santa Maria delle Grazie at Sinigaglia, for the duke Giovanni della Rovere. He probably died at Urbino, where he was apparently naturalized, as he took the surname of Urbinas. He appears to have been influenced by the style of Brunelleschi in his designs, in which there are still characteristics of the previously prevailing pointed architecture. His works are said to be well constructed, as appears from the cupola of Sant' Agostino and the Ponte Sisto, still in a perfect state of preservation.

## Pinto de Fonseca, Emmanuel[[@Headword:Pinto de Fonseca, Emmanuel]]

             grand-master of the Order of Malta, born May 24, 1681, belonged to one of the first families of Portugal. Elected grandmaster Jan. 18,1741, after discharging the functions of vice-chancellor and bailli de grace, he won by his firmness of conduct the esteem of the sovereigns of Europe, to whom he had been useful. It was during his mastery that a widespread conspiracy against the order was discovered, June 25, 1742. A number of Turkish prisoners, among them Osman Pasha, governor of Rhodes, were to destroy the knights by the sword and by poison, and take possession of Malta with the aid of the Turkish fleet, with which they were in secret correspondence. In September, 1760, a number of Christian slaves forming the crew of a first-rate ship carrying a valuable freight, and on board of which Mehemet Pasha was going to Stanchio to collect the taxes, made themselves masters of the ship, brought it to Malta, and shared the spoils with the knights. The sultan prepared to wreak terrible vengeance on the order, when Louis XV, king of France, had the vessel redeemed at his own cost and restored to the padishah, Dec. 10, 1761. Pinto suppressed (1769) the Jesuits in all the  dominions of the order, but granted them an indemnity in the form of life- rents. In 1772 he obtained from king Stanislaus-August of Poland the restitution of considerable donations which had been taken from the order. He died Jan. 24, 1773. — Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Géneralé, 40, 281.

## Pinto, Isaac[[@Headword:Pinto, Isaac]]

             a Portuguese moralist of Jewish descent, was born in 1715. He first settled at Bordeaux, then went to Holland. He was a learned man, but commenced to write only at the age of about fifty, when he gained some reputation by defending against Voltaire his Jewish brethren, or at least, among them, the Portuguese and Spanish Jews. He wrote in French. We select among his writings, Essai sur le luxe (Amster. 1762, 12mo). He thus defines -his subject: “Luxury consists in this, that the houses we dwell in, the clothes we put on, the victuals we live on, the equipages we use, are so expensive in proportion of our means, that we can no longer discharge our duties towards our families, friends, the country, and the poor” (Apologie pour la nation Juive; Reflixions critiques, etc. [ibid. 1762, 12mo]). Pereire, the instructor of the deaf-mutes, was the editor of this work. The author sent a copy of it to Voltaire, who thanked him, and promised to notice it in the next edition of his works, which, however, he failed to do. Guenee reprinted the “Apology” as a kind of introduction to his Lettres de quelques Juifs Portugais: — Du jeu de Cartes (1768, 8vo), a letter to Diderot: — Traiti de la Circulation et du Credit (ibid. 1771, 1773, 1781, 8vo), translated into English and German: — Precis des arguments contre les materialistes (La Haye, 1774, 1776, 8vo). The complete works of  Pinto were published in French (Amster. 1771, 8vo), and in German (Leipsic, 1777, 8vo). Pinto died Aug. 14, 1787, at La Haye. — Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Géneralé 40, 282.

## Pinto, Josias, ben-Joseph[[@Headword:Pinto, Josias, ben-Joseph]]

             a Jewish rabbi, was born at the beginning of the 17th century at Lisbon, and settled at Damascus. He is also called רי8, i.e. Rabbi Josias Pinto, and wrote מאור עינים, “Light of the Eyes,” annotations on the Fountain of Jacob, עיו יעקב, by R. Jakob ibn-Chabib (Venice, 1643, and often since): — כס מזקק, “Purified Silver,” a diffuse exposition on the Pentateuch (ibid. 1628): — כס נבחר, “Choice Silver.” a succinct exposition on Genesis and Exodus:— כס צרו, “Proved Silver,” a commentary on Proverbs (Amsterd. 1714-35): — — שו8ת, legal decisions (Venice, 1694; Smyrna, 1756). See Furst, Bibl. Jud. 3. 104; De Rossi, Dizionario storico degli autori Ebrei (Germ. transl. by Hamburger), p. 265; Wolf, Bibl. Hebr. 1, 399 sq.; 3, 281 sq.; Lindo, Hist. of the Jews in Spain and Portugal, p. 336; Etheridge, Introduction to Hebrew Lit. p. 437; Finn, Sephardim, p. 462; Steinschneider, Catalogus Libr. Hebr. in Bibl: Bodl. p. 1547. (B. P.)

## Pinturicchio, Bernardino[[@Headword:Pinturicchio, Bernardino]]

             an Italian painter of much celebrity, was born at Perugia in 1454. His real name was Betti Biagi, but he was often called Sordicchio, from his deafness and insignificant appearance, but Pinturicchio was his usual name. He was a disciple of Pietro Perugino (q.v.). His earlier works no longer exist. He never perfected himself in the use of oil mediums, but was confined almost entirely to tempera. He went to Rome, and probably labored with Perugino in the Sistine Chapel. He afterwards executed almost numberless frescos in the churches and palaces of that city. He was first patronized by the Roveri, and then by the Piccolomini. For Alexander VI he decorated the Apartamento Borgia in the Vatican; five of these rooms still remain in their original state. His pictures in the Castle of S. Angelo have been completely destroyed. During his engagements in Rome he went twice to Orvieto, for the execution of commissions there. The amount of his labors was surprising, but is explained by his great facility of execution and the employment of many assistants. He was not original ‘in his compositions; he loved landscapes, but he cumbered them with too much detail; his figures of virgins, infants, and angels have a certain coarseness; he used too much gilt and ornamentation; his draperies were full, but often badly cast; his works are either too gaudy or very somber, no pleasing medium seeming to suggest itself to him; his flesh has the red outlines of the earliest tempera; and yet with all these faults he painted at a time when the great precepts of art were well known, and his works are good exponents of skilled labor in art without any striking or exceptional power in the artist. It is scarcely possible here to give more than a list of the churches in which he painted: in Rome they were the Araceli, S. Cecilia in Trastevere, Santa Croce in Gerusalemme, and S. Onofrio. In 1496 he returned to Perugia, and undertook an altar-piece for S. Maria de' Fossi (now S. Anna), to be completed in two years. This is the most finished of his works, and more full of feeling than any other. He next adorned the collegiate church of Spello; but his works there are fast disappearing from the effects of dampness.

He was next called to Siena by cardinal Francesco Piccolomini, to decorate the library of the Duomo. Here he painted the ceiling in a variety of designs, with the shield and arms of the Piccolomini ill the center; and the walls with ten scenes from the life of Eneas Sylvius, or Pius II. This work was commenced in 1503, but was interrupted by deaths in the family of his patron, and was not completed until 1507, he having filled various other commissions in the mean time. It is said with great probability that he was assisted in the library by the then youthful Raffaelle, and some critics have been wont to attribute the best features of all Pinturicchio's pictures to aid from the same source. But this can hardly have been the case. They were associated more or less, without doubt, and it is not improbable that Raffaelle was one of the many assistants whom the master hired in Perugia for his work in Siena; but there are many reasons why the credit of the best of Pinturicchio should not be given to Sanzio, who certainly does not need any such praise. There are many circumstances connected with certain cartoons, many similarities of figures in the works of the two masters, which make us feel sure of their association, but these Siena frescos are conceived in the system of Pinturicchio. This library is one of the few Italian halls that retain their original character. The frescos are discolored and injured in parts, but are, on the whole, fairly preserved. It is probable that after the completion of these works the master went to Rome, and returned to Siena in 1509 with Signorelli, who stood as godfather to the son born to Pinturicchio in the beginning of that year. He then probably entered the service of Pandolfo Petrucci. His last authentic picture is now in the Palazzo Borromeo at Milan, and is a cabinet size of Christ bearing his Cross. It was painted in 1513, the year of his death. Dreadful stories have been told of the manner in which his wife Grania treated him. It is said that when very sick she left him to die of starvation, but this lacks confirmation. His works are seen in all large, and in some smaller collections of Europe. See Clement, Handbook of Sculptors, Painters, etc., s.v.; Spooner, Biog. Hist. of the Fine Arts, s.v.

## Piny, Alexandre[[@Headword:Piny, Alexandre]]

             a French ascetic writer of much celebrity, was born at Barcelonnette in 1640. He joined the Dominican Order, and then taught theology at Aix; was called to Paris in 1676, and there was the director of the novitiate in the houses of his order. He was more distinguished for the holiness of his life than for his writings. He died at Paris Jan. 28, 1709. Of these we mention Cursus philosophicus (Lyons, 1670, 5 vols. 12mo): — Summte S.  Thomae Compendium (ibid. 1680, 4 vols. 12mo): — La Clef du par amour (ibid. 1682, 12mo): — La Vie cachae (Paris, 1685, 12mo), etc. — Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Géneralé, 40, 285.

## Pious Workers[[@Headword:Pious Workers]]

             a Roman Catholic congregation, founded in 1621 by Caraffa, an Italian nobleman, who was for a time a Jesuit, was approved by pope Gregory XV, and confirmed in 1634 by pope Urban VIII. This congregation is governed by a superior tribunal, and vows are taken, and they serve in missions and other ecclesiastical functions useful to the Church. Their dress is black cloth, like that of other ecclesiastics.

## Pipe, Hydraulic[[@Headword:Pipe, Hydraulic]]

             There are three Hebrew words so rendered: מוּצָקָה(mutsakah, Zec 4:2, something cast, as rendered 2Ch 4:3); נֶקֶב(ne'keb, prob. a bezel or cavity, Eze 28:13); and עִנְתָּר(tsantadr a tube, Zec 4:12; whence κάνθαρος, cantharus).

## Pipe, John S[[@Headword:Pipe, John S]]

             a Wesleyan minister, was born in the last half of the 18th century. He was converted when but a boy. He entered the itinerant ministry in 1790, and for thirty-five years labored most successfully for the Gospel cause. He was generally employed ill the most populous parts of the British kingdom, and was much beloved by the people to whom he preached. He died July 21, 1835. “‘His ministry was faithful, lively, and zealous, and his spirit affectionate, cheerful, and devout.”- Wesleyan Meth. Mag. 1835, p. 723.

## Pipe, Musical[[@Headword:Pipe, Musical]]

             (חָלַיל, chalil). The Hebrew word invariably so rendered (1Sa 10:5; 1Ki 1:40; Isa 5:12; Isa 30:29; Jer 48:36; so also αὐλός, 1Co 14:7) is derived from a root signifying “to bore, perforate,” and is represented with sufficient correctness by the English “pipe” (or “flute,” as in the margin of 1Ki 1:40). It is one of the simplest, and therefore probably one of the oldest of musical instruments; and in consequence of its simplicity of form there is reason to suppose that the “pipe” of the Hebrews did not differ materially from that of the ancient Egyptians and Greeks. It is associated with the tabret (toph) as an instrument of a peaceful and social character, just as in Shakespeare (Much Ado, 2, 3), “I have known when there was no music with him but the drum and fife, and now had he rather hear the tabor and the pipe” the constant accompaniment of merriment and festivity (Luk 7:32), and especially characteristic of “the piping time of peace.” The pipe and tabret were used at the banquets of the Hebrews (Isa 5:12), and their bridal processions (Mishna, Baba metsia, 6, 1), and accompanied the simpler  religious services, when the young prophets, returning from the high-place, caught their inspiration from the harmony (1Sa 10:5); or the pilgrims, on their way to the great festivals of their ritual, beguiled the weariness of the march with psalms sung to the simple music of the pipe (Isa 30:29). When Solomon was proclaimed king the whole people went up after him to Gihon, piping with pipes (1Ki 1:40). The sound of the pipe was apparently a soft wailing note, which made it appropriate to be used in mourning and at funerals (Mat 9:23), and in the lament of the prophet over the destruction of Moab (Jer 48:36). The pipe was the type of perforated wind instruments, as the harp was of stringed instruments (1Ma 3:45), and was even used in the Temple-choir, as appears from Psa 87:7, where “the players on instruments” are properly “pipers.” Twelve days in the year, according to the Mishna (Arach. 2, 3, the pipes sounded before the altar: at the slaying of the First Passover, the slaying of the Second Passover, the first feast-day of the Passover, the first feast-day of the Feast of Weeks. and the eight days of the Feast of Tabernacles. On the last-mentioned occasion the playing on pipes accompanied the drawing of water from the fountain of Siloah (Succah, 4, 1; 5, 1) for five and six days. The pipes which were played before the altar were of reed, and not of copper or bronze, because the former gave a softer sound. Of these there were not less than two nor more than twelve. In later times the office of mourning at funerals became a profession, and the funeral and death-bed were lever without the professional pipers or flute-players (αὐλητάς. Mat 9:23), a custom which still exists (comp. Ovid, Fast. 6, 660, “cantabat moestis tibia funeribus”). It was incumbent on even the poorest Israelite, at the death of his wife, to provide at least two pipers and one woman to make lamentation. SEE MUSICAL INSTRUMENTS.

In the social and festive life of the Egyptians the pipe played as prominent a part as among the Hebrews. ‘While dinner was preparing, the party was enlivened by the sound of music; and a band, consisting of the harp, lyre, guitar, tambourine, double and single pipe, flute, and other instruments, played the favorite airs and songs of the country” (Wilkinson, Anc. Egypt. 2, 222). In the different combinations of instruments used in Egyptian  bands, we generally find either the double pipe or the flute, and sometimes both; the former being played both by men and women, the latter exclusively by women. The Egyptian single pipe, as described by Wilkinson (Anc. Egypt. 2, 308), was “a straight tube, without any increase at the mouth, and when played was held with both hands. It was of moderate length, apparently not exceeding a foot and a half, and many have been found much smaller; but these may have belonged to the peasants, without meriting a place among the instruments of the Egyptian band… Some have three, others four holes… and some were furnished with a small mouthpiece” of reed or thick straw. This instrument must have been something like the này, or dervish's flute, which is described by Mr. Lane (Mod. Egypt. vol. 2, ch. 5) as “a simple reed, about eighteen inches in length, seven eighths of an inch in diameter at the upper extremity, and three quarters of an inch at the lower. It is pierced with six holes in front, and generally with another hole at the back… In the hands of a good performer the này yields fine, mellow tones; but it requires much practice to sound it well.” The double pipe, which is found as frequently in Egyptian paintings as the single one, “consisted of two pipes, perhaps occasionally united together by a common mouthpiece, and played each with the corresponding hand. It was common to the Greeks and other people, and, from the mode of holding it, received the name of right and left pipe, the tibia dextra and sinistra of the Romans; the latter had but few holes, and, emitting a deep sound, served as a bass. The other had more holes, and gave a sharp tone” (Wilkinson, Anc. Egypt. 2, 309, 310). It was played on chiefly by women, who danced as they played, and is imitated by the modern Egyptians in their zummára, or double reed, a rude instrument, used principally by peasants and camel-drivers out of doors (ibid. p. 311. 312).

In addition to these is also found in the earliest sculptures a kind of flute, held with both hands, and sometimes so long that the player was obliged to stretch his arms to their full length while playing. Any of the instruments above described would have been called by the Hebrews by the general term châlil, and it is not improbable that they might have derived their knowledge of them from Egypt. The single pipe is said to have been the invention of the Egyptians alone, who attribute it to Osiris (Jul. Poll. Onomnst. 4, 10); and as the material of which it was made was the lotus- wood (Ovid, Fust. 4, 190, “horrendo lotos adunca sono”), there may be some foundation for the conjecture. Other materials mentioned by Julius Pollux are reed, brass, boxwood, and horn. Pliny (16, 66) adds silver and the bones of asses. Bartenora, in his note on Arachin, 2, 3, above quoted,  identifies the châlil with the French chalumeau, which is the German schalineie and our shawm or shalm, of which the clarionet is a modern improvement. The shawm, says Mr. Chappell (Pop. Mus. 1, 35, note b), “was played with a reed like the wayte, or hautboy, but being a bass instrument, with about the compass of an octave, had probably more the tone of a bassoon.” This can scarcely be correct, or Drayton's expression, “the shrillest shawm” (Polyol. 4:366), would be inappropriate. — Smith, s.v. As among the Greeks, Romans, and the modern Arabs (see Niebuhr, Reis. 1, 180, where cuts are given), so probably among the ancient Jews, there were several kinds of pipe, distinguished chiefly by the number of holes. (See Joseph. War, 3, 9, 5; Pliny, 10:60; Doughtaei Anal. 2, 12; Altmann, in Tempe Helv. 2, 509 sq.) Yet we must not call to mind the completeness of modern pipes and flutes, obtained by keys, etc. See esp. Meursius, De tibiis collect and. in Ugolino, Thesaur. vol. 32; Bartholin, De tibiis vet. Bib. 3 (Amsterd. 1679). SEE FLUTE.

## Piper[[@Headword:Piper]]

             (Rev 18:22). SEE MINSTREL; SEE PIPE.

## Pipher, William G[[@Headword:Pipher, William G]]

             a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born August 23, 1817, in Hopkinston, N. H. In 1837 he removed to Illinois, and entered a school  in the town of Ebenezer, near Jacksonville. He was converted Aug. 6, 1838, and believing that he was moved by the Holy Ghost to preach the Gospel, obtained license Aug. 14, 1841. In September of the same year he joined the Illinois Conference, and was appointed to the Rushville Circuit; in 1842 was sent to Carthage; in 1843 he was appointed to Pulaski; in 1844 was reappointed to Rushville; in 1845 to Mount Sterling; in 1846 to Lawrenceville; in 1847 to Hillsborough; in 1848 was ordained elder; and from 1848 to 1850 held a local relation. In 1851 he was readmitted to the Conference, and reappointed to Pulaski; in 1852 to Havanna; in 1853 to Athens; in 1854 to Edgar; in 1855, his health not being very good, he took a transfer to Kansas, which at that time was just opening for settlement. His first appointment was Topeka Circuit, where he labored with great acceptability, and laid foundations upon which others have since largely built. In 1857 he was sent to Big Springs Circuit, where he did a good work, organized classes and Sunday-schools, attending to all the duties of a Methodist preacher. In 1858 he was appointed to the Auburn and Tecumseh Circuit, where he labored the earlier half of the year with some success; but the long rides between appointments, the many exposures to storms, swimming swollen streams, with only such accommodations as new settlements often afford, and sometimes wandering over the wide prairies until morning, broke him down completely, and at the Conference in 1859 he took a superannuated relation, after which he resided at Baldwin City, Kansas, highly respected and most beloved by those who knew him best. He died there May 15, 1869. See Minutes of Annual Conferences, 1870, p. 94.

## Piphiles[[@Headword:Piphiles]]

             a name given to the Flemish Albigenses (see Ekhert, Adv. Cathar. in Bibl. Max. Lugd. 23, 601). SEE ALBIGENSES.

## Pipping, Henri[[@Headword:Pipping, Henri]]

             a German theologian and biographer, was born at Leipsic in 1670. He discharged, from the year 1693, several ecclesiastical functions at the church of San Thomas at Leipsic, and became in 1708 preacher at the court of Dresden. Pipping died in 1722. He wrote Arcanae Bibliothecae Thorae Lipsiensis sacrae (Leipsic, 1780, 8vo): — Sacer decadum septenarius menmriam theologorum nostra cetate clarissimorum exhibens (ibid. 1705, 2 vols. 8vo), followed by a Trias decadunm (ibid. 1707, 8vo):  — Semicenturia Biographica selecta (ibid. 1709, 8vo): — Syntagma dissertationum (ibid. 1708 and 1723, 8vo).

## Piquepuz[[@Headword:Piquepuz]]

             is the name of a French reformed order of Franciscans, which was organized by father Vincent Massart, a Parisian, in 1593. They built their first convent between Paris and Pontoise, and the second at the place called Piquepuz, where they finally made their headquarters, and obtained the name by which they are generally known. The strength of the order confined to France is remarkable. They have a house at Rome, but it is the only one sanctioned outside of France, as pope Paul V, who gave authority for the order in 1620, so conditioned. Their dress is a black coat, and a round hood with scapulary. They wear sandals, and shave like the Capuchin monks.

## Piquet (or Picquet), Claude[[@Headword:Piquet (or Picquet), Claude]]

             a French monastic, was born at Dijon in the second half of the 16th century. He joined the Franciscan Order, and became the abbot of this order at Chalons-sur-Saone and at Romenay. He was also professor of philosophy. He died after 1621. He left Commentaria super evangelicam fratrum Minorum regulam ac sancti Francisci testamentum (Lyons, 1597, 8vo). It contains a life of the founder, and a catalogue of the distinguished men of his order: — Provinciae S. Bonaventurae, seu Burgundiae fratrum Minorum regularis observantiae, etc., descrimptio (Tournon, 1610 and 1612, 8vo). Claude Piquet left, among other manuscripts, a life of pope Clement IV. Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Géneralé, 40, 298.

## Piquet, Francois[[@Headword:Piquet, Francois]]

             an eminent Roman Catholic missionary, was born at Bourg-en-Brasse. France, Decmber 6, 1708. Having been educated at the seminary of St. Sulpice, Paris, he was admitted to that order, and in 1733 was sent to Montreal, of which the Sulpicians were the founders and pastors. In 1740 he was placed in charge of the Iroquois mission at the Lake of the Two Mountains. He accompanied the Iroquois in their ensuing campaign, and tried to found a mission at Oswegatchie, but, protected by count de la Gallissoniere and Bigot, he began his work on the site of Ogdensburg, in 1749. The Mohawks burned his mission buildings a few months after, but in two years he received three thousand in, Christian instruction. In May, 1752, a bishop conferred the sacraments for the first time within the present limits of New York State. The fall of Canada approaching, Piquet, in 1759, had to abandon Oswegatchie, and retired with his converts to Grande Isle des Galops, where he built a chapel. His register closes July 23, 1760. He then returned to Europe, and the traveller Bossu met him at Corunna in 1762. In France he was occupied in various duties in the Church, and died at Verjon, July 1, 1781. See (N.Y.) Cath. Almanac, 1877, page 60; De Courcy and Shea, Hist. of the Cath. Church in the U.S. page 447.

## Pira[[@Headword:Pira]]

             (Πειρά), a name found in the apocryphal account of the family-heads who returned from the Captivity with Zerubbabel (1 Esdr. 5, 19); but not contained in the parallel Heb. texts (Ezr 2:25; Neh 7:29), and evidently originating from a repetition of the name Caphira preceding.

## Piram[[@Headword:Piram]]

             (Heb. Pirame', פַּרְאָם, like a wild ass, i.e. fleet; Sept. (Φιδών, v. r. Alex. Φεραάμ, Vulg. Pharam), the Amoritish king of Jarmuth at the time of  Joshua's conquest of Canaan (Jos 10:3). B.C. cir. 1618. With his four confederates he was defeated in the great battle before Gibeon, and fled for refuge to the cave at Makkedah, the entrance to which was closed by Joshua's command. At the close of the long day's slaughter and pursuit, the five kings were brought from their hiding-place, and hanged upon five trees till sunset, when their bodies were taken down and cast into the cave “wherein they had been hid” (Jos 10:27) Smith. SEE JARMUTH.

## Pirathon[[@Headword:Pirathon]]

             (Heb. Pirathons, פַּרְעָתוֹן, Gesen. princely; First, a cleft or creek; Sept. Φαραθών, v. r. Φαραθώμ and Φραθών), the name of one or two places in Palestine. We read in the book of Judges that “Abdon the son of Hillel, a Pirathonite, judged Israel, . . . and was buried in Pirathon, in the land of Ephraim, in the mount of the Amalekites” (12:13, 15). The city is not again mentioned in the Bible; but among David‘s mighty men was “Benaiah the Pirathonite, of the children of Ephraim” (1Ch 27:14; 1Ch 11:31; 2Sa 23:30). The city of Pirathon was therefore situated in the territory of Ephraim, and among the mountains, apparently where a colony of the wandering Amalekites had settled. Jerome mentions it (Onomast. s.v. Fraaton), but does not appear to have known anything of it. It is mentioned, however, by the accurate old traveller hap-Parchi as lying about two hours west of Shechem, and called Fer'ata (Asher's Bejammin of Tud. 2, 426). About six miles W.S.W. of Nebulus, upon the summit of a tell among low hills, still stands the little village of 1'ea'ata, which is doubtless identical with the ancient Pirathon (Robinson, Bib. Res. 3, 134). According to Schwarz (Palest. p. 151), it is identified, by Astori with the modern village Pretha, on the mountain of Amalek, five English miles west of Shechem, doubtless referring to the same place. Josephus mentions a Pharathon (Φαραθών), grouping it between Timnah and Tekoa (Ant. 13, 1, 3); and the same name occurs in 1 Mace. 9:50 (Φαραθωνι), among the towns whose ruined fortifications were restored by Bacchides, in his campaign against the Jews; but it could scarcely have been identical with the Pirathon of Ephraim, though the names are the same. This city was probably situated somewhere in the wilderness of Judah; but the site has not been discovered. SEE PIRATHONITE.

## Pirathon (2)[[@Headword:Pirathon (2)]]

             The modern Ferata is laid down on the Ordnance Map at five and a half miles south-west of Nablus, and described in the accompanying Menzoirs (2:162) as "a small village of ancient appearance, standing on a tell or mound, with a rock-cut tomb to the south and a sacred museum to the east." It has "a few cisterns and the remains of a sarcophagus" (ibid. page 285). Instead of this identification Lieut. Conder, with less probability,  suggests Feron, lying ten miles west of Sebustieh, and described (ibid. page 164) as "a small village on a slope, at the edge of the plain, with a few trees and a well to the east. The inhabitants are all Greek Christians."

## Pirathonite[[@Headword:Pirathonite]]

             (Heb. Pirathoini', פַּרְעָתוֹנַיand פַּרְעָתֹנַי, from Pirathon; Sept. Φαραθωνίτης, Φαραθωνει or ἐκ Φαραθών), a native or inhabitant of Pirathon (q.v.); the epithet of the judge Abdon (Jdg 12:13; Jdg 12:15), and of two of David's officers, namely, Benaiah, captain of the eleventh army contingent (1Ch 23:14), and a member of the royal guard (1Ch 11:31).

## Pirie, Alexander[[@Headword:Pirie, Alexander]]

             a Scotch divine, flourished near the opening of the present century. His ecclesiastical connection was first with the Antiburghers, then with the Relief Synod, and finally he joined the Independents. He died at Newburgh, in Fife, in 1804. His works, collected and published after his death (Edinb. 1805-6, 6 vols. 12mo), contain various treatises, relating to the Jews, to the primitive condition of man, on difficult passages of Scripture, on baptism and the covenant of Sinai, and a dissertation on Hebrew roots. On all these topics he has many fanciful and visionary speculations, and it is to be regretted that a mind so capable and a life so industrious was spent so largely on trifles, or things of a fanciful nature. His controversial pamphlets are prized because they exhibit his religious modifications.

## Pirie, William Robinson, D.D[[@Headword:Pirie, William Robinson, D.D]]

             a Scotch divine, son of Reverend George Pirie, D.D., of Slains, Aberdeenshire, was born in that village, July 26, 1804, and educated at the University of Aberdeen. He was appointed minister at Dyce in 1830; professor of divinity in the university of Marischal College, Aberdeen, in December, 1843; minister at Greyfriars, of the same city, in September, 1846; professor of divinity or Church history in united universities, Marischal and King's colleges, in 1860, and in May 1877, principal and vicechancellor of the same, a position which he occupied until his death, November 4, 1885. Dr. Pirie was active in every movement which agitated the Scottish Church during the forty years of his public life. He was the author of Natural Theology (Edinb. 1868). See Fasti Eccles. Scoticanae, 3:501.

## Pirit[[@Headword:Pirit]]

             a ceremony among the Buddhists of Ceylon, which consists in reading certain portions of the Bana, for the purpose of appeasing the daemons called Yakas, from whom all the afflictions of men are supposed to proceed. This ceremony, which is the only one that professes to be sanctioned by Gotama Buddha, is thus described by Mr. Spence Hardy in his Eastern Monachism:

“About sunset numbers of persons arrived from different quarters, the greater proportion of whom were women, bringing with them coconut- shells and oil, to be presented as offerings. As darkness came on the shells were placed in niches in the wall of the court by which the wihara is surrounded; and by the aid of the oil and a little cotton they were soon converted into lamps. The wall around the bótree was similarly illuminated: as many of the people had brought torches, composed of cotton and resinous substances, the whole of the sacred enclosure was in a blaze of light. The gay attire and merry countenances of the various groups that  were seen in every direction gave evidence that, however solemn the professed object for which they were assembled together, it was regarded by all as a time of relaxation and festivity. Indeed, the grand cause of the popularity of this and similar gatherings is that they are the only occasion, marriage festivals excepted, upon which the young people can see and be seen, or upon which they can throw off the reserve and restraint it is their custom to observe in the ordinary routine of society intercourse. The service continues during the seven days, a preparatory ceremony being held on the evening of the second day. The edifice in which it is conducted is the same as that in which the Bana is read upon other occasions. A relic of Buaha, enclosed in a casket, is placed upon the platform erected for the purpose; and the presence of this relic is supposed to give the same efficacy to the proceedings as if the great sage were personally there. For the priests who are to officiate another platform is prepared; and at the conclusion of the preparatory service a sacred thread, called the pirit nula, is fastened round the interior of the building, the end of which, after being fastened to the reading-platform, is placed near the relic. At such times as the whole of the priests who are present are engaged in chanting the chorus the cord is untwined, and each priest takes hold of it, thus making the communication complete between each of the officiating priests, the relic, and the interior walls of the building.

From the commencement of the service on the morning of the second day, until its conclusion on the evening of the seventh day the reading-platform is never to be vacated day or night. For this reason, when the two officiating priests are to be relieved by others, one continues sitting and reading while the other gives his seat to his successor, and the second priest does not effect his exchange until the new one has commenced rending. In the same way, from the morning of the second day till the morning of the seventh day, the reading is continued day and night, without intermission. Not fewer than twelve, and in general twenty-four, priests are in attendance, two of whom are constantly officiating. As they are relieved every two hours, each priest has to officiate two hours out of the twenty-four. In addition to this, all the priests engaged in the ceremony are collected three times in each day: viz. at sunrise, at mid-day, and at sunset, when they chant in chorus the three principal discourses of the pirit, called respectively Mangala, Ratana, and Karaniya, with a short selection of verses from other sources. After this the reading is continued till the series of discourses have been read through, when they are begun again, no other than those in the first series being read until the sixth day, when a new series is commenced. On the morning of  the seventh day a grand procession is formed of armed and unarmned men, and a person is appointed to officiate as the dewad-utaya, or messenger of the gods. This company, with a few of the priests, proceeds to some place where the gods are supposed to reside, inviting them to attend prior to the conclusion of the service, that they may partake-of its benefits. Until the messenger and his associates return the officiating priests remain seated, but the reading is suspended. At the festival I attended the messenger was introduced with great slate, and sulfur was burned before him to make his appearance the more supernatural. One of the priests having proclaimed that the various orders of gods and daemons were invited to be present, the messenger replied that he had been deputed by such and such deities, repeating their names, to say that they would attend. The threefold protective formulary, which forms parts of the recitation, was spoken by all present in grand chorus. In the midst of much that is superstitious in practice or utterly erroneous in doctrine, there is some advice repeated of an excellent tendency; but the whole ceremony being conducted in a language that the people do not understand, no beneficial result can be produced by its performance.”

Such is the ceremony attending the reading of the ritual of priestly exorcism. This ritual is called Pinruwana pota., It is written in the Pali language, and consists of extracts from the sacred books, the recital of which, accompanied with certain attendant ceremonies, is intended to ward off evil and to bring prosperity.

## Pirke Aboth[[@Headword:Pirke Aboth]]

             i.e. capita patrum (פֶּרֶק, a chapter), or sayings of the fathers, is the name of a tract of the Mishna (q.v.), and consists of five chapters of chronologically regulated gnomes from the teachers of Israel who flourished within 4501 years. They were in all ages highly esteemed for their moral character, but in modern times, when a greater interest in Jewish history awoke, they also experienced greater attention on account of their historical ‘value. The Pirke Aboth was especially used by Frankel for solving some historical problems, and several after him found in them sources for chronological suggestions. A very ingenious speculation about ‘the first chapter of the Pirke Aboth is brought forward by rabbi Bloch. He asserts that its sentences and rules of life were pronounced on the occasion of the solemn dispensing of the Semicha, “the ordination and authorization to the office of rabbi and judge,” given to the disciples as rules of life in  office. With such sentence the teacher discharged his disciple, who was prepared to enter an independent calling. The first chapter gives us the chain of tradition, how the law was delivered from generation to generation. When the men of the great synagogue said, “Be deliberate in judgment. train up many disciples, and make a fence for the law,” they could not have intended for every man and for every opportunity, but just for such disciples to whom they dispensed Semicha. When Judah ibn-Tabia taught (1Ch 11:8), “Consider not thyself like a chief-justice, and when parties are before thee in judgment, consider both as guilty; but when they are departed from thee, consider them both as innocent, if they acquiesced in the sentence;” or if Abtalyon impressed the sages to be cautious of their words (1Ch 11:11), etc., it appears clearly that they merely addressed persons who have charge of judgments and of the chair. 1Ch 11:13, which is taught in the name of Hillel, expresses genuine Shamaic rigor, and only the suppositions that these precepts are directed to disciples will somewhat explain their rigidness. Especially 1Ch 11:3 gains clearness, which reports the sentence of Antigonos of Socho: “Be not like servants who serve their master for the sake of receiving reward, but be like servants who serve without the condition to receive reward, and let the fear of heaven be upon you.” According to the common conception, the last sentence could not be brought into close connection with the foregoing. Clearly Antigonos intended to say something else than what his expounders impute to him. By פרסhe decidedly understood earthly reward, and addressed his disciples to exercise their offices as teacher and judge not with a view to reward. but for the office' sake, and “The fear of heaven be upon you” completes the advice. The chapters following contain rules of life for “every man” (שיבור לו האדם).

When the extemporaneous discourses were suspended in the synagogue by the reading of the Haggadah (q.v.), etc., it became the custom to read in the Sabbath afternoon service a chapter of the Aboth (Zunz, Gottesdienstl. Vortradqe der Juden, p. 424), and this still continues the practice in many countries (Bodenschatz, Kirchl. Ver. fussung der Juden, 2, 151 sq.). The Spanish Jews read the Aboth only on the six Sabbaths between Passover and Pentecost. The Prayer-books have the Aboth always as an appendix. A separate critical edition, with German translation, was prepared by rabbi Caro, under the title Minchath Schabbath (Krotoshin, 1847). SEE TALMUD. (J.H.W.)

## Pirkheimer, Wilibald[[@Headword:Pirkheimer, Wilibald]]

             a celebrated German humanist, was born at Eichstadt, Dec. 5, 1470, of an old patrician Nuremberg family. He enjoyed a most refined education; he was at the age of eighteen introduced to the court of the bishop of Eichstadt, where he soon became proficient in every kind of knightly pursuit, and carefully cultivated his fine native talent for music. Though interrupted by several military expeditions, his literary studies, in which he was guided by Georges von Tegen and the canon Adelmann, were not neglected. In 1490 he went to the University of Padua, where he studied jurisprudence, and got familiar with the Greek language, in which he was taught by Musurus. Three years afterwards he completed his study of jurisprudence at Pavia, under Maino, Lancelot and Philip Decius. At his return to Nuremberg, 1497, he married Crescentia Rietter, whose influential family soon opened to him the doors of the senate. This assembly soon acknowledged his merit, and, in spite of his youth, entrusted him with several important negotiations. In 1499 he obtained the command of the contingent sent by the city to the emperor Maximilian I against the Swiss cantons, when his brilliant conduct during this campaign, of which he afterwards published an account won him the favor of the sovereign, who made him his counselor. Disgusted by the envious attacks of which the imperial favor was fruitful, he resigned in 1501 his functions as senator, but resumed them three years afterwards, when he was again entrusted with the most delicate negotiations, his amiable disposition and persuasive eloquence fitting him especially for this kind of affairs. In 1511 or 1512 he was sent as deputy to the diets of Treves and Cologne. In 1522 Pirkheimer retired into private life, devoting himself to study, and encouraging with all his power throughout Germany the cultivation of literature and science. His library, rich in rare manuscripts, was at the disposition of the public; his opulent mansion became the favorite resort of a chosen phalanx of literati, artists, and other persons of merit. He helped many a poor savant with his purse and his influence. He entertained friendly relations with Erasmus, Conrad Cettes, Reuchlin. Tritheme, Albert Durer, Pico de la Mirandola, etc.

Unfortunately the greater part of his correspondence is lost; but what remains of it proves the truth of the words of Cochlaeus in a letter to Pirkheimer, “Eo enim hactenus in eruditos fuisti animo, ut communi studiosorum judicio habitus fueris et literarum decus et eruditionis varise atque adeo omnigene princeps.” After greatly improving the condition of the schools of Nuremberg, he made that city one of the most active centers  of intellectual culture. Hutten likens his influence to that of Erasmus and Reuchlin. His predilection for the classical, especially for the Greek writers, some of which he translated into Latin and German, did not lessen his interest for the history of his own country. Some parts of it he treated with a judicious criticism remarkable for that time. He also endeavored to encourage the study of mathematics and of astronomy, and finally took a most lively interest in all attempts made to reform the Church and its discipline, writing against the degenerated scholastics, and taking the part of Reuchlin against his persecutors in an eloquent pamphlet. He at first enlisted among the partisans of Luther, but soon changed his mind, being, like Erasmus, fearful lest the success of reformation might prove obnoxious to his favorite pursuits. He died at Nuremberg Dec. 22,1530. His works are Eccius dedotatus (1520, 4to), under the pseudonym of T. Fr. Cottalambergius: — Apologia seu laus podagree (Nuremb. 1522, 4to; Strasb. 1529, 1570; Amberg, 1604, 1611, 4to); this humorous pamphlet was translated into German (Nuremb. 1831, 8vo): — De vera Christi carne, ad AEcolampadium responsio (ibid. 1526, 8vo); followed by a second answer, and a pamphlet with the title De convitiis monachi illius qui AEcomlapadius nuncupatur (1527, 8vo): — Germaniae ex vatriis Scriptoribus perbrevis explicatio (ibid. 1530, 1532, 8vo): — Priscorum num morum cestimatio (Tübing. 1533; Nuremb. 1541, 4to): — Translations of several Opuscula of Plutarch, Lucian, St. Nilus, St. Gregory Nazianzenus, etc. The complete works of Pirkheimer have been collected by Goldast (Frankf. 1610, fol.); among them we find printed for the first time his Bellum Suitense seu Helveticum anno 1490, translated into German by Munch, who added thereto a life of the author (Nuremb. 1826). Pirkheimer gave the first edition of Fulgentius (ibid. 1519, 8vo); he also wrote the text to the splendid woodcuts of Albert Dilrer's Triumphal Chariot of the Emperor Maximilian. Some of his letters are to be found in Strobel's Beitrige and Miscellanea, in Waldau's Beitrage, and other collections.

His sister, Charitas Pirkheimer, born 1464, after enjoying a most liberal education, entered very young the monastery of Santa Clara at Nuremberg, of which she became abbess in 1504. She read Greek, and wrote in Latin with elegance. Some of her letters in that language to Erasmus and others have been preserved. She died in 1532. — Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Géneralé, 40, 304.

## Pirking, Ehrenreich[[@Headword:Pirking, Ehrenreich]]

             a German canonist, was born at Sigarten, in Bavaria, in 1606. After studying philosophy and jurisprudence at Ingolstadt, he entered the Jesuitic order in 1628, and was a professor of morals, canon law, and exegesis in several colleges of his order. Pirking died after 1676. We have of him, Apologia Caesaris, principum Catholicorum et ordinum religiosorum adversus Balduini calumnios (Ingolstadt, 1652, 8vo):De jurisdictione prelatorum et rectorum episcopis inferiorum (Dillingen, 1663, 8vo): — De jurisdictione juidicis delegati (ibid. 1664, 8vo): — De constitutionibus et consuetudine (ibid. 1666, 8vo): — De renuntiatione beneficiorum (ibid. 1667, 8vo): — Commentariain Decretales (ibid. 1674, 3 vols. fol.): — Jus canonicum explicatum (ibid. 1674-1678, 5 vols. fol.; Venice, 1759).

## Pirksoma[[@Headword:Pirksoma]]

             in the mythology of the Greenlanders, is the god to whom all other deities are subordinate, and who distributes rewards or punishments according to moral actions.

## Pirminius, St[[@Headword:Pirminius, St]]

             a Frankish ecclesiastic and bishop of Melci (Metz, or Melo in St. Gallen, or Medelsheim, near Zweibriicken, or Meaux-on-the-Marne), carried the Gospel along the shores of the lake of Constance; and, protected in his labors by Charles Martel, he founded the monastery of Reichenau. Three years afterwards, however, he was expelled in consequence of a national rising of the Alemanni against the Frankish rule, and he now descended the Rhine and founded a number of monasteries (as Murbach, Schwarzenbach, Neuweiler, Schuttern, Gengenbach, etc.), among them Hornbach, in the diocese of Metz, where he died, Nov. 3. 753, after having met shortly before with St. Boniface. A great many legends surround the life of this servant of Christ, which, however, have no historical basis. Pirminius is said to be the author of Libellus abbmatis Pirminii, de singulis libris canonicis scarapsus (the latter in mediaeval Latin meaning “excerpt”), printed in Mabillon, Vetera Analecta (Paris, 1723, fol.), p. 65-73. See Rettberg, Kirchengeschichte Deutschlands, 2, 50-58; Hefele, Geschichte der Einfiihrung des Christenthums in südwestlichen Deutschland (Tübing. 1837); G. Th. Rudhard, Alteste Geschichte Bayerns (Hamburg, 1841), p. 346, 371, 372; M. Gorringer, Pirminius, etc. (Zweibr. 1841), p. 384-407; Fink, in Piper's Evangel. Kalender, 1861, 12:129-134; Kurtz, Lehrbuch der Kirchengesch. vol. 1, § 78, p. 1; Herzog, Real-Encyklop. s.v.; Jicher, Gelehrten-Lexikon, s.v.; Theologisches Universal-Lexikon, s.v. (B. P.)

## Pirna, John[[@Headword:Pirna, John]]

             SEE PIRNENSIANS.

## Pirnensians[[@Headword:Pirnensians]]

             a mediaeval sect, taking its name from John Pirna or Pirnensis, an anti- sacerdotal schismatic of Silesia, A.D. 1341. His principles were those common to the mediaeval sects, and illustrated especially in the Beghards and the Brethren of the Free Spirit. It is thought probable that they were in some way connected with the Strigolniks of Russia, although the latter belong to a much more recent time. The Pirnensians regarded the pope as Antichrist, and were especially distinguished by great hatred of the clergy. They disappeared on the Continent by merging with the Hussites. See Krazinski, Hist. of the Reformation in Poland, 1, 55; Hardwick, Hist. of the Church in the Middle Ages, p. 374.

## Piromalli, Paolo[[@Headword:Piromalli, Paolo]]

             an Italian missionary, was born in 1591 or 1592 at Siderno (Ulterior Calabria). Having embraced the rule of St. Dominic, he devoted himself to preaching, and was in 1628 called to Rome to teach philosophy in the monastery of La Minerva. Appointed in 1631 director of the missions of Major Armenia, he succeeded in gaining for the Catholic faith a number of schismatics and Eutychians, among the latter the patriarchs Cyriac and Moyse III. In 1637 he traveled through Georgia, and was twice sent to pacify in Poloilia the uneasiness caused by the disputes of the Armenians. In 1642 he went to Persia, remaining there ten years, and then preached the Gospel in several parts of India. In 1654 he passed over to Africa, with a view of converting infidels, but was captured by Algerian pirates, who kept him prisoner for fourteen months. Appointed archbishop of Naschivan (1655), he governed that Armenian Church to the close of 1664, when he was transferred to the episcopal see of Bisignano, in the kingdom of Naples. He died July 13, 1667, at Bisignano. He left Theanthropologia (Vienna, 1656. 8vo): — Apologia de duplici natura Christi (ibid. 1656, 8vo); and sixteen works never printed, among which we may mention a Vocabulary and a Grammar of the Armenian language. — Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Géneralé, 40, 308.

## Pirot, Edmonde[[@Headword:Pirot, Edmonde]]

             a French theologian, was born Aug. 12, 1631, at Auxerre. He chose the clerical career, and having taken his degrees, the doctorate included, at the Sorbonne, he became a most successful professor of theology, a member of the chapter of Notre Dame de Paris, and at last chancellor. It was his  regular business to examine the works and theses of theology. He interrogated Mme. Guyon, and undertook the censure of her doctrines. Fenelon gave him his Explication de Maximes des Saints to examine. He approved of it greatly, after some small changes, going even so far, it is said, as to call it a golden book; then, under the influence of Bossuet, he took back his first decision and wrote against the Explication a censure which was signed by sixty other doctors. He died at Paris Aug. 4, 1713. With the exception of a Latin speech pronounced in 1669, nothing of his exists in print; but some manuscript pamphlets are mentioned by contemporaries.

A Jesuit of this name, Prof (Georges), who was born in 1599 in the bishopric of Rennes, is the author of an Apologie des Casuistes contre les Calomnies des Jansenistes (1657), a work condemned by Alexander VII and several bishops. He died Oct. 6, 1659. — Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Géneralé, 40, 320.

## Pisa[[@Headword:Pisa]]

             a city of Northern Italy, the recent capital of Tuscany, with a population of about 22,000, is noted in ecclesiastical history as the seat of several important Church councils.

I. The first council here (Concilium Pisanum) was convoked by pope Innocent II in 1134, who presided at the head of a large assembly of the bishops of France, Germany, and Italy. St. Bernard assisted at their deliberations. By this body the excommunication of the anti-pope Anacletus was renewed, together with his abettors. Several canons were published.

1. Directs that priests shall be separated from their wives, and nuns from their pretended husbands; and both parties put to penance.

6. Forbids, under pain of excommunication, to violate the sanctuary of a church or churchyard. See Labbe, Concil. 10, 989.

II. But far more important was the council convened here March 25, 1409. Its object was the conciliation of the pope and anti-pope, and the ending of so dangerous a schism as then existed. It was proposed to judge between the two competitors for the papacy, and elect one of them to the throne, or set both aside and choose a third party. The council was called  under the protection of king Charles VI of France, and was attended by the cardinals of both rivals to the papal chair-Benedict XIII (q.v.) and Gregory XII (q.v.). Benedict, by the advice of several bishops, sent seven legates to the council; but Gregory, on the other hand, refused to appear either in person or by deputy, although summoned in due form. The assembly was one of the most august and numerous ever seen in the Church: there were present 22 cardinals; the Latin patriarchs of Alexandria (Simon), Antioch (Wenceslaus), Jerusalem (Hugo), and Grade (Francis Lando); 12 archbishops were present in person, and 14 by their proctors; 80 bishops, and the proctors of 102 absent; 87 abbots, and the proctors of 200 others; besides priors; generals of orders; the grand-master of Rhodes with 16 commanders; the prior-general of the Knights of the Holy Sepulcher; the deputy of the grand-master and Knights of the Teutonic Order; the deputies of the universities of Oxford, Cambridge, Paris, Florence, Cracow Vienna, Prague, and many others; more than 300 doctors in theology; and ambassadors from the kings of England, France, Portugal, Bohemia, Sicily, Poland, and Cyprus; from the dukes of Burgundy, Brabant, etc.

The following was the action of each session of this council:

Session

1. The order of precedency to be observed by the members of the council was laid down.

Sess.

2. After the usual prayer and sermon, the archbishop of Pisa read the decree of Gregory X upon the procession o f the Holy Spirit, to which the Greeks had agreed in the Council of Lyons, A.D. 1274, and the canon of Toledo relating to the proper order of ecclesiastical councils. After this the necessary officers were appointed, the letter of convocation read, and the two rival popes summoned at the gates of the church; no one, however, appearing for them.

Sess.

3. A fresh citation was made, and no one having appeared, the two popes, Pedro of Luna and Angelo Corrario, were declared contumacious by a sentence which was affixed to the church door.

S

ess.

4. Bishop Ulric, the ambassador of Robert, king of the Romans, addressed the assembly, endeavoring to frustrate the object of the council.

Sess.

5. The two contending parties were again declared contumacious, and the promoter of the council produced against them thirty-seven articles, containing the whole history of the schism, and showing the  badness of their cause. Although the facts contained in this accusation were sufficiently notorious, commissioners were appointed to prove their truth.

S

ess.

6. The bishop of Salisbury showed that it was necessary for the cause that there should be a general, and not merely a partial, withdrawal from the obedience of the popes, and declared that he had authority from the king of England to follow out the scheme for unity, and to consent to whatever the council should determine.

Sess.

7. The difficulties started by the ambassador of the king of the Romans were answered.

Sess.

8. The bishops of Salisbury and Evreux showed that the union of the two colleges of cardinals could not be effected while those of the party of Benedict continued to obey him, and that the withdrawal from obedience must be universal. Whereupon the council declared the union of the two colleges to be lawful, and the council itself duly convoked; and a decree was passed to the effect that each one might and ought to' withdraw from the obedience both of Gregory and Benedict; since both of them had by their artifices eluded the solemn cession of office which they had promised upon oath to make.

S

ess.

9. Was employed in the reading of the decree of the preceding session.

Sess.

10. The two contending parties were again cited at the door of the church, in order that they might hear the testimony of the witnesses. -Then thirty-seven articles, containing their deposition, were read; and it was; noted down by how many witnesses each article was proved.

Sess.

11. The reading of the depositions was continued.

S

ess.

12. A decree was published declaring the council to be ecumenical, and all contained in the preceding depositions to be true, public, and notorious.

Sess.

13. One of the deputies from the University of Paris showed that Pedro of Luna was a heretic and schismatic, and that he had forfeited the papacy; and this he declared to be the opinion of the French universities. The bishop of Navarre also declared that all the doctors in the council, to the number of three hundred, agreed in this view.  S

ess.

14. A declaration was made that the council represented the Roman Catholic Church that the cognizance of the matter before it of right belonged to it, as being the highest authority on earth; also an act of general withdrawal from the obedience of the two contending parties was drawn up,

Sess.

15. The definitive sentence was pronounced in the presence of the whole council and of the people who were permitted to enter. The sentence was to the effect that the holy ecumenical synod, representing the Catholic Church, to which it appertained to take cognizance of and to decide the question, after having examined everything which had been done concerning the union of the Church, declared Pedro of Luna, called Benedict XIII, and Angelo Corrario, called Gregory XII, to be both of them schismatical, abettors of schism, heretics, and guilty of perjury; that they had given offence to the whole Church by their obstinacy, that they had forfeited every dignity, and were, ipso facto, separated from the Church. It forbade all the faithful, under pain of excommunication, to recognize them or support their cause. It annulled all that they had done against the promoters of unity, and declared the last promotion of cardinals made by them to be null and void.

Sess.

16. A paper was read, in which the cardinals present all promised that, in the event of any one of them being elected to the papal chair, he would continue the present council, until the Church should be reformed in its head and in its members; and if one of those then absent or any other not belonging to the college of cardinals, were elected, that they would compel him to make the same promise before publishing his election. Afterwards the council ratified the sentence against Angelo and Pedro.

Sess.

17. Certain preliminaries concerning the election were settled.

Sess.

18. A solemn procession was made to implore of the Almighty the grace necessary to guide their election.

Sess.

19. The cardinals, to the number of twenty-four, entered into conclave under the guard of the grand-master of Rhodes, and at the end of ten days' confinement, they unanimously elected Peter of Candia, cardinal of Milan, of the order of Franciscan friars, a man seventy years of age, who took the name of Alexander V. As soon as he was elected, John Gerson, chancellor of the University of Paris, delivered a discourse, exhorting him to the faithful discharge of his duty, etc.

Sess.

20. The new pope presided and delivered a discourse. The decree of his election was then read, and on the following Sunday he was crowned.

Sess.

21. A decree was read on the part of the pope, approving and ratifying all the dispensations of marriage, and those relating to the penitentiary, which had been granted by Benedict or Gregory.

Sess.

22. A decree was published on the part of the pope and council, confirming all collations, provisions, translations, etc., made canonically by the two rival popes.

Sess.

23. A decree was read, ordering metropolitans to convoke provincial councils, and the generals of orders to hold chapters, having presidents of the pope's appointment. Finally, Alexander ratified all that the cardinals had done since May 3, 1408, and especially what had passed at Pisa. With regard to Church reform, as many of the prelates had left the council, the pope declared that the subject should be deferred until the following council, which he appointed to be held in 1412; then he dismissed the assembly, giving plenary indulgence to all who had assisted at it, and to all who had adhered to it.

See Hardouin, Acta, 7, 1929 sq.; 8:1 sq.; Mansi, Concil. 26, 1131 sq.; 27, 1-522; Labbe, Concil. 11, 2114; Lenfant, Hist. du Cone. de Pisa (Amsterd. 1724, 4to); Wessenberg, Die Allgemeinen Concil. des 15 u. 16 Jahrh. 2, 48 sq.; Hefele, Conciliengesch. vol. 5. For the imbecile conduct of papal affairs under the newly chosen candidate we refer the reader to the art. SEE ALEXANDER V, and the history of his successor, John XXIII (s.v.). In this place we may simply add that the schism, instead of being closed, continued, with three popes in the room of two. The effort also to reduce the rank of the pope to a constitutional instead of an absolute monarch, by giving to the councils of the Church the supreme tribunal, to which the pope himself is subordinate and amenable, failed. SEE INFALLIBILITY; SEE PAPAL SUPREMACY.

III. Another council was convened at Pisa in 1511, at the instigation of the emperors Maximilian and Louis XII of France, who having just cause of complaint against pope Julius II (q.v.), persuaded the cardinals of St. Croix, Narbonne, and Cosenzi to convoke a council, whose object was set forth to be the reform of the Church in its head and in its members, and to punish various notorious crimes which for a long time had scandalized the whole Church. It was further stated that there was urgent need of such  councils, that Julius had not only neglected to convoke one, but had done all in his power to hinder it; and, finally, the pope was in respectful terms cited to appear at the council. Besides this, in answer to the complaint made against them by Julius, they published an apology for their conduct, in which they justified the convocation of the Council of Pisa: first, by a decree passed in the thirty-ninth session of the council; secondly, by the pope's own vow, according to which he had promised to hold a council; thirdly, by the oath of the cardinals, and by the necessity of avoiding so great scandal. They further showed that the canons, which vest the power of convoking such councils in the pope, are to be understood as speaking of the ordinary state of things, but that cause may arise in which councils may be called and assembled by others than the sovereign pontiff. The pope, in order to parry the blow, convoked a rival council to Rome, and cited the three above-mentioned cardinals to appear there within a certain time, under pain of deprivation. The Council of Pisa, however, proceeded, and was opened Nov. 1, 1511. Four cardinals attended, and the proctors of three who were absent, also fourteen French bishops and two archbishops, together with a few abbots and doctors; deputies from the universities of France, and the ambassadors of Louis XII. The following is an account of each session's transactions:

Sess.

1. Cardinal St. Croix presided. The convocation of the Council of Pisa, having for its object the reformation of the Church, was pronounced to be just and lawful, and all that had been or might be done to its prejudice declared null and void.

Sess.

2. All that related to the order of the assembly was settled; the canon of Toledo read, and officers appointed. A decree was made to the effect that the present council could not be dissolved until the reformation of the Church should have been effected. The decrees of the Council of Constance, relating to the authority of ecumenical councils, were renewed.

Sess.

3. At this time, the pope having entered into a league with Ferdinand and the Venetians, began to attack the state of Florence, and the fathers judged it expedient to transfer the council to Milan; which accordingly was done; and on Jan. 4, 1512, the fourth session was held at Milan.

S

ess.

4. The assembly was more numerous, the cardinals of St. Severin and St. Angelo joined themselves to the others. The proctor-general of the Order of Premonstrants made a long discourse upon the disorders which ravaged the Church; then certain decrees were read, by which thirty days  were given to the pope, within which time to determine himself to reform abuses in the Church, or else to assemble an ecumenical council, or to unite with that already assembled.

Sess.

5. The decree of the Council of Constance was renewed against those who troubled and maltreated persons coming to the council.

S

ess.

6. A deputy from the University of Paris delivered a discourse, after which the pope Julius was again cited in the usual form; and upon his non- appearance a demand was made that he should be declared contumacious. Several decrees were also published, among other subjects upon the exemplary life which ecclesiastics ought to lead; also upon the order to be observed in councils, with regard to sessions and congregations. The convocation of a council to Rome, made by Julius, was declared null and void.

Sess.

7. The promoters of the council required that Julius should be declared, through his contumacy, to have incurred, ipso facto, suspension from all administration of the pontifical office. Consequently he was called upon three times from the foot of the altar, and at the church door: the settlement of the question was then deferred till the next session.

Sess.

8. After mass, sung by the bishop of Maguelonue (now Montpellier), a decree was made suspending Julius, and the council, after reciting all that had been done in order to obtain his protection, exhorted all cardinals, bishops, princes, and people no longer to recognize Julius as pope, he having been declared contumacious, the author of schism, incorrigible and hardened, and having as such incurred the penalties denounced in the decrees of Constance and Basle.

Sess. 9. This was the last session of the council, for the French being obliged to abandon the Milanese, the bishops were compelled to quit Milan; they made an attempt to continue the council at Lyons, but without effect.

See Landon, Conc. 13, 1486; Dupin, Comp. Hist. 4, 4; Hefele. Conciliengesch.

## Pisa, Bartholomeo de[[@Headword:Pisa, Bartholomeo de]]

             an Italian theologian, was born at Pisa near the beginning of the 14th century. He belonged to the Dominican Order, and has often been  confounded with a Franciscan monk of the same name, who rendered himself famous by his book on the resemblance of Jesus to St. Francis. He died about 1347. He wrote several works of piety and theology; but two only have been printed: Summa de casibus conscientiae (Cologne, 1474, fol.), and De documentis antiquorum opus morale (Treviso, 1601, 8vo). See lchard, De Script. Ord. Prcedicat. — -Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Géneralé, 40, 330.

## Pisa, Samuel Cohen de[[@Headword:Pisa, Samuel Cohen de]]

             a native of Lisbon, was one of the most profound Talmudists of the 17th century. He wrote צפנת פענח, the “Revealer of Secrets” (Venice, 1661), a commentary on the most difficult passages of Ecclesiastes and Job, in fourteen chapters, which, besides the exposition of the passages, considers very important questions. Thus, for instance, in the first chapter he treats on the question “whether, in the third chapter of Ecclesiastes, the immortality of the soul is denied;” and in the ninth chapter, “whether Job did deny, the immortality of the soul and the resurrection of the dead.” See Furst, Bibl. Jud. 3, 105; De Rossi, Dizzionario storico degli autori Ebrei, p. 265 (German trans. by Hamburger); Wolf, Bibl. Hebr. 1, 1206; 3, 1111; Lindo, History of the Jews in Spain and Portugal, p. 369. (B. P.)

## Pisano, Giovanni[[@Headword:Pisano, Giovanni]]

             the son and assistant of Niccola, was born at Pisa about 1240. He seems to have inherited much of his father's genius, but had an entirely different taste. Gothic architecture was his choice, and he was fond of exaggeration and fantastic action and expression in sculpture. As early as the making of the Siena pulpit he was a master in his own right, and went in 1268 to Naples to fulfill a commission from the Franciscans there; he also designed the Episcopal Palace. After the death of Niccola the Pisans were anxious to have Giovanni remain in his native city, where he executed important works. The church of S. Maria della Spina was the first example in Italy of the pointed architecture, and is a most pleasing one, In 1278 he was chosen to build the Pisan Campo Santo; it was the first and the most beautiful church of all Italy. It is too well known to be described in our limited space, but it seems that nothing could have been more fitting for its purpose than the plan which he adopted. Many of the sculptures here were also by his hand. The representation of Pisa was the first attempt at making large statues in Italy since the days of Constantine. It is a strange, and in many respects are unlovely work; and yet it has great intensity of expression in its principal figure, and displays the originality of Giovanni. He gained much reputation from this, and in 1286 went to Siena, where he was commissioned to build the facade of the cathedral. The people of Siena were very desirous that he should fix his home there; the magistrates made him a citizen, and exempted him from taxes for life; but he remained only three years, and went next to Perugia. In that city he made a monument to Urban IV, which no longer exists. From this time he devoted himself almost wholly to sculpture. At Arezzo he made the shrine of S. Donato for the cathedral, which cost (including jewels for the Madonna, enamels, and silver bass-reliefs) 30,000 florins. It was a superb work of art. His next  work was done as a rival to “II Tedesco,” a sculptor who had made a pulpit for the church of S. Giovanni at Pistoja, which was much praised. A new pulpit was also to be made for the church of S. Andrea, and there were those in Pistoja who had so admired Niccola Pisanio that they desired to have Giovanni do it; he excelled his rival in every way, and fully supported the reputation he had gained. Our artist now went to Florence. This was a prosperous time there, and Giovanni remained two years. In 1305 he began the monument of pope Benedict XI, and somewhat later one for St. Margaret in S. Dominica at Perugia. In 1312 he undertook the rebuilding of the cathedral of Prato, and, though he did not live to see it completed, his designs were carried out with precision. He died in 1320. He had many pupils; among them Andrea Pisano (q.v.). See Spooner, Bing. Hist. of the Fine Arts, s.v.; Vasari, Lives of the Painters and Sculptors; Cicognara, Storia della, Scultura, s.v.

## Pisano, Giunta (or Giunta di Giustino of Pisa)[[@Headword:Pisano, Giunta (or Giunta di Giustino of Pisa)]]

             is the earliest known Tuscan painter, and flourished in the first half of the 13th century. A crucifixion painted by him in the church of Santa Maria degli Angeli at A'ssisi, about the year 1236, is still preserved; it is admirable in impasto and absolutely great as a work of art, compared with anything we know of this early period in Italy. Giunta was anterior to Cimabue. This shows how little reliance is to be placed on local and partial histories, especially where individuals are made heroes of. This picture, of which a facsimile has been published by the Disseldorf painter Ramboux, in his Outlines from Tracings, illustrating the Old Christian Art in Italy, shows that, so far from Cimabue being the father of Italian painting, he was scarcely equal to Giunta, certainly inferior in style of drawing. If an individual can have the credit of reviving painting in Italy, it must belong to Giunta Pisano, for anything we know, as yet, to the contrary; he is said to have worked with the Greeks about 1210. There was notoriously an influx of Greek artists into Italy after the Venetian capture of Constantinople in 1204, but we know of no Greek works equal to this crucifixion by Giunta. There are several other works of his preserved, and the progress of the art was evidently very slow, even down to the time of Masaccio, notwithstanding the great impulse given to it by the works of Giotto.

## Pisano, Niccola[[@Headword:Pisano, Niccola]]

             a noted Italian architect and sculptor, was born at Pisa about 1206. At the age of fifteen he was appointed architect to Frederick II, with whom he went to Naples. In the service of this sovereign he passed ten years, and then went to Padua, where he made the design for the Basilica di S. Antonio. The first known attempt which he made as a sculptor resulted in his alto-rilievo of the Deposition from the Cross which now fills a lunette over a door of the cathedral of S. Martino at Lucca. This is most excellent as the work of an untutored artist, as he was at that time, and it shines by comparison with works of his contemporaries which are near it. The statuettes of the Misericordia Vecchia at Florence are of about the same merit as this bass-relief. In 1248 Niccola went to Florence to assist the Ghibellines in their work of destruction; he was commissioned to overturn the tower called Guardamorto in such a way as to destroy the Baptistery; he overturned the tower, but it did not fall in the anticipated direction, and we may believe that this was in accordance with his intention, although it was attributed to a special miracle by Villani. During tie twelve succeeding years he was employed in making designs for the building and remodeling of many churches and palaces. The church of Santa Trinita at Florence is one of the best known of his works of this period. In 1260 Niccola established his fame as a sculptor by the magnificent pulpit which he executed for the Baptistery at Pisa. Of course marks of his comparative inexperience can be found in this work, but taken all in all it almost challenges criticism. His next work was the Arca di S. Domenico at Bologna, which is now surrounded with a maze of beautiful sculptures, of which the Arca is the center, and is of great interest as illustrating the art of the 13th century. In 1266 Pisalno went to Siena to make the pulpit for the Duomo. This is similar to that of Pisa in many ways, but not so effective, because surrounded by other objects of interest, and in a larger space, while at Pisa the pulpit seems almost the only thing to attract the attention. In 1269 he was commissioned to build the abbey and convent of. La Scorgola, which are now in ruins. In 1274 he commenced the fountain of Perugia, which was his last work. The authorities of the city made severe laws for its preservation, and it was considered the most precious possession of the city. In 1278 Pisano died, after a life of great usefulness, for his influence had been felt through all Italy. His services could never be estimated. He had founded a new school of sculpture; had put behind him the standards of barbarism; in architecture too, the same may be said, and  in the words of Mr. Perkins, “He was truly a great man, one to whom the world owes an eternal debt of gratitude, and who looms up in gigantic proportions through the mist of five centuries, holding the same relation to Italian art which Dante holds to Italian literature.” In his life he was respected and beloved by all who came in contact with him, be it as patron, friend, of servant.

## Pisanski, Georg Christoph[[@Headword:Pisanski, Georg Christoph]]

             a Lutheran theologian of Germany, was born at Johannisberg, Prussia, August 23, 1725. He studied at Konigsberg, and in 1748 was teacher at the cathedral school. In 1773 he was doctor of theology, and died October 11, 1789. He wrote, Canonica Librorum Omnium Vet. Testamenti, etc. (Berlin, 1775): — Λογία τοῦ θεοῦ Judaeorum Fidei Credits, etc. (Konigsberg, 1778): — Beleuchtung der sogenannten biblischen Damonologie (eod.): — Deo Errore Irenaei in Determinanda Etsiate Christi (eod.): — De Miraculosis Spiritus Sancti Donis, etc. (eod.): — Vindiciae Psalmorum, etc. (1779): — Adversaria de Accommodationibus Veteris Testamenti, etc. (1781): — An Liber Jonas non Historiam ssed Fabulam Contineat? (1789). See Doring, Die gelehrten Theologens Deutschlands, s.v.; Furst, Bibl. Jud. 3:105. (B.P.)

## Pisant, Louis[[@Headword:Pisant, Louis]]

             a French savant, was born in 1646 at Sassetot, near Fdcamp. Admitted in 1667 into the Congregation of the Benedictines of Saint-Maur he administered with the rank of superior several abbeys, and retired to that of Saint-Ouen. He died May 5, 1726, at Rouen. He wrote, Sentiments d'une AmRe penitente (1711, 12mo), and Traite historique et dogamatiqile des Privileges et Exemptions ecclesiastiques (Luxemb. 1715, 4to), a work which failed to meet the approbation of his congregation. — Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Géneralé, 40, 330.

## Pisarno, Andrea[[@Headword:Pisarno, Andrea]]

             an early artist of Pisa, was a sculptor and architect, and the friend of Giotto, a few years his senior. Andrea was born about 1280. Of his several works still extant, the bronze gates of the Baptistery of St. John at Florence are the most important. These two gates are still perfect; the exact date of their execution is disputed-whether they were finished in 1330, or only commenced in that year. The reliefs are from the life of John the Baptist, and the general design of the gate is said to have been made by Giotto; but Giotto's share, if any, must have been more that of the architect than the sculptor, though even defining the panels and indicating the subjects; he can scarcely have had more to do with the design than this, or his name would have been more intimately associated with them. The work appears to have been modeled by Andrea and his son Nine, and the castings commenced by some Venetian artists in 1330, and the complete gates to have been finished and gilded in 1339, with the exception of some decorations of the architrave, which were added many years afterwards by Vittorio, the son of Lorenzo Ghiberti, in order to make them harmonize  with the other two sets of gates executed by his father. The gates of Andrea were originally in the center of the Baptistery, opposite to the cathedral, but were afterwards removed to the side. to give place to the more beautiful work of Ghiberti, in the year 1424. All three sets of gates have been well engraved in outline by Lasinio, Letre Porte del Battisterio di Firenze (Florence, 1823). Andrea was made citizen of Florence, and died there in 1345; he was buried in the cathedral of Santa Maria del Fiore. See Vasari, Vite de Pittori, etc. (ed. Fjor. 1846 sq.); Cicognara, Storia della Scultura; Rumohr, Italienische Foarschungen; Rosini, Storia della Pittura Italiana, s.v.

## Piscator (i.e., Fischer), Peter[[@Headword:Piscator (i.e., Fischer), Peter]]

             a Protestant theologian of Germany, was born at Hanau, April 7, 1571. He studied at different universities, was for some time professor of Hebrew at Jena, in 1605 professor of theology, and died January 10, 1611, doctor of theology. He wrote, De Baptismo: — De Eterna Praedestinatione Salvandorums: Problemata Sacra: — Comm. in Formulam Concordiae: Dissertationes in Libros Symbolicos: — Quaestione Miscellaneae Hebraeo-Chaldaeo-Syriaco-Graco-Latinae: — De Peccato e Psalmi 51. Enarratione. See Winer, Handbuch der theol. Lit. 1:340; Jocher, Allgemeines Gelehrten-Lexikon, s.v. (B.P.)

## Piscator, Johannes[[@Headword:Piscator, Johannes]]

             a German theologian of the Reformation age, is noted for his learning and piety. He was born at Strasburg March 27, 1546. He was from his youth up a lover of study, and was soon distinguished for his learning. While engaged in the study of logic, he anxiously sought to reconcile ‘and unite Aristotle and his commentator Peter Ramus (q.v.); and when, after the completion of his university studies at Strasburg and Tübingen, he became professor at the university of his native town, he made this the special subject of some of his lectures, though the department of divinity was his field. Suspected of Zwinglianism, he found his position uncomfortable, and accepted a professorship at Heidelberg in 1574. But here also the severely Lutheran tendency gave him disquiet, and after a short stay at Neustadt in 1578 he went to Nevers, France, where, however, he was not suffered to remain quietly, and in 1584 he finally removed to Ierborn as connector of the Academy, where he taught with so much success that many students flocked thither from Germany, France, Poland, and other northern countries. He was very diligent, and scarcely allowed himself sufficient time for sleep. He wrote extensively, translating the whole Bible with great faithfulness into the German, and making a logical and theological analysis of the greater part (Herborn, 1602-3, 3 vols. 4to; 2d ed. 1604-6; 3d ed. 1624; abridged ed. Berne, 1681; Dinsburg, 1684). He also published  several valuable commentaries on the Old and New Testaments (1613-58), and many dogmatic and polemic writings, of which those on the Lord's Supper, Predestination, Heidelberg Catechism, Justification, and the reply to Hunnius, De Sacramentos, deserve mention. Most peculiar were the views of Piscator on the active obedience of Christ, which he held not to be imputed, but that which Christ for himself owed to God. SEE SATISFACTION. Piscator died in 1625. See Steubing, in Zeitschriftf: histor. Theol. 1841, 4:198 sq.; Schröckh, Kirchengesch. s. d. Rev, 358 sq.; Gass, Prot. Dogmatik, 1, 163, 383, 422; Tholuck. Das akademische Leben des Men Jahrh. pt. 2, p. 304; Hagenbach, Kitchengesch. vol. v; Bossuet, Variations, vol. 2; Buchanan, Justification (see Inex). (J. H. W.)

## Pischon, Friedrich Augustus[[@Headword:Pischon, Friedrich Augustus]]

             a minister of the German Evangelical Church, and pastor in Berlin, died Dec. 31,1857. He published, Die hohe Wichltigkeit der Uebersetzung der heil. Schrift durch Martin Luther (Berlin, 1834): — Von der Hülfe, welche die Frauen der Aufnahme des gottlichen Wortes leisten konnen (ibid. 1836): — Predigten (ibid. 1837): — Vortrdye über die deutsche und schweizerische Reformation (ibid. 1846): Die Augsburgische Confession u. der Berliner Kirchentag (ibid. 1853): — Die Tauznamen. Eine Weihnachtsgabe (ibid. 1857, etc.). He also edited the Monatsscrift für die unirte evangelische Kirche, in connection with Eltester, Jonas, and Sydow. See Zuchhold, Bibliotheca Theologica, 2, 899, 997 sq. (B. P.)

## Pischon, Johann Karl[[@Headword:Pischon, Johann Karl]]

             a Reformed theologian, was born at Cottbus, in Lower Lusatia, October 12, 1764. He studied at Halle, was in 1790 cathedral-preacher there, in 1799 court-preacher at Potsdam, and died November 18, 1805. He published several volumes of sermons. See Doring, Die deutschen Kanlzelredner, page 297 sq.; Winer, Handbuch der theol. Lit. 2:62, 96, 149, 222, 292, 323, 331. (B.P.)

## Piscictili[[@Headword:Piscictili]]

             (little fishes), a name which the early Christians sometimes assumed, to denote, as Tertullian alleges, that they were born again into Christianity by water, and could not be saved but by continuing therein. SEE ICHTHUS.

## Piscina[[@Headword:Piscina]]

             (Lat.= a reservoir of water), originally the reservoir and filter connected with the aqueducts of Rome, but applied in ecclesiastical language to a water drain formerly placed near an altar in a church, is a small niche, orfenestella, containing the piscina or lavacrum, basin. It consists of a shallow stone basin, or sink, with a hole in the bottom, to carry off whatever is poured into it. It is fixed at a convenient height above the floor, and was used to receive the water in which the priest washed his hands as well as that with which the chalice was rinsed at the time of the celebration of the mass. It is usually annexed to the consessus or seats of the priests in the ancient churches, for the most part similarly decorated, and sometimes  appearing as an additional compartment. It is sometimes also found alone in the southern walls of chancels and aisles, sometimes in the eastern walls on the right, and there are one or two instances in which it occurs on the left. When two channels occur in it, one was to receive the water in which the priest had washed his hands, the other that in which he had rinsed the chalice. Ducange limits the piscina, as it is restricted above, to the lavacrum. By Bingham it is received in a more enlarged meaning. “The font,” says that author, by the Greek writers is commonly called κολυμβήθρα, and by the Latins piscina, for which latter name Optatus affords a mystical reason. He says it was called piscina in allusion to our Savior's technical name ἰχθύς, which was an acrostic composed of the initial letters of our Savior's several titles, Jesus Christ, the Son of God, our Savior.” SEE FISH; SEE FONT.

In many instances, particularly in those of Early English and early Decorated date, there are two basins and drains, and occasionally three; within the niche there is also often found a wooden or stone shelf, which served the purpose of a credence-table, to receive certain of the sacred vessels that were used in the service of the mass, previous to their being required at the altar; sometimes there is room at the bottom of the niche for these to stand at the side of the basin. In England the piscina is almost invariably on the south side of the altar, and usually in the south wall (though sometimes in the eastern), but in Normandy it is not uncommon to find it on the north side, when the situation of the altar is such as to render that more convenient than the south. No piscinas are known to exist in England of earlier date than the middle of the 12th century, and of that age they are extremely rare; of the 13th and succeeding centuries, down to the period of the Reformation, they are very abundant, and are to be found (or at least traces of them) in the chancel of most churches that have not been rebuilt, and very frequently at the eastern ends of the aisles of the nave also: their forms and decorations are very various, but the character of the architectural features will always decide their date.

## Piscis, Pisciculi, and Vesica Piscis[[@Headword:Piscis, Pisciculi, and Vesica Piscis]]

             The fish is a hieroglyphic of Jesus Christ, very common in the remains of Christian art, both primitive and medieval. The origin of it is as follows: From the name and title of our blessed Lord, Ι᾿ησοῦς Χριστός, θεοῦ Υἱός, Σωτήρ-Jesus Christ, the Son of God, the Savior-the early Christians, taking the first letter of each word, formed the name ΙΧΘΥΣ, piscis, a fish. SEE INSCRIPTIONS. Hence Christians came to be called Pisciculi, little  fishes, with reference to their regeneration in the waters of baptism. The Vesica Piscis, which is the figure of an oval, generally pointed at either end, and which is much used as the form of the seals of religious houses, and to enclose figures of Jesus Christ or of the saints, also has its rise from this name of Christ, though some say that the mystical Vesica Piscis has no reference except in its name to a fish, but represents the almond, the symbol of virginity and self-production. Clement of Alexandria, in writing of the ornaments which a Christian may consistently wear, mentions the fish as a proper device for a ring, and says that it may serve to remind the Christian of the origin of his spiritual life. See Riddle, Christian Antiquities, p. 185; Siegel, Christl. Alterthümer (see Index in vol. 4). SEE ICHTHUS.

## Pise, Charles Constantine, D.D[[@Headword:Pise, Charles Constantine, D.D]]

             an American Roman Catholic divine of note, was born at Annapolis, Md., in 1802. He was the son of an Italian gentleman of ancient and noble family. His mother was an American lady, a native of Philadelphia. At an early age Charles was placed in the Georgetown College, that famous institution being then as now under the control of the Order of the Society of Jesus. Graduating there most creditably, he went to Rome to pursue his theological studies, but returned after two years, and completed his preparation for the ministry under the tutelage of the Rev. Dr. Bunti, the preceptor of the late archbishop Hughes. On his return to this country Pise taught rhetoric and poetry in the Seminary of Mount St. Mary's, Emmettsburg, Md. He was ordained priest in 1825, and commenced his labors in Frederick Md., but subsequently removed to Baltimore, where he officiated at the cathedral. The labors of his position, together with the performance of a large amount of religious literary work which he attempted, impaired his health, and he again visited Rome for a respite. While there he was honored with the title of Knight of the Roman Empire. Upon his return to America he settled in Washington, and through the influence of Henry Clay and other warm personal friends he was elected chaplain to the senate of the United States. On the invitation of Dr. Dubois, then bishop of New York, he afterwards removed to New York City, and officiated at St. Peter's, in Barclay Street, till 1849, when he went over to Brooklyn, and purchased the church in Sydney Place, with which he was connected at the time of his death, in 1866. Dr. Pise was acknowledged to be one of the most eloquent and learned divines of his Church in America, as he was one of the most industrious and faithful laborers in it. Aside from  his labors with his spiritual charge, he was eminent both as a preacher and a lecturer. He devoted much time to literary pursuits. He was the author of Letters on the Truths of Catholic Doctrines; a History of the Church from its Establishment to the Reformation (1830, 5 vols. 8vo): — The Acts of the Apostles in Verse: — The Lives of St. Ignatius and his Companions; and many other volumes in prose and verse. He also edited, many years ago, in company with the late father Felix Varella, D.D., an influential magazine published in New York City, and known as the Catholic Expository. In the volumes of this work will be found many of his happiest efforts both in verse and prose. Among the latter may be mentioned Horae Vagabandae, a series of deeply interesting letters descriptive of his travels in Europe. They were eagerly sought after at the time of their publication. (J. H. W.)

## Pisgah[[@Headword:Pisgah]]

             (Heb. Pisgah', פַּסְגָּה, always with the art.), the name of a mountain of Moab. It is in fact an ancient topographical name found, in the Pentateuch and Joshua only, in two connections:

1. The top, or head, of the Pisgah (ראֹשׁ הִפַּ), from which Moses took his dying survey of Canaan (Num 21:20; Num 23:14; Deu 3:27; Deu 34:1);

2. Ashdoth hap-Pisgah, perhaps the springs, or roots, of the Pisgah (Deu 3:17; Deu 4:49; Jos 12:3; Jos 13:20). SEE ASHDOTH- PISGAH.

The word hap Pisgaih, הִפַּסְגָּה, literally is the section, from פסג = פסק, to divide, and hence it may mean an isolated hill or peak. The rendering of the Sept. is not uniform. In Deu 3:17; Deu 34:1; Jos 12:3; Jos 13:20, it is Φασγά; but in Num 21:20; Num 23:14; and Deu 3:27, the phrase ראש הפסגהis rendered κορυφὴ τοῦ λελαξευμένου, which is a translation of the Hebrew, top of the cut mountain. The Vulgate has everywhere Phasga. The reference to the scene of Moses's death by Josephus (Ant. 4, 8, 48) affords no additional light.

“The Pisgah” must have been in the mountain range or district, the same as or a part of that called the mountains of Abarim (comp. Deu 32:49 with Deu 34:1). SEE ABARIM. Its situation is minutely described by the  sacred writers. It is first mentioned in connection with the approach of the Israelites to Palestine. They marched “from Bamoth in the valley, that is in the country of Moab, to the top of Pisgah, which looketh towards Jeshimon” (Num 21:20). Pisgah was thus on the plateau of Moab, and commanded a view of the western desert. SEE JESHMON.

Another passage (Num 23:13-14) proves that it commanded a view of the Israelitish camp in the valley on the east bank of the Jordan; and from other incidental no times we learn that it was opposite to and in sight of (פני על) Jericho (Deu 34:1), and overhanging the northeastern angle of the Dead Sea (Deu 4:49; Jos 12:3). The names Abarim, Nebo, and Pisgah are connected in such a way by the sacred writers as to create some difficulty to the geographer. In Deu 32:49 the Lord commands Moses, “Get thee up into this mountain Abarim, Mount Nebo,” etc.; and in Deu 34:1 we read that Moses, obeying, “went up from the plains of Moab unto the mountain of Nebo, the top of Pisgah” (ראש הפסגה אלאּהר נבו). From these passages we may infer, (1) that Abarim was the name of a range or group of mountains; (2) that Nebo was one of its peaks; and (3) that the name Pisgah was either equivalent to Abarim, or that it is (as represented in some passages in the Sept., and in the margin of the A. V.) a common noun, signifying “an isolated hill or peak.” If the latter view be taken, then Deu 34:1 may be rendered, “Moses went up to Mount Nebo, to the top of the hill.” The construction rather favors the view that Pisgah, like Abarim, was the name of the range, and that Nebo was one of its peaks. Others have taken precisely the opposite view, namely, that Pisgah was a particular summit of Nebo as a range; but in that case Pisgah would not be so often mentioned (as a mountain at the foot of which the Israelitish host encamped, and as furnishing springs of water), while Nebo is but once named (as the peak on which Moses died). (See below.)

Upon Pisgah Balaam built altars and offered sacrifices, so that it was probably one of the ancient “high places” of Moab (Num 23:14). From its summit Moses obtained his panoramic view of the Holy Land, and there he died (Deu 34:1-5). Beneath the mountains were celebrated “springs” or “torrents” (אִשְׁדּוֹת), which are several times mentioned in defining the boundaries of Reuben, as Ashdoth-Pisgah (Deu 3:17; Deu 4:49 in the Hebrew; Jos 12:3; Jos 13:20). Pisgah therefore lay on the east of Jordan, contiguous to the field of Moab, and immediately opposite Jericho. The field of Zophim was situated on it, and its highest  point or summit-its “head”-was the Mount Nebo. If it was a proper name, we can only conjecture that it denoted the whole or part of the range of the highlands on the east of the lower Jordan. In the late Targums of Jerusalem and Pseudo-Jonathan, Pisgah is invariably rendered by ramatha, a term in common use for a hill it will be observed that the Sept. also does not treat it as a proper name. On the other hand, Eusebius and Jerome (Onomast. s. 5. Abarim, Fasga) report the name as existing in their day in its ancient locality. Mount Abarim and Mount Nabau were pointed out on the road leading from Livias to Heshbon (i.e. the Wady Hesban), still bearing their old names, and close to Mount Phogor (Peor), which also retained its name, whence, says Jerome (a quo), the contiguous region was even then called Phasgo. This connection between Phogor and Phasgo is puzzling, and suggests a possible error of copyists. SEE PEOR.

No traces of the name Pisgah have been met with in later times on the east of Jordan, but in the Arabic garb of Ras el-Feshkah (almost identical with the Hebrew Rosh hap-Pisgah) it is attached to a well-known headland on the north-western end of the Dead Sea, a mass of mountain bounded on the south by the Wady en-Nar, and on the north by the Wady Sidr, and on the northern part of which is situated the great Mussulman sanctuary of Neby Misa (Moses). This association of the names of Moses and Pisgah on the west side of the Dead Sea-where to suppose that Moses ever set foot would be to stultify the whole narrative of his decease-is extremely startling. No explanation of it has yet been offered.. Certainly that of M. De Saulcy and of his translator (see De Saulcy's Voyage, etc., and the notes to 2, 58-66 of the American edition), that the Ras elFeshkah is identical with Pisgah, cannot be entertained. Against this the words of Deu 3:27, “Thou shalt not go over this Jordan,” are decisive. SEE DEAD SEA.

The mountain itself is chiefly memorable as the height from which Moses got his most distinct view of the Land of Promise; from thence “the Lord showed him all the land of Gilead unto Dan, and all Naphtali, and the land of Ephraim and Manasseh, and all the land of Judah unto the utmost sea; and the south, and the plain of the valley of Jericho, the city of palm-trees, unto Zoar (Deu 34:1-3). Mr. Tristam (Land of Israel, 1865, p. 535 sq.) describes a visit which he and his fellowtravellers paid to the range of Nebo or Abarim, and the magnificent prospect they had from the height  which they supposed might possibly be the Pisgah of Moses. It was about three miles southwest of Heshbon, and one and a half miles due west of Main. The elevation was considered to be about 4500 feet; yet the ascent was not rugged, and for several hours they rode along the ridge. The day was clear, and to the north and east they saw the hills of Gilead, and “the vast expanse of the goodly Belka, one waving ocean of corn and grass.” Southwards appeared Mounts Hor and Seir, with other granite peaks of Arabia, in the direction of Akabah. Then, turning westwards, there lay distinctly before them the Dead Sea and the whole valley of the Jordan,” all the familiar points in the neighborhood of Jerusalem.” Looking over Jordan, “the eye rested on Gerizim's rounded top; and farther still opened the plain of Esdraelon, the shoulder of Carmel, or some other intervening height, just showing to the right of Gerizim, while the faint and distant bluish haze beyond it told us that there was ‘the sea, the utmost sea.' It seemed as if but a whiff were needed to brush off the haze, and reveal it clearly. Northward, again, rose the distant outline of unmistakable Tabor, aided by which we could identify Gilboa and Jebel Duhy (Littie Hermon). Snowy Hermon's top was mantled with cloud, and Lebanon's highest range must have been exactly shut behind it; but in front, due north of us, stretched in long line the dark forests of Ajlun, bold and undulating, with the deep sides of mountains, here and there whitened by cliffs, terminating in Mount Gilead, behind Es-Salt (Ramoth-Gilead).” This seems to realize to the full what was anciently exhibited to the eve of Moses, and shows the representation given of his extensive prospect to have been no ideal picture.

The spot has more recently been the subject of a considerable discussion by Prof. Paine, of the American exploring party, in report No. 3 of these operations (N. Y. Jan. 1875). Prof. Paine contends that Jebel Neba, the highest point of the range, is Mount Nebo, that Jebel Siaghah, the extreme headland of the hill, is Mount Pisgah, and that “the mountains of Abarim” are the cliffs west of these points, and descending towards the Dead Sea. He maintains these positions by the following arguments:

I. There is still an old road leading down to the Jordan valley in this direction, which he thinks the Israelites pursued on their way from Almon- diblathaim to the plains of Moab (Num 33:47-48). It has generally been supposed, however, that they took the route now usual with travelers, down Wady Hesban. The position of the Israelites on Abarim is there said  to have been “before” (לַפְנֵי) Nebo, a particle which generally signifies east and not west. The parallel account of the station in question (Num 21:29) places it on “the top of the Pisgah” (ראֹשׁ הִפַּסְגָּה); and this certainly discountenances Paine's location on a lower peak of the ridge. It is true the phrase is added, “which looketh towards Jeshimon,” i.e. the Ghor or Jordan valley (see Keil, Comment. ad loc.); but this may possibly mean only pointing in that direction from the station last left. The preceding clause, “the valley that is in the field of Moab,” is ambiguous; as it may qualify either the point of departure, ie. Bamoth, or the destination, i.e. Pisgah. The A. V. adopts the former construction; but this is not favored by the syntax of the adjoining verses, and conflicts with the idea of a high place (Bamoth), which could hardly have been in a valley. The latter reference is therefore adopted by most interpreters, but (as Rosenmüller remarks) seems to disagree with the phraseology “top of Pisgah.” We suggest as the only consistent translation, “And from Bamoth [to] the valley which [is] in the plateau of Moab (the summit of the Pisgah [range]), and overlooks the Ghor.” This makes Pisgah but another name for the edge of the table-land of Moab overhanging the Jordan valley or Dead Sea. The particular “top” in question was apparently Nebo itself, which is in fact but a crest of the Moabitic table-land, that shows as a “mountain” only from the western point of View. The sole considerable “valley” (הִגִּיְא) answering to this description is Wady es-Sowanieh, which is the southern head-branch of Wady Hesban, and intersects the plain up to the very crest of Nebo. Prof. Paine, however, appears to identify it with the valley in which the “Springs of Moses” are situated, a deep, wild glen hardly answering to the requirements of the case, except that it contains water and looks directly down upon the Dead Sea. At the encampment as we have located it, the Israelites would have been precisely on the route to Heshbon, which they next attacked (Num 21:21-26), and thence to the Ghor opposite Jericho (Num 22:1), by way of Wady Hesban.

2. Paine's next argument is drawn from the history of Balaam and Balak immediately following the passages last cited. After lodging at Kirjath- huzoth (Num 22:39), which Paine regards as the site of Kufeir Abi- Bed, just east of the crest of Nebo, the two proceeded first to “the high places of Baal” (Num 22:41), which the professor deems to be “the extremity of Jebel Siaghah, the first chief summit of Pisgah”—a description which, if we correctly understand the somewhat confused statements, designates the outer or westernmost peak, as from this “the whole of Israel” could be  seen. Balaam next repaired to a point called “the top of Pisgah” (Num 22:14), which Paine regards as “the third” or easternmost peak, because from it only a part of the Israelitish camp could be seen. Finally, the prophet ascended “the top of Peor” (Num 22:28), which the professor thinks was the middle or ruin-crowned peak of Siaghah, as from it the various surrounding countries there enumerated can be seen to advantage. But this distribution of the several localities seems rather arbitrary. The first name is a very indefinite one, being identical with Bamoth-baal (Jos 13:17), apparently nearer the Arnon (Num 21:28), if not identical with the Bamoth previously referred to (Num 21:20); and surely there are many spots in the vicinity from which “the utmost part of the people” could be seen-a phrase that designates not the whole, but only the rear. In Num 23:13, where the same expression is used, the same place is referred to, and the words must be rendered, “And Balak said to him, Come now with me to another place, whence thou mayest see him (only his extremity canst thou see [here], and not all of him canst thou see); and thou shalt curse him for me from there” (see Keil, ad loc.). The next locality accordingly was one commanding a view of the entire encampment, namely, “the top of the Pisgah” range, probably Jebel Neba itself. It seems to have been much farther than Paine makes it from Balak's previous station, for there the two adjoining eminences are spoken of in very different phraseology (“the high- places of Baal— to a high place,” Num 22:41; Num 23:3). As this second outlook of Balaam is called (Num 23:14) “the field of Zophim,” or the watchers, Paine holds that it was Wady Haisa, which he reports as being partly under cultivation; but this affords no good prospect of the “plains of Moab” eastward, such as Keil thinks the import of the name requires (Comment. ad loc.). The third of Balaam's posts of observation was “the top of Peor, that looketh towards Jeshimon,” or the desert [of Judah] (Num 23:28); and as the next to the last day's journey of the Israelites was “to the top of Pisgah, that looketh towards Jeshimon” (Num 22:28), and as, moreover, Moses died on the top of Pisgah, and was buried “in a valley in the land of Moab, over against Beth-peor” (Deu 34:6), Paine concludes that all these were designations of the same or immediately adjoining spots, thus making the ruin-crowned summit of Siaghah the site of the sanctuary of Peor, and he adduces the character of the remains as evidence that they were an early temple. He thinks they are not sufficiently extensive for those of the town of Nebo (q.v.), which he inclines to identify with the more considerable  ruins called Kharhb el-Mukheyat, a little more than a mile south of Jebel Neba.

Other collateral arguments of less moment adduced by Prof. Paine in support of his views are drawn from the name “Ashdoth-Pisgah” (Deu 2:17; Deu 4:49; Jos 12:3; Jos 13:20), which he renders springs of Pisgah, and identifies with those of Ayfin Mfsa; and from the Bible accounts of Moses's death and burial. He also adduces the statements of later writers (Josephus, Eusebius, etc.) on these points. His attempt to trace the name Pisgah in the modern Siaghah is an obvious failure. His main conclusion that Pisgah is a special name for a particular part of Mount Nebo, and that the mountains of Abarirm are likewise limited to the hills immediately overhanging the north-east end of the Dead Sea, can hardly be said to be sustained by his ingenious reasoning; and we therefore incline to the generally entertained view that the reverse is true. Dr. J. L. Porter has still more recently traveled over this locality, and he states, in his account of his journey in the London Athenaeum, that Jebel Nebbeh is a common name for many of the eminences in this vicinity. He is inclined to regard Sidghah as a relic of the name Pisgah. SEE NEBO.

## Pishtah[[@Headword:Pishtah]]

             SEE FLAX.

## Pisidia[[@Headword:Pisidia]]

             (Πισιδία, etymology uncertain) was a district of Asia Minor, which cannot be very exactly defined. But it may be described sufficiently by saying that it was to the north of Pamphylia, and stretched along the range of Taurus. Northward it reached to and was partly included in Phrygia, which was similarly an indefinite district, though far more extensive. Thus Antioch in Pisidia was sometimes called a Phrygian town. In general terms it may be said that Pisidia was bounded on the north by Phrygia, on the west by Caria and Lycia, on the south by Pamphylia, and on the east by Cilicia and Isauria (Strabo, 12:569; Ptolemy, 5, 5). It was a mountainous region; but high up among the peaks of Taurus were some fertile valleys and little upland plains. The province was subdivided into minute sections, and held by tribes of wild and warlike highlanders, who were the terror of the whole surrounding country (Strabo, 1. c.; Xenoph. Anab. 1, 1, 11; 2, 5,  13). It was probably among the defiles of Pisidia that the apostle Paul experienced some of those “perils of robbers” of which he speaks in 2Co 11:26; and perhaps fear of the bandits that inhabited them had something to do with John's abrupt departure from Paul and Barnabas just as they were about to enter Pisidia (Act 13:13-14). The Pisidian tribes had rulers of their own, and they maintained their independence in spite of the repeated attacks of more powerful neighbors, and of the conquests of the Greeks, and even of the Romans. The latter were content to receive from them a scanty tribute, allowing them to remain undisturbed amid their mountain fastnesses. See Smith, Dict. of Class. Geog. s.v. The scenery of Pisidia is wild and grand. The mountains are mostly limestone, and are partially clothed with forests of oak, pine, and juniper. The lower slopes are here and there planted with olives, vines, and pomegranates. Many of the ravines are singularly grand-bare cliffs rising up a thousand feet and more on each side of the bed of a foaming torrent. In other places fountains gush forth, and streams brawl along amid thickets of oleander. The passes from the sea-coast to the interior are difficult, and have always been dangerous. SEE ASIA MINOR. Paul paid two visits to Pisidia. In company with Barnabas he entered it from Pamphylia on the south, and crossed over the mountains to Antioch, which lay near the northern border (Act 13:14). Their mission was successful; but the enemies of the truth soon caused them to be expelled from the province (Act 13:50). After an adventurous journey through Lacaonia and Isauria, they again returned through Pisidia to Pamphylia, apparently by the same route (14, 2124). See Arundell, Asia Minor, vol. 2; Fellows, Asia Minor; Spratt, Travels in Lycia; see also full extracts in Conybeare and Howson, Life of St. Paul, 1, 164 sq., and article SEE ANTIOCH OF PISIDIA.

## Pison[[@Headword:Pison]]

             (Heb. Pishon', פַּישׁוֹן, streaming; Sept. Φισῶν). the second of the four great rivers which watered the garden of Eden, the identification of which has hitherto been attempted variously. It is described in the sacred text (Gen 2:11-12) as “compassing (סוֹבֵב, rather, perhaps, traversing) the whole land of Havilah, where there is gold; and the gold of that land is good: there is bdellium (bedo'lach) and the onyx-stone (sho'hamn).” With regard to this river, the most ancient and most universally received opinion identifies it with the Ganges. Josephus (Ant. 1, 1, 3), Eusebius (Onomast. s.v.), Ambrosins (De Parad. c. 3), Epiphanius (Ancor. c. 58), Ephr. Syr.  (Op. Syr. 1, 23), Jerome (Ephesians 4 ad Rust. and Quiaest. Heb. in Genesis), and Augustine (De Genesis ad lit. 8:7) held this. But Jarchi (on Genesis 2, 11), Saadiah Gaon, R. Moses ben-Nachman, and Abr. Peritsol (Ugolino, Thesnotr . vol. vii) maintained that the Pison was the Nile. The first of these writers derives the word from a root which signifies “to increase,” “to overflow” (comp. Hab 1:8), but at the same time quotes an etymology given in Bereshith Rabba, § 16, in which it is asserted that the river is called Pison “because it makes the flax (פשׁתן) to grow.” Josephus explains it by πληθύς, Scaliger by πλήμμυρα. The theory that the Pison is the Ganges is thought to receive some confirmation from the author of the book of Ecclesiasticus, who mentions (24:25, 27) in order the Pison, the Tigris, the Euphrates, Jordan, and Gihon, and is supposed to have commenced his enumeration in the east and to have terminated it in the west.

That the Pison was the Indus was an opinion current long before it was revived by Ewald (Gesch. d. Volkes Isr. 1, 331, note 2) and adopted by Kalisch (Genesis, p. 96). Philostorgius, quoted by Huet (Ugolino, vol vii), conjectured that it was the Hydaspes; and Wilford (As. Res. vol. 6), following the Hindu tradition with regard to the origin of mankind, discovers the Pison in the Landi-Sindh, the Ganges of Isidorus, called also Nilab from the color of its waters, and known to the Hindus by the name of Nila-Ganga, or Ganga simply. Severianus (De Mundi Creat.) and Ephraem Syrus (Comni. on Genesis) agree with Caesarius in identifying the Pison with the Danube. The last-mentioned father seems to have held, in common with others, some singular notions with regard to the course of this river. He believed that it was also the Ganges and Indus, and that, after traversing Ethiopia and Elymais, which he identified with Havilah, it fell into the ocean near Cadiz. Such is also the opinion of Epiphanius with regard to the course of the Pison, which he says is the Ganges of the Ethiopians and Indians and the Indus of the Greeks (Ancor. c. 58). Some, as Hopkinson (Ugolino, vol.7), have found the Pison in the Naharmalca, one of the artificial canals which formerly joined the Euphrates with the Tigris. This canal is the flumen regium of Amm. Marc. (23, 6, § 25, and 24:6, § 1), and the Ar-malchar of Pliny (V. H. 6, 30). Grotius, on the contrary, considered it to be the Gihon. Even those commentators who agree in placing the terrestrial Paradise on the Shat el-Arab, the stream formed by the junction of the Tigris and Euphrates, between Ctesiphon and Apamea, are by no means unanimous as to which of the branches, into which this stream is again divided, the names Pison and Gihon are to be applied. Calvin (Comm. in Genesis) was the first to conjecture that the  Pison was the most easterly of these channels, and in this opinion he is followed by Scaliger and many others. Huet, on the other hand, conceivea that he proved beyond doubt that Calvin was in error, and that the Pison was the westernmost of the two channels by which the united stream of the Euphrates and Tigris falls into the Persian (Gulf. He was confirmed by the authority of Bochart (Hieroz. pt. 2, 1. 5, c. 5). Junius (Prael. in Genesis) and HaTask discovered a relic of the name Pison in the Pasitigris. The advocates of the theory that the true position of Eden is to be sought for in the mountains of Armenia have been induced, from a certain resemblance in the two names, to identify the Pison with the Phasis, which rises in the elevated plateau at the foot of Mount Ararat, near the sources of the Tigris and Euphrates. Reland (de Situ parad. terr. Ugolino, vol. vii), Calmet (Dict. s.v.), Link (Urwelt, 1, 307), Rosenmuller (Handb. der bibl. AIt.), and Hartmann have given their suffrages in favor of this opinion. Raumer (quoted by Delitzsch, Genesis) endeavored to prove that the Pison was the Phasis of Xenophon (Anab. 4, 6), that is, the Aras or Araxes, which flows into the Caspian Sea. There remain yet to be noticed the theories of Leclerc (Comm. in Genesis) that the Pison was the Chrysorrhoas, the modern Barada, which takes its rise near Damascus; and that of Buttmann (Aelt. Erdk. p. 32), who identified it with the Besvnga or Irabatti, a river of Ava. Mendelssohn (Comm. on Genesis) mentions that some affirm the Pison to be the Gozan of 2Ki 17:6 and 1Ch 5:26, which is supposed to be a river, and the same with the Kizil-Uzen in Hyrcania. Colonel Chesney, from the results of extensive observations in Armenia, was “led to infer that the rivers known by the comparatively modern names of Halys and Araxes are those which, in the book of Genesis, have the names of Pison and Gihon; and that the country within the former is the land of Havilah, while that which borders upon the latter is the still more remarkable country of Cush” (Exped. to Euphr. and Tigris, 1, 267). — Smith. Faber inclines to make it the Absarus of Pliny, or Batim of modern geographers, which rises in Armenia and flows into the Black Sea; but Dr. Hales considers the Araxes to have a better claim; and this last speculation (for nothing better can any of the assigned positions be called) seems to derive support from the author of the apocryphal book of Ecclesiasticus, who, speaking of a wise man, says that “he filleth all things with his wisdom,” or spreads it on every side, “as Phison and Tigris” spread their waters “in the time of the new fruits,” that is, when they are swollen by the melting of the winter snows, thus seeming to indicate a river rising in a cold and mountainous region. The mention of gold as the special product  of the vicinity inclines to the view which regards the Pishon as identical with the Phasis of antiquity; and the resemblance of names confirms this. SEE EDEN.

## Pispah[[@Headword:Pispah]]

             (Heb. Pispah', פַּסְפָּה, perh. expansion; Sept. Φασφά), the second of the three sons of Jether, of the tribe of Asher (1Ch 7:38). B.C. cir. 1017.

## Pistachio[[@Headword:Pistachio]]

             SEE NUT.

## Pistis Sophia[[@Headword:Pistis Sophia]]

             (1. i.e. the Believing Wisdom) is the name of a newly discovered Gnostic work, fully entitled Pistis Sophia, Opus Gnosticum e codiae manuscripta Coptico-Latine vertit M. G. Schwartze, edidit J. H. Petermann (Berl. 1851). The date is doubtful; it evidently belongs to the period when Valentinian Gnosticism had reached its full development-about the close, therefore, of the 2d century. The general dogmas of the Valentinian system are found in it, though half buried in a luxurious and monotonous vegetation. The theme is always the same-a gnosis, or hidden doctrine, which brings salvation by simple illumination. Jesus Christ returns from the heavens into which he had reascended, and appears to his disciples on the Mount of Olives, to reveal to them the sublime mysteries of the truth. They form around him the inner and privileged circle of the spiritual ones, whose charge it is to transmit this hidden manna to the pneumatic men of future generations. All these revelations revolve around the destiny of Sophia, who here symbolizes, far more clearly than among the early Valentinians, the melancholy condition of the human soul, which, as the punishment for having sought to overpass the limits of its original sphere, is tormented by the cosmical powers, among which we recognize the Demiurgus. He produces, by emanation, a terrible power with a lion face, which, surrounded by other similar emanations, terrifies the noble and ardent exiled Sophia, even in the dark regions of matter, flashing before her eves a false and misguiding brightness. Nevertheless she does not lose courage; she still hopes and believes. Hence she deserves the name of the Believing Wisdom. Twelve times she invokes the Deliverer in strains of passionate and truly sublime supplication; these are her twelve repentances (“Nunc  cujues πνεῦμα alacre, progreditor, ut dicat soluitonem duodecimae μετάνοιας πίστεως σοφίας,” Pist. Soph. p. 70). Her deliverance is accomplished by means of an equal number of interventions on the part of Jesus. As the fall, or sin, is nothing more than an obscuration produced by matter, so salvation is simply a return to the light. This division of the lamentations of Sophia and the interventions of Jesus produces a wearisome amount of repetition; the aspirations of the soul are, however, rendered with a force all the more poetic because so largely derived from the Old Testament. In particular, all the penitential Psalms are applied to Sophia, being wrested from their natural meaning.

“O Light of lights,” she exclaims, “thou whom I have seen from the beginning, listen to the cry of my repenting” (Lumen luminum, cui ἐπίστευσα inde al) initio, aildi igitur nunc, lumen, mean μετάνοιαν, ibid. p. 33). “Save me, O Light, from my own thoughts, which are evil. I have fallen into the infernal regions. False lights have led me astray, and now I am lost in these chaotic depths. I cannot spread my wings and return to my place, for the evil powers sent forth by my enemy, and most of all this lion faced power, hold me captive. I have cried for help, but my voice dies in the night. I have lifted up my eves to the heights, that thou mayest come to my aid, O Light. But I have found -none but hostile powers, who rejoice in my affliction, and seek to increase it by putting out the spark of thine which is in me. Now, O Light of truth, in the simplicity of my heart I have followed the false brightness which I mistook for thine. My sin is wholly before thee. Leave me not to suffer longer, for I have cried to thee from the beginning. It is for thee that I am plunged into this affliction. Behold me in this place weeping, crying out again for the light which I have seen upon the heights. Hence the rage of those who keep the doors of my, prison. If thou wilt come and save me, great is thy mercy; grant my supplication. Deliver me from this dark matter, lest I be, as it were, swallowed up in it” (Libera me e Þλῃ hujus caliginis, ibid. p. 4). “O Light, cast upon me the flame of thy compassion, for I am in bitter anguish. Haste thee, hear me. I have waited for my spouse that be might come and fight for me, and he comes not. Instead of light, I have received darkness and matter. I will praise thee, I will glorify thy name; let my hymn rise with acceptance to thee at the gates of light. Let my whole soul be purified from matter, and dwell in the divine city. Let all souls which receive the mystery be admitted therein” (Ψυχαί hornm qui snscipient mysteriuni, ibid. p. 36). The same cry rises twelve times to the Deliverer. “I am become,” says  Sophia again, “like the daemon who dwells in matter, in whom all light is extinct. I am myself become matter. My strength is turned to stone in me” (Atque mea vis congelascuil in me, ibid. p. 43). “I have set my love in thee, O Light, leave me not in the chaos. Deliver me by thy knowledge” (Libera mea in tua cognitione, ibid. p. 56). “My trust is in thee; I will rejoice, I will sing praise to thy glory, because thou hast had pity on me. Give me thy baptism, and wash away my sins.”

This mythology, full of poetic sadness, was skillfully spread as a veil over the abstractions of Gnosticism, and adapted them to the taste of subtle and unhealthy minds. The dialogue between Jesus and his disciples, in spite of its uniformity, pleased the readers of the apocryphal Gospels, and satisfied those feverish imaginations which had lost the sense of true beauty. Pride found its gratification in these new mysteries, which emulated in every respect those of Eleusis or of Mitra. See Cramer, Beitrage zur Befirderung theolog. Kenntnisse (1778), 3, 82 sq.; Kostlin, Das gnostische System des B. Pistis Sophia, in Zeller's Theol. Jahrb. (Tüb. 1854), vol. 1 and 2. SEE GNOSTICISM. (J. H. W.)

## Pistoja, Synod of[[@Headword:Pistoja, Synod of]]

             in 1786, marks one of the many reformatory movements in the Roman Catholic Church which remained without any effect. Leopold of Tuscany (q.v.), actuated by the same sense in which his brother Joseph II of Austria acted, tried to ameliorate the affairs of the Catholic Church in his country. For this purpose he issued Jan. 26, 1786, a circular-address to his bishops, containing fifty-seven articles of his reformatory plan, which he wished them to examine respectively, and carry out. The most important points for consideration were,

1. The necessity of holding annual synods in each diocese;

2. The restitution of the episcopal power;

3. A scientific training of the clergy, and a religious education of the people.

This circular address was prepared by the grand duke himself, who was well versed in theological literature. He gave his bishops six months' time for consideration, but after this time he expected them to answer in a frank and categorical manner. Almost all the bishops opposed; among those who favored the plan was the bishop of Pistoja, Scipio Ricci, who, having high notions of religious purity, attempted other reforms. In September, 1786,  Ricci assembled a diocesan council at Pistoja, which was opened Sept. 18 in the church of St. Leopold. Two hundred and thirty-four clergymen were present, among whom was the greatest unanimity. Among the passed resolutions we find several that aimed to enlighten the people as to the proper limits of image-worship and the invocation of the saints; suppression of certain relics which gave occasion to superstitious practices; encouragement to spread religious works, especially the Gospel, among the flock. Besides advocating the use of the liturgy in the oral language of the country, and exposing the abuse of indulgences, the spiritual independence of the bishops was maintained, and the four propositions of the Gallican Church of 1682 (comp. the art. SEE GALLICAN CHURCH, 3, 725, of this Cyclop.) were adopted. The synod also recommended that the ecclesiastical law of marriage should be subject to the law of the country. The minutest attention was paid to the reform of monachism-all orders should be united into one, and perpetual vows should be restricted or abolished-and Church discipline, and to carry this out the convocation of a national synod was expressed as very desirable. The grand duke, who welcomed these resolutions with great joy, convoked a council at Florence of the bishops of Tuscany, April 23, 1787, and proposed to them fifty- seven articles concerning the reform of ecclesiastical discipline. The result was, that all articles were either laid aside or so modified as to lose their importance. The government did not abandon its reformatory plans, and allowed every bishop to do in his diocese what he pleased. Leopold's successor abandoned all these plans, and suffered a papal bull, Auctorem fidei, dated Aug. 28, 1794, to condemn the eighty-five propositions of the Synod of Pistoja. Comp. Attie decreti del concilio dimcesano di Pistoja a. 1786, edited by Bracali and translated into Latin: Acta et decreta synodi diceces. Pistoriensis (1791, 2 vols.). The proceedings, published at the expense of the grand-duke, and prepared by C. Cambiagi in 7 vols., were also translated into Latin: Acta congregationis archiepiscoporum et episcoporum Hetruriae Florentiae anno 1787 celebrate, Ex Italico translata a J. Schwarzel (Bamb. 1790-1794); Vie de Scipion de Ricci, par de Potter (Bruss. 1825, 3 vols.), German transl. 4 vols. (Stuttg. 1826); Wolf, Geschichte der rom — kathol. Kirche unter Pius VI (Leips. 1796); Minch, Leopold von Oesterreich, in his Denkwürdigkeiten, p. 303 sq.; Herzog, Real-Encyklop. s.v.; Theologisches Universal- Lexikon, s.v.; H. B. Smith, History of the Church of Christ in Chronological Tables, p. 619; Kurtz, Lehrbuch der Kirchengeschichte, § 164, p. 9; Niedner, Lehrbuch der christl. Kirchengeschichte, p. 846; Hagenbach-Hurst, History of the  Church in the 18th and 19th Centuries, 2, 433; Evangelische Kirchenzeitung (1820), p. 270 sq.; Denzinger, Enchiridion symbolorum et definitionum (4th ed. 1865), p. 388 sq., “Prcapositiones 85 Synodi diaecesanae Pistoriensis damnatae a Pio VI per constitutionem ‘Auctorem fidei' Aug. 28, 1794; Ranke, in Zeitschrift für historische Theologie, 1871, 3, art. 2. (B. P.)

## Pistolies[[@Headword:Pistolies]]

             (bakers) was a term of reproach applied to the early Christians in consequence of their poverty and simplicity.

## Pistor, Henricus[[@Headword:Pistor, Henricus]]

             is the author of a Latin hymn, “De S. Johanne Baptista,” commencing, “Praecursoris Baptistse.” The only notice we have of Pistor is that given by Clichtovlus in Elucidator Eccles. p. 198, where we read: “Auctor ejus (viz. of the hymn) fuisse traditur eximius pater Henricus Pistor, doctor theologus Parisiensis, et in religiosa domo Sti. Victoris juxta Parisios monasticam vitam professus, qui etiam Concilio Constantinensi (1414-18) interfuit, eaque tempestate, doctrina et virtute mirifice floruit.” This is about all. As to the hymn itself, the first verse runs thus:

Praecursoris et Baptistse Diem istum chorus iste Veueretur landibus.

Vero die jam diescat, Ut in nostris elucescat Verus dies mentibus.

See Daniel, Thesaur-us Hymnol. 2, 169; Trench, Sacred Latin Poetry, p. 9i sq.; Rambach, Anthologie christl. Gesänge, p. 364. (B. P.)

## Pistorius[[@Headword:Pistorius]]

             (Germ. Becker), a name common to many theologians in the first two centuries of the Reformation of whom we mention the following:

1. CONRAD, a Brunswick theologian. Together with Paul Eitzen, of Hamburg, and Joachim Mirlin, of Brunswick, he took part in the proceedings of the Hardenberg controversy (comp. Herzog, Real- Encyklop. 5, 540 sq.). In 1562 he was superintendent in Güstrow; in 1572 the duke Ulric of Mecklenburg dismissed him from his estates. He then went to Rostock; thence to Antwerp and Vienna; was appointed superintendent at Hildesheim, and, when expelled, returned again to Brunswick, where he died in 1588. See Herzog, Real Encyklop. s.v.; Theologisches Universal-Lexikon, s.v.

2. JOHN (1), at first a Roman Catholic priest of St. John's in Nidda, a Hessian city, afterwards first Lutheran pastor and superintendent there, took part with Melancthon and Bucer as a representative of the Protestants in the colloquy at Ratisbon in 1541, and afterwards at Worms in 1557. In 1544 he was very active in aiding the prince Herman, count of Wied, to introduce the Reformation in the archbishopric of Cologne, but the battle at Muhlberg put an end to the whole movement. Pistorius died in 1583. See Herzog, Real-Encyklop. s.v.; Theolog. Universal-Lexikon, s.v.; Smith, Hist. of the Church of Christ in Chronological Tables, p. 53; Kurtz, Lehrbuch der Kirchengesch. § 135, 3; Niedner, Lehrbuch der christl. Kirchengesch. p. 635.

3. JOHN (2) (also called Niddanus, from his native place), son of the former, was born Feb. 4, 1546. He studied first medicine, law, and history, and finally theology. Originally a Lutheran, he became next a zealous Calvinist, and induced the first son of the margrave Charles II of Baden, Ernest Frederick, to join him. Soon afterwards he joined the Roman Catholic Church, in which alone he could see the continuity of the Church of Christ, and induced the second son of the margrave Jacob to follow him. In behalf of his patron, he held in 1589 a colloquy at Baden with Andreai and Heerbrand, who represented Lutheranism, and Schyrius, who represented Calvinism. A second colloquy he held at Emmendingen in 1590, with Dr. Peppus, of Strasburg. After the death of his patron, Pistorius went to Freiburg and Constance; became doctor of theology, canon of Constance, cathedral-provost of Breslau, and imperial counselor to the emperor Rudolph II. Pistorius died in 1608. In his Theorema de fidei Christianae definita mensura, and in Unser von Gottes Genaden Jakobs Mark. grafen zu Baden… christl. erhebliche und wohlfundirte Motifen, etc., he endeavored to justify his own and his patron's conversion to the Church of Rome. His polemics against Luther in his Anatomia Lutheri, seu de septem spiritibus Lutheri, called forth a number of rejoinders. Pistorius is also the author of some medical works, and some historical works on Poland, Germany, Hungary, and Spain. In the service of the Church of Rome, Pistorius also wrote a Wegweiser für alle verfuhrten Christen, to which Dr. Mentzer replied in his Anti-Pistorius. See Fechti Historia Colloquii Emmendingensis, cui subjicitur protocollum et conclusio (Rostockii, 1709); Herzog, Roal-Encyklop. s.v.; Theolog. Universal- Lexikon, s.v.; Jocher, Gelehrten-Lexikon, s.v. Buchanan, Justification (see Index). ministry at Joachimsthal; and his son,

5. THEOPHILUS (2), a great Oriental scholar, lectured at Leipsic, Tiibingen, Jena, and Copenhagen, and wrote Enthiridion linguae sanctae grammaticam (Leips. 1612), etc. See Herzog. Real-Encyklop. s.v.; Jocher, Gelehrten Lexikon, s.v.; Fiirst, Bibl. Jud. 3. 106; Steinschneider, Bibliog. Handbooch, p. 111, No. 1574. (B. P.)

## Pistorius, Hermann Alexander[[@Headword:Pistorius, Hermann Alexander]]

             a Lutheran theologian of Germany, was born August 27, 1811, at Walbeck. He studied at Halle, was in 1843 preacher at Supplingen, near Magdeburg, and made himself conspicuous by his opposition against the so-called Friends of Light (q.v.), and by advocating the right of the Lutheran Church in the State Church of Prussia. In 1849 he left the State Church, having the year before published Aufruf an alle Lutheraner innerhalb der preussischen Landeskirche, became Lutheran preacher at Wernigerode, afterwards at Wollin, and finally superintendent at Breslau,  where he had to pass through many trials. In 1863 he was called to Basedow, Mecklenburg, and died April 27, 1877. He published, Das christliche Leben in Liedern (Dresden, 1840): — Was und wo ist die lutherische Kirche? (Magdeburg, 1844): — Richtige Erklarung der Bibelstellen, etc. (1845): — Ueber Kraft und Form der Absolution (Leipsic, 1858). See Zuchold, Bibl. Theol. 2:998 sq. (B.P.)

## Pit[[@Headword:Pit]]

             In the A. V. this word appears with a figurative as well as a literal meaning. It passes from the facts that belong to the outward aspect of Palestine and its cities to states or regions of the spiritual world. With this power it is used to represent several Hebrew and Greek words, and the starting-point which the literal meaning presents for the spiritual is, in each case, a subject of some interest.

1. Of these bor, בּוֹר (root בָּאִר, cognate בְּאֵר, beer, a well), occurs most frequently, and means a deep hole or pit, dug in the first instance for a well, or a cistern hewn or cut in stone, a reservoir, which the Orientals are in the habit of preparing in those regions where there are few or no springs, for the purpose of preserving rain-water for travellers and cattle. These cisterns and trenches are often without water, no supply being obtainable for them except from the rain. In old decayed cisterns the water leaks out, or becomes slimy (Jeremiah 2, 13). Such cisterns or pits, when without water, were often used in the East apparently for three purposes:

(1) As a place of sepulture (Psa 28:1; Psa 30:4; Isa 38:18), hence יוֹרְדֵי בוֹר, “they that go down to the pit”-a phrase of frequent occurrence, employed sometimes to denote dying without hope, but commonly a simple going down to the place of the dead (see Gesen. Lex. s.v.); also, “the graves set in the sides of the pit” (Exo 32:23), the recesses cut out for purposes of burial; or they might be the natural fissures in the rocks, abounding in all limestone formations, of which the rocks of Syria and Palestine chiefly consist.

(2) A prison: “they shall be gathered as prisoners are gathered in the pit, and shall be shut up” (Isa 24:22; also Jer 37:16; Exo 12:29). The pit or dungeon was a common place of punishment in the East, and very dreadful it was, as the case of often to be left to a slow death by starvation; and to be saved from such a doom was regarded as the greatest of all deliverances. Hence it was used

(3) as a place of destruction (Zec 9:11). In the case of Joseph, Reuben suggested the pit as a device for saving his brother; the others hostile to Joseph adopted it as the most secret, and, they might think, the least guilty method of making away with him (Gen 37:22-29).

As remarked above, in this word, as in the cognate בְּאֵר, bee (which is likewise rendered pit in Gen 14:10; Psa 55:23; Psa 69:15; Pro 23:27), the special thought is that of a pit or well dug for water (Gesen. Thesaur. s.v.). The process of desynonymizing which goes on in all languages seems to have confined the former to the state of the well or cistern, dug into the rock, but no longer filled with water. Thus, where the sense in both cases is figurative, and the same English word is used, we have pit (bedr) connected with the “deep water,” “the water- flood,” “the deep” (Psa 69:16), while in pit (=בּוֹר) there is nothing but the “miry clay” (Psa 40:2). Its dreariest feature is that there is “no water” in it (Zec 9:11). So far the idea involved has been rather that of misery and despair than of death. But in the phrase “they that go down to the pit” (בּוֹר) it becomes even more constantly than the synonyms noticed below (sheol, shachath) the representative of the world of the dead (Eze 31:14; Eze 31:16; Eze 32:18; Eze 32:24; Psa 28:1; Psa 143:7). There may have been two reasons for this transfer:

1. The wide, deep excavation became the place of burial. The “graves were set in the sides of the pit” (bor) (Eze 32:24). To one looking into it, it was visibly the home of the dead, while the vaguer, more mysterious Sheol carried the thoughts further to an invisible home.

2. The pit, however, in this sense, was never simply equivalent to burial-place. There is always implied in it a thought of scorn and condemnation. This, too, had its origin apparently in the use made of the excavations, which had either never been wells, or had lost the supply of water. The prisoner in the land of his enemies was left to perish in the pit (bor) (Zec 9:11). The greatest of all  deliverances is that the captive exile is released from the slow death of starvation in it (shachath, Isa 51:14). The history of Jeremiah, cast into the dungeon or pit (bor) (Jer 38:6; Jer 38:9), let down into its depths with cords, sinking into the filth at the bottom (here also there is no water), with death by hunger staring him in the face, shows how terrible an instrument of punishment was such a pit. The condition of the Athenian prisoners in the stone quarries of Syracuse (Thuc. 7:87), the Persian punishment of the σπόδος (Ctesias, Pers. 48), the oubliettes of mediaeval prisons, present instances of cruelty more or less analogous. It is not strange that with these associations of material horror clustering round, it should have involved more of the idea of a place of punishment for the haughty or unjust than did the sheol or the grave. SEE WELL.

2. Sháchath, שִׁחִת, of which, as well as in the cognate שׁוּחָה, shuchâh (rendered “pit” in Pro 20:14; Jer 2:6; Jer 18:20; Jer 18:22), שְׁחוּת. shechuth (“pit,” Pro 28:10), שְׁחַית, shechith (“pit,” Lam 4:20; “destruction,” Psa 107:20), and שַׁיחָה, shichah (“pit,” Psa 57:6; Psa 119:85; Jer 18:22), as the root שׁוּחִshows, the sinking of the pit is the primary thought (Gesen. Thesaur. sv.). It is dug into the earth (Psa 9:16; Psa 119:85). A pit thus made and then covered lightly over, served as a trap by which animals or men might be ensnared (Psa 35:7). It thus became a type of sorrow and confusion, from which a man could not extricate himself, of the great doom which comes to all men, of the dreariness of death (Job 33:18; Job 33:24; Job 33:28; Job 33:30). To “go down to the pit” is to die without hope. It is the penalty of evildoers, that from which the righteous are delivered by the hand of God. SEE TRAP.

3. Sheol, שְׁאֹל, in Num 16:30; Num 16:33; Job 17:16. Here the word is one which is used only of the hollow, shadowy world, the dwelling of the dead, and as such it has been treated of tinder HELL.

4. Other Hebrew words rendered pit in the A. V. are the following: גֵּב, geb, something cut out, hence a cistern in the rock (Jer 14:3); and the cognate גֶּבֶא, gebe (Isa 30:14; Jer 14:3); גּוּמִוֹ, gumdts, something dug (only Ecc 10:8); and פִּחִת, pachath, an excavation (2Sa 17:9; 2Sa 18:17; Isa 24:17-18; Jer 48:43-44; “hole,” Jer 48:28; “snare,” 1 Samuel 3:47). The  term mahamoroth, מִהֲמֹרוֹת, rendered “deep pits” (Psa 140:10), properly signifies streams, whirlpools, abysses of water. The rabbins, Symmachus, and Jerome understood pits of water.

5. The Greek terms are the following: in Rev 9:1-2, and elsewhere, the “bottomless pit” is the translation of τὸ φρέαρ τῆς ἀβύσσου. The A. V. has rightly taken φρέαρ here as the equivalent of bor rather than beer. The pit of the abyss is as a dungeon. It is opened with a key (Rev 9:1; Rev 20:1). Satan is cast into it, as a prisoner (Rev 20:2). In Mat 12:11, “pit” is the rendering of βόθυνος, a deep hole or “ditch” (as rendered in Mat 15:14; Luk 6:39). SEE CISTERN.

## Pitaka or Pitakattayan[[@Headword:Pitaka or Pitakattayan]]

             (Pali pitakan, a “basket,” and tayo, “three”), the sacred books of the Buddhists. The text of the Pitaka is divided into three great classes. The instructions contained in the first class, called Winaya, were addressed to the priests; those in the second class, Sutra, to the laity; and those in the third class, Abhidarma, to the dewas and brahmas of the celestial worlds. There is a commentary called the Atthakatha, which, until recently, was regarded as of equal authority with the text. The text, as we learn from Mr. Spence Hardy, was orally preserved until the reign of the Singhalese monarch Wattagamani, who reigned from B.C. 104 to B.C. 76, when it was committed to writing in the island of Ceylon. The commentary was written by Badhagosha in A.D. 420. To establish the text of the Pitakas three several convocations were held. The first met B.C. 543, when the whole was rehearsed, every syllable being repeated with the utmost precision, and an authentic version established, though not committed to writing. The second convocation was held in B.C. 443, when the whole was again rehearsed, in consequence of certain usages having sprung up contrary to the teachings of Buddha. The third convocation took place B.C. 308, when the Pitakas were again rehearsed, without either retrenchment or addition. These sacred books are of immense size, containing, along with the commentary, nearly 2,000,000 lines. SEE BUDDHISTS.

## Pitcairn, Alexander[[@Headword:Pitcairn, Alexander]]

             a Scottish divine who flourished in the second half of the 17th century, and appears to have been obliged to seek refuge in Holland, is known to us  only as the author of, Compendiaria Physiologiae Aristoteliae unai cum Anaztome Cartesianismi (Loud. 1676, 12mo): — Harmonia Evangelica Apostolorum Pauli et Jacobi in Doctrina de Justif. etc. (Rotterd. 1685, 4to). In the last-named work, which is of a controversial nature, Pitcairn opposes Socinians, Papists, and Arminians in general, and Curcellaeus, Morus, Bull, Sherlock, and Baxter in particular. There is a good deal of learning and acuteness displayed in the book, and he deserves the study of Calvinists.

## Pitcairne, Alexander[[@Headword:Pitcairne, Alexander]]

             another Scottish divine, flourished about the same time as the preceding. He was minister at Oron. He published The Spiritual Sacrifice, a treatise concerning the saints' communion with God in prayer (Edinb. 1664, 2 vols. 4to).

## Pitch[[@Headword:Pitch]]

             is the rendering in the A. V. of two Hebrew words, ze'pheth, זְפֶת, and ko'pher, כֹּפֶר. The former is from the root zuph, זוּפ, to flow, or be liquid (like the German Schmalz, from the verb schmelzen) (Exo 2:3; Isa 34:9; comp. Mishna, Schab. 2). The latter is from the root כָּפִר, to cover or smear, and is used in Gen 6:14, where the Sept. has ἄσφαλτον, the Vulg. bitumen. The word חֵמָר, chemar, rendered “slime” (Gen 11:3; Gen 14:10; Exodus 2, 3), likewise belongs here. The three Hebrew terms all represent the same object, viz. mineral pitch or asphalt, in its different aspects: zepheth (the zift of the modern Arabs, Wilkinson, Anc. Egypt. 2, 120) in its liquid state, chemâr in its solid state, from its red color, though also explained in reference to the manner in which it boils up (the former, however, being more consistent with the appearance of the two terms in juxtaposition in Exo 2:3; A.V. “pitch and slime”); and kopher, in reference to its use in overlaying wood-work (Gen 6:14). Asphalt is an opaque, inflammable substance, which bubbles up from subterranean fountains in a liquid state, and hardens by exposure to the air, but readily melts under the influence of heat. In the latter state it is very tenacious, and was used as a cement in lieu of mortar in Babylonia (Gen 11:3; Strabo, 16:743; Herod. 1, 179), as well as for coating the outsides of vessels (Gen 6:14; Josephus, War, 4, 8, 4), and particularly for making the papyrus boats of the Egyptians water-tight (Exo 2:3; Wilkinson, 2, 120). The Babylonians obtained their chief  supply from springs at Is (the modern Hit), which are still in existence (Herod. 1, 179). The Jews and Arabians got theirs in large quantities from the Dead Sea, which hence received its classical name of Lacus Asphaltites. The latter was particularly prized for its purple hue (Pliny, 28:23). In the early ages of the Bible the slime-pits (Gen 14:10), or springs of asphalt, were apparent in the vale of Siddim, at the southern end of the sea. They are now concealed through the submergence of the plain, and the asphalt probably forms itself into a crust on the bed of the lake, whence it is dislodged by earthquakes or other causes. Early writers describe the masses thus thrown up on the surface of the lake as of very considerable size (Josephus, War, 4, 8,4; Tacit. Hist. 5, 6; Diod. Sic. 2, 48). This is now a rare occurrence (Rooinson, 1, 517), though small pieces may constantly be picked up on the shore. The inflammable nature of pitch is noticed in Isa 34:9. SEE APHALTUM; SEE BITUMEN.

## Pitcher[[@Headword:Pitcher]]

             in the A.V. represents the following words in the original:

1. כִּד, kad; Sept. ὑδρία; Vulg. hydria, lagena; akin to Sanscrit kut and κάδος; rendered “barrel” (1Ki 17:12; 1Ki 18:33).

2. נֵבֶלand נֶיֶל, nebel; Sept. ἀγγεῖον; Vulg. vas; A.V. “bottle,” only once a “pitcher” (Lam 4:2); where it is joined with חֶרֶשׁ, an earthen vessel (Gesen. Thesaur. p. 522).

3. In the N.T. κεράμιον, twice only (Mar 14:13; Luk 22:10). It denotes the water-jars or pitchers with one or two handles, used chiefly by women for carrying water, as in the story of Rebecca (Gen 24:15-20; but see Mar 14:13; Luk 22:10). This practice has been and is still usual both in the East and elsewhere. The vessels used for the purpose are generally carried on the head or on the shoulder. The Bedawin women commonly use skin-bottles. Such was the “bottle” carried by Hagar (Gen 21:14; Harmer, Obs. 4:246; Layard, Nin. and Bab. p. 578; Roberts, Sketches, pl. 164; Arvieux, Trav. p. 203; Burckhardt, Notes on Bed. 1, 351; Thomson, Lend and Book, 2, 379). The same word kad is used of the pitchers employed by Gideon's 300 men (Jdg 7:16), where the use made of them marks the material. Also the vessel (A.V. barrel) in which the meal of the Sareptan widow was contained (1  Kings 17:12), and the “barrels” of water used by Elijah at Mount Carmel (1Ki 18:33). It is also used figuratively of the life of man (Ecc 12:6). It is thus probable that earthen vessels were used by the Jews as they were by the Egyptians for containing both liquids and dry provisions (Birch, Anc. Pottery, 1, 43). At the Fountain of Nazareth may be seen men and women with pitchers which scarcely differ from those in use in Egypt and Nubia (Roberts, Sketches, pi. 29, 164). The water-pot of the woman of Samaria was probably one of this kind, to be distinguished from the much larger amphorae of the marriage-feast at Cana. SEE BOTTLE; SEE CRUSE; SEE EWER; SEE FLAGON; SEE POT.

## Pitcher, Edwin Frank[[@Headword:Pitcher, Edwin Frank]]

             a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born Feb. 14,1846, near Fairmount, Marion County, West Virginia. He was the youngest of thirteen children. Very early in life he gave evidence of religious culture, and at the age of eleven was converted, and joined the Methodists. His school life was noted for its spiritual tone. At fourteen he entered Dickinson College. At sixteen he took the prize medal in the junior contest, and graduated the first in his class. The year following his graduation he became professor in Emory Female College, Carlisle, Pa., and while in this position was licensed to preach. Impressed with the value of a higher theological training, he went to Evanston; but the climate proving unfavorable to his health lie returned to his home. In the fall of 1865 he entered the theological school at Concord, N. H., where he remained until the spring of 1867, when he graduated. Joining the New England Conference, he was sent to Amherst, Mass., which was a new field for Methodism. In 1868 he was called to Morgantown, West Virginia, where his labors were very successful. In 1870 he was stationed at Lawrence, Mass., but finding his wife's health failing, he entered the Philadelphia Conference, and in March 1872, was stationed at Lebanon, Pa. In March 1873, he was sent to Allentown, Pa., which proved to be his last appointment. In the spring of 1875, his own health failing, he sailed for Europe. Returning the middle of September, his pastoral work occupied his time until Feb. 23, when he was taken with hemorrhage from the lungs. He died May 18, 1876. His scholarship was thorough and elevated, his style classic and chaste. His manner was gentle and unpretentious, and his presentation of truth forceful and vivid. His favorite theme was the all-powerful Name. See Zion's Herald, Aug. 10, 1876.

## Pithom[[@Headword:Pithom]]

             (Heb. Pithom', פַּתֹם, meaning, if of Heb. derivation, mouth of Thom; but the word is probably Egyptian, meaning the [city of] Thomei [justice]; Sept. Πειθώμ, v.r. Πειθώ), one of the store-cities built by the Israelites for the first oppressor, the Pharaoh “which knew not Joseph” (Exo 1:11). In the Heb. these cities are two, Pithom and Raamses; the Sept. adds On as a third. It is probable that Pithom lay in the most eastern part of Lower Egypt, like Raamses, if, as is reasonable, we suppose the latter to be the Rameses mentioned elsewhere, and that the Israelites were occupied in public works within or near to the land of Goshen. SEE RAAMSES.

Herodotus mentions a town called Patumus, Πάτουμος, which seems to be the same as the Thoum or Thou of the Itinerary of Antoninus, probably the military station Thohu of the Notitia. Whether or not Patumus be the Pithomn of Scripture, there can be little doubt that the name is identical. The first part is the same as in Bu-bastis and Bu-siris, either the definite article masculine or a possessive pronoun, unless indeed, with Brugsch, we read the Egyptian word “abode” pa, and suppose that it commences these names. SEE PIBESETH.

The second part appears to be the name of Atum or Tuur, a divinity worshipped at On, or Heliopolis, as well as Ra, both being forms of the sun, SEE ON, and it is noticeable that Thoum or Thou was very near the Heliopolite nome, and perhaps more anciently within it, and that a monument at Abu-Kesheid shows that the worship of Heliopolis extended along the valley of the canal of the Red Sea. As we find Thoum and Patumus and Rameses in or near to the land of Goshen, there can be no reasonable doubt that we have here a correspondence to Pithom and Raamses, and the probable connection in both cases with Heliopolis confirms the conclusion. It is remarkable that the Coptic version of Gen 46:28 mentions Pithom for, or instead of, the Heroopolis of the Sept. Whether Patumus and Thoum be the same, and the position of one or both, have yet to be determined, before we can speak positively as to the Pithom of Exodus. Herodotus places Patumus in the Arabian nome upon the canal of the Red Sea (2, 48). The Itinerary of Antoninus puts Thou fifty Roman miles from Heliopolis, and forty-eight from Pelusium; but this seems too far north for Patumus, and also for Piuthom, if that place were near Heliopolis, as its name and connection with Raamses seem to indicate. It was twelve miles from Vicus Judseorum, according to the Itinerary. It must therefore have been somewhere over against Wady Tlmilat, or the valley of Thom, or near the mouth of that valley, and not far from Pi-  beseth or Bubastis, now called Tell Basta. Tell el-Kebir, or “the Great Heap,” which is a little to the south of it, may perhaps be the site of ancient Pithom. Heroopolis, which had so long disappeared, and had almost become mythical, may, after all, be the same as Pithom. Heroopolis, according to Ptolemy, lay at the extremity of Trajan's canal, i.e. its eastern extremity, where it joined or approached the more ancient canal of Pharaoh Necho, possibly at or within the mouth of this valley, and, according to Manetho, not far from the Bubastic branch of the Nile. Most writers' however, regard the ruins at Abut-Kesheid as marking the site of Heroopolis. Accordingly the scholars who accompanied the French expedition place Pithom on the site of the present Abhaseh, at the entrance of the Wady Tumilat, where there was at all times a strong military post. See Hengstenberg, Die Biicher Moses und Aegypten; Du Bois Ayme, in Descript. de l'Eyypte, 11, 377; 18:1, 372; Champollion, L'Egypte sous les Pharaons, 1, 172; 2, 58. SEE GOSHEN.

## Pithom (2)[[@Headword:Pithom (2)]]

             This has recently been identified by Edouard Naville, who has carried on excavations under the auspices of the "Egypt Exploration Fund," with Tell el-Maskhutah, or Abu Kesheid (usually thought to be the site of Heropolis), and he has published the results of his explorations in a volume entitled The Store-city of Pithom (Lond. 1885). The identification rests chiefly on the discovery, upon the spot, of a statue of a squatting man, in red granite, the lieutenant of king Osorkon II, "Ank-renp-nefer, the good recorder of Pithom " (pages 4, 5, 13), together with an inscription on a large monument of Rameses at Ismaileh, containing the words "the lord of Theku, of Succoth." This is certainly somewhat slender ground, but it may perhaps be provisionally accepted for the present. Mr. Naville found the remains of what he regards as a. large temple with numerous chambers, indicating the existence of a city there in ancient times, but he was unable to make out its plans, or to unearth it to any great extent.

## Pithon[[@Headword:Pithon]]

             (Heb. Pithon', פַּיתוֹן, perh. harmless [First]; Sept. Φιθών), the first named of four sons of Micah, the grandson of Jonathan, son of king Saul (1Ch 8:35; 1Ch 9:41). B.C. post 1050.

## Pithon, Francois and Pierre[[@Headword:Pithon, Francois and Pierre]]

             twin brothers, were born Nov. 1, 1539. Both became famous as canonists. Francois, who died as chancellor of the Parliament at Paris in 1607, published among other works the Codex Dionysius Hadrianus (i.e. the collection of canons of Dionysius Exiguus, as augmented by Adrian). Pierre occupied some of the highest official positions, which, however, he relinquished, in order to give himself entirely to his studies. After the massacre on Bartholomew's eve, he became a convert to the Roman Catholic Church, and again came before the public to defend the conversion of Henry IV, and to effect his reconciliation with Paris. He died at Noyen-sur-Seine in 1596. Pierre wrote Les Libertes de l'Eglise Gallicane (Par. 1594), in 83 articles, to which must be added Du Puy's Preuves des Libertes de l'Eglise Gallicane, de Maistre Pierre Pithon (ibid. 1652). Both brothers published an edition of the Corpus jluris canon. See Theolog. Universal-Lexikon, s.v. (B. P.)

## Pitiful[[@Headword:Pitiful]]

             SEE PITY.

## Pitiscus, Martin Friedrich[[@Headword:Pitiscus, Martin Friedrich]]

             a Lutheran theologian. of Germany, was born at Hamburg in 1721. In 1756 he was preacher at his birthplace, in 1768 professor of Oriental languages, and died November 13, 1794. He wrote, Versuch von der Religion der Starmmelten des menschlichen Geschlechts (Hamburg, 1768): — Eximium Divinae Sapientia Specimen (1763): — Ueber den Kanon der Bucher des Altens Testaments (1776): — Zur Beurtheilung der von Herrn Hofrath Lessing herausgegebenen Fragmente eines Ungenannten von Duldung der Deisten (1779). See Doring, Die gelehrten Theologen Deutschlands, s.v.; Furst, Bibl. Jud. 3:106. (B.P.)

## Pitkin, Caleb[[@Headword:Pitkin, Caleb]]

             a Presbyterian minister, was born in New Hartford, Litchfield Co., Conn., Feb. 27, 1781. He graduated at Yale College, New Haven, Conn., in 1806; studied theology privately under Rev. Asahel Hooker, of Goshen, Conn.; was licensed June 10, 1807, by the North Congregational Association of Litchfield, Conn., and supplied for a time the churches of Derby and Oxford. In 1808 he became pastor of the Church in Milford, being ordained and installed by the West Consociation of New Haven, Conn.; in 1816 he acted as missionary in Ashtabula and Portage counties, Ohio; and in 1817 he was installed pastor of the Congregational Church of Charlestown, Portage Co., Ohio, where he remained about ten years. Previous to the close of this period measures had been taken by the presbyteries of Grand River and Portage towards the establishment of a college. Mr. Pitkin had been an active agent in this work, and henceforward it was the principal object of his attention. In 1828 he removed to Hudson, where the Western Reserve College was established, and remained there till his death, Feb. 5, 1864. See Wilson, Presb. Hist. Almanac, 1865, p. 169. (J. L. S.)

## Pitman, Charles, D.D[[@Headword:Pitman, Charles, D.D]]

             a pioneer preacher of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born near Cookstown, N. J., January, 1796. He early embraced religion, became a local preacher in 1817, and the next year joined the Philadelphia Conference. At once he obtained popularity with all hearers, occupying, from time to time, the most important stations and districts in the Philadelphia Conference. In the year 1841 he was elected corresponding secretary of the Missionary Society. His health failing in 1850, he resigned this office and retired to Trenton, passing serenely and faithfully from life, Jan. 14, 1854, and leaving a name for Christian purity, consistency, ministerial ability, and usefulness which thousands delight to remember. He possessed a strong memory, a quick perception, with discriminating judgment, and a holy evangelical fervor stamped his pulpit labors. Dr. Pitman had not many equals as a public speaker, His oratory was emphatically not scholastic, but, like the great Patrick Henry's, the true eloquence of nature. Although Dr. Pitman was an extemporaneous  preacher, he carefully used his pen in preparations for the pulpit. Many sermons he wrote in full, not to read or memorize them, but for the purpose of properly disciplining his thoughts and language, and for useful reference. Emphatically a preacher of Christ, the precious atonement became his favorite theme, and immense multitudes hung delighted upon his lips while he held up a crucified Savior. All who heard believed him to be a man of God, preaching with divine unction, and they received in faith the words of truth which he uttered. Dr. Pitman had a fine, large head, moderately high forehead, and slightly sunken eyes, his likeness strongly resembling that of the celebrated Robert Hall of England. See New Jersey Memorials of Methodism; Sprague, Annals of the American Pulpit, vol. 7.

## Pitman, John Rogers[[@Headword:Pitman, John Rogers]]

             an English divine, noted as a classical scholar and general litterateur, was born about 1782, and was educated at Pembroke College, Cambridge, in 1804. He became preacher at Berkeley and Belgrave chapels, and in the Foundling and Magdalen hospitals, and perpetual curate of St. Barnabas Church, Kensington. He died in 1870. Of his publications, we mention Excerpta ex variis Romanis Poetis (Lond. 1808, 8vo): — Practical Lectures on St. John (1821, 8vo; supplement, 1822, 8vo): - Sermons for the Year (1825, 2 vols. 8vo; 2d series, 1828): — Practical Commentary on the Sermon on the Mount (1852). Mr. Pitman also edited the works of Dr. Lightfoot (1822-25,13 vols. 8vo), and Bingham's Origines Ecclesiasticae (1840, 9 vols. 8vo).

## Pitri[[@Headword:Pitri]]

             (Sanskrit, i.e. father) is the name affixed in Hindai mythology to the deified progenitors of mankind, supposed to inhabit the orbit of the moon.

## Pits (or Pitseus), John, D.D[[@Headword:Pits (or Pitseus), John, D.D]]

             an English divine, noted as a biographer, was born at Alton, in Hampshire, A.D. 1560. He received his early education at Winchester School, whence, at the age of eighteen, he was elected a probationer fellow of New College. Oxford; but in less than two years he left the kingdom as a voluntary Romish exile, and went to Douai. He went thence to Rheims, and a year afterwards to the English college at Rome, where he studied seven years, and was then ordained priest. He returned to hold the professorship of rhetoric and Greek at Rheims. Towards the end of 1590 he was appointed  governor to a young nobleman, with whom he traveled into Lorraine, and afterwards went through Upper Germany and Italy. He subsequently returned to Lorraine, where he was preferred to a canonry of Verdun. When he had passed two years at his hew residence, Antonia, daughter of the duke of Lorraine, who had married the duke of Cleves, invited him to Cleves to be her confessor. He continued in her service twelve years, till her death, when he returned a third time to Lorraine, and was promoted to the deanery of Liverdun, where he died in 1616. The leisure he enjoyed while confessor to the duchess of Cleves enabled him to compile a work which has given him great renown, The Lives of the Kings, Bishops, Apostolical Men, and Writers of England (four large volumes). The first contains the lives of the kings, the second of the bishops, the third of the apostolical men, and the fourth of the writers. The three first are preserved in the archives of the collegiate church of Verdun; the fourth only was published after his decease, under the title of Joannis Pitsei Angli, S. Theologiae Doctoris, Liverduni in Lotharingia Decani, Relationum Historicarum de Rebus Anglicis Tomus Primus (Paris, 1619 and 1623, 4to), but the running title by which it is most frequently quoted is “De Illustribus Anglise Scriptoribus.” In this work Pits took much from Bale's book, De Scriptoribus Majoris Britannice, without acknowledgment, pretending at the same time to abhor both Bale and his work. He also quotes Leland's Collectanea de Scriptoribus Angliae, which Wood asserts he never could have had the means of perusing, but must likewise have taken at second hand from Bale. His partiality is also great. He leaves Wickliffe and his followers, together with the Scotch and Irish writers, entirely out of his work, and in their room gives an account of the Roman Catholic writers, such especially as had left the kingdom after the Reformation in queen Elizabeth's time, and settled at Rome, Douai, Louvain, etc. This, however, is the best and most valuable part of Pits's work. He published three small treatises, which are less known: De Legibus (Trier, 1592): — De Beatitudine (Ingolstadt, 1595): — De Peregrinatione (Düsseldorf, 1604, 12mo). The last is dedicated to the duchess of Cleves. See Biogr. Brit. s.v.; Dodd, Ch. Hist.; Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Auth. s.v.; English Cyclop. s.v.; Wood, Athen. Oxon. 2, 173.

## Pitt, Christopher[[@Headword:Pitt, Christopher]]

             an English divine, noted especially as a poet, was born in 1699 at Blandford, Dorsetshire; was educated at Winchester and at New College,  Oxford; and, after taking holy orders, obtained the family living at Pimperne, where he passed his life, beloved and respected for his suavity of manners and general benevolence. He died in 1748. His works are of a secular character. See Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Auth. s.v.

## Pittoni, Giambattista[[@Headword:Pittoni, Giambattista]]

             an Italian canonist, was born at Venice in 1666. He took holy orders and was a priest, and resided in turns at Rome and Venice. He died Oct. 17, 1748. He compiled with great order a collection of the pontifical constitutions and of the decisions of the different Roman congregations (Viterbo, 1745 and ensuing years, 14 vols. 8vo), which is held in great esteem. He left also, Vita di Benedetto XIII (Venice, 1730, 4to): — De commemoratione omnium fidelium defunctorum (ibid. 1739, 8vo): — De octavis festorum (ibid. 1746, 2 vols. 8vo); etc.

## Pittori, Lodovico Bigi[[@Headword:Pittori, Lodovico Bigi]]

             (in Latin, Pictorius), a modern Latin poet, was born in 1454 at Ferrara. He cultivated with some success philosophy and theology, but his favorite study was Latin poetry. The only defect of his Latin poems is a kind of monotonous facility, we mention of his works, Candida, a poem (Modena, 1491, 4to): — Tumultuariorum carminum lib. 7 (ibid. 1492, 4to): — Christianorum opusculorum lib. 3 (ibid. 1496 or 1498, 4to): — Epigrmammata in Christi vitamm (Milan, 1513, 4to): — In coelestes proceres hymnorum epitaphiorumque liber (Ferrara, 1514, 4to): — Sacra et satyrica epigrammata (ibid. 1514, 4to): — Epiganrammata moerulia lib. 4 (Modena, 1516, 4to); a collection of sermons in Italian. All these works have become very rare. Freytag and David Clement have given a complete list of them.

## Pity[[@Headword:Pity]]

             is usually defined to be the uneasiness we feel at the unhappiness of others, prompting us to compassionate them, with a desire for their relief. God is said to pity them that fear him, as a father pitieth his children (Psa 103:13). Pity is thus a Christian grace, to the practice of which we are exhorted by the apostle: “Love as brethren, be pitiful, be courteous” (1Pe 3:8).  The phrase נָשַׁים רִחֲמִנַיּוֹת, nashim rachamaniyoth, rendered “pitiful women” in our version (Lam 4:10), properly refers to the tenderness and affectionate love which is the distinguishing trait of the female character; and that such women should in the “siege and the straitness” be driven to and adopt the terrible expedient of feeding upon their own children, as in this passage they are stated to have done, is an awful instance of the literal fulfillment of the threatenings of the Lord in the event of the disobedience of the house of Israel (Deu 28:57). The same horrible expedient was resorted to also in the last siege of Jerusalem, as it had formerly been at the siege of Samaria, in the reign of Ahab (2Ki 6:28-29).

Pitiful is a word whose derivations have by modern usage been almost limited to the sense of mean, contemptible, or insignificant. In the Bible and Prayerbook the old and primary meaning of full of mercy compassionate, or tender, is retained. The English Prayer-book gives us these examples: “... though we be tied and bound with the chain of our sins, yet let the pitifulness of thy great mercy loose us.” — Occasional Prayer. Again: “Pitifully behold the sorrows of our hearts;” which petition in the Litany is thus altered in the American Prayer-book, “With pity behold the sorrows of our hearts.” In these the original and better sense of the word is alone intended. In the Primer of king Edward VI there is this expression: “O pitiful Physician, and Healer both of body and soul, Christ Jesu!” And Latimer, in his sermon on the birth of Christ, remarks: “Preachers exhort us to godliness, to do good works, to be pitiful and liberal unto the poor;” that is, to be compassionate, tenderhearted, and sympathizing to them.

## Pius I[[@Headword:Pius I]]

             pope and saint of Rome, was a native of Aquileia, and succeeded Hyginus. Pius I is supposed to have commenced his pontificate, or rather bishopric, about 152 or 153, and to have died in 157. The date of his reign, however, as given by other authorities, is from 127 to 140. He was succeeded by Anicetus, but if by Hyginus, as some think, then the latter date of reign is correct. Several decretals have been attributed to Pius I by Gratian, but they are generally considered apocryphal. Hermes, the author of the Shepherd, is reputed to have been the brother of this pontiff. Pius is commemorated in the Western Church July 11. See Acta SS. vol. 3, July, p. 178; Pagi, 37 rev. Pontif. Rom. 1, 27; Jaffe, Regesta Pontificum Romanorum, p. 3 and 920; Tillemont, Memoires pour servir a l'Histoire  ecclesiastique (ed. 1732, fol.), p. 130 and 263; Fontanini, Historia Litteraria Aquile. lib. 2, cap. 3, p. 70. (J. H. W.)

## Pius II[[@Headword:Pius II]]

             pope of Rome (from 1458 to 1464), whose original name was AEneas Sylvius Piccolomini, was a great theologian, diplomatist, canonist, historian and orator, and in fact a pontiff universally accomplished. He is especially noted as the inspirer of a crusade against the Saracens lie was born at Corsignano, in Siena, Oct. 18,1405. Early devoted to study he soon became noted for his scholarship, and found no difficulty in securing within the Church all the honors and distinctions he might seek. In 1431 he went as secretary of cardinal Dominicus Capranica to the Council of Basle, that celebrated ecclesiastical assembly which attempted earnestly, though with little success, the reformation of the Church, and of which cardinal Piccolomini wrote a history: Commentarius de Gestis Basil. Concilii, in two books — a very important work for the history of the Church of that period, which, because of its advocacy of Gallican principles, was put in the Index Librorum Prohibitorum. At that time Piccolomini was a strong advocate for the supremacy of the council, and its right to judge and depose even the pope, “who,” he argued, “‘ought to be considered as the vicar of the Church rather than as the vicar of Christ.”

These tenets, however, were condemned by pope Eugenius IV, though they caused the council to assert its authority by suspending the pope from his dignity. Then began a long struggle, which terminated in an open schism, the council deposing Eugenius and electing Felix V. Piccolomini was appointed secretary of the new pope or antipope, and was sent by him as his ambassador to the emperor Frederick III, who was so pleased with the envoy that he prevailed upon him to give up his precarious situation and accept the place of imperial secretary. Frederick afterwards sent him on several missions, and loaded him with favors. Piccolomini proved his gratitude to his imperial master, for he wrote several works in praise of his patron and in support of his imperial prerogative-De Origine et Actoritvite Romani Imperii itd Fridericum III Imperatoremn, Libe.:Urnuss: — Historia Rerum Friderici II: — De Itinere, uptiis, et Coronatione Friderici III Commentariols: — De his. qui Friderico III Imperante, in Germanium. et per totam Europam memorabiliter gesta sunt, usque ad annum 1458, Commentarius. At last Frederick sent Piccolomini as his ambassador to pope Eugenius. This was a delicate errand for one who had been a most avowed antagonist of that pontiff; but Piccolomini managed so  well by his dexterity, his captivating address, and, above all his eloquence, that the pope not only forgave him, but became his friend; and Piccolomini had hardly returned to Germany from his mission when he received a papal brief appointing him apostolic secretary. He accepted an office congenial to his clerical profession, and also because it fixed his residence in Italy. From that time a marked change took place in the opinions, or at least in the professions, of Piccolomini, and he became a decided advocate for the claims of the see of Rome. Eugenius died in 1447, and his successor Nicholas V was recognized by the fathers of the Council of Basle, who. being forsaken by both the emperor and the French king, made their peace with Rome.

Felix V also having abdicated in favor of Nicholas, the schism of the Church was healed. Nicholas made Piccolomini bishop of Trieste, and afterwards of Siena, and sent him as nuncio to Germany and Bohemia, where he had several conferences with the Hussites, which he relates in his Epistles (Epistola 130). He had, however, the merit— rare in that age— of recommending mild and conciliatory measures as the most likely to reclaim dissenters to the bosom of the Church. He wrote a work on the history of Bohemia and the Hussites, in which he states fairly and without any exaggeration the tenets of that sect, as well as those of the Waldenses, which he calls “impious,” but which are mainly the same that have since been acknowledged by the Protestant and Reformed churches throughout Europe. He relates (in his Historia Boemica) the burning of John Huss and Jerome of Prague, and speaks of their fortitude, “which,” he says, “exceeded that of any of the philosophers of antiquity,” and he recapitulates literally their charges against the corruption of the clergy. In the year 1452 Piccolomini, being then in Italy, was present at the solemn coronation of Frederick III at Rome, and delivered an oration to the pope in the name of that sovereign, whom he afterwards accompanied to Naples. On their return to Rome he delivered another oration before the pope, the emperor, and other German and Italian princes, and the ambassadors of other European courts, for the purpose of exhorting them to form an effectual league against the Turks, who were then on the point of taking Constantinople. Piccolomini felt the great danger to Christian Europe from the rapid advance of the Ottoman conquerors and his paramount object through the remainder of his life was to form a strong bulwark to protect Italy and Germany; but at the same time he was too well acquainted with the politics of the various Christian courts, and their selfish and petty jealousies, to expect much union in their councils and he expresses his views and his doubts in a masterly manner in several of his “Epistles.” In  December 1456, Calixtus III, the successor of Nicholas V, made Piccolomini a cardinal; and in 1458, after the death of Calixtus, he was unanimously elected pope, and assumed the name of Pius II.

His pontificate lasted only six years but during this period he distinguished himself by promoting learning, by inculcating peace and concord among the Christian princes, and exhorting them to unite their efforts against their common enemy, the barbarous Turks. The year after his election he convoked a congress of the ambassadors of all the Christian sovereigns to arrange the plan of a general war against the Ottomans. The pope himself repaired to Mantua, accompanied by the learned Philelphus, who spoke eloquently in favor of the proposed league. Most of the Italian states were willing to join in it, but Germany and France stood aloof, and nothing was decided. Pius also took the pains to write a long letter to sultan Mohammed II, to convince him of the errors of Islamism, and to induce him to turn Christian. In the year 1464 an armament intended against the Turks was directed to assemble at Ancona, and soldiers began to repair thither from various parts. Matthias, king of Hungary, and Charles, duke of Burgundy, had promised to accompany the expedition. The Venetians also had promised the use of their fleet to forward the troops across the Adriatic into Albania. Pius II set off from Rome for Ancona, but on arriving there he found that the soldiers were in want of arms, clothes, and provisions; the foreign princes did not come; and instead of the Venetian fleet, only a few galleys made their appearance. The aged and disappointed pontiff fell ill, and on Aug. 14 he expired, after having taken leave of his cardinals, and begged forgiveness if he had erred in the government of the Church. He was generally regretted, especially throughout Italy. He was succeeded by Paul II. Pius II, before his death, raised his native town, Corsignano, to the rank of a bishop's see, and gave it the name of Pienza, by which it is now known. Pius assisted Ferdinand, king of Naples, in his war against the duke of Anjou, the pretender to that crown. At the same time he was obliged to make war in his own states against Sigismondo Malatesta, lord of Rimini, and against the Savelli and other feudal barons, in all of which undertakings he was successful. By a bull addressed to the universities of Paris and of Cologne, Pius condemned his own writings in defence of the Council of Basle, concluding with these words: “Believe what I, an old man, now say to you, and not what I wrote when I was young; believe the pontiff rather than the private individual; reject Eneas Sylvius, and accept Pius II.” In several of his letters to his friends also, and  especially to Pietro di Noceto, he expresses sorrow for his juvenile weaknesses, for he had once been too fond of the fair sex, and had even written accounts of some of his amorous adventures, and of those of other persons which are found among his “Epistles.” Some writers assert that Eeneas Sylvius had refused the priestly office until his fortieth year because of his fondness for the fair sex; and they quote his own confessions in proof. But whatever his previous life, as pontiff he was devoted to the Church, and sought the accomplishment of great things.

A vacancy having occurred in the archiepiscopal see of Mentz, two candidates appeared for it-Adolph, count of Nassau, and Dietrich of Isenburg. The latter had the majority of votes, but Pius, who by the concordat had the right of deciding in cases of contested elections, refused to confirm the choice of Dietrich unless he engaged not to assert the supremacy of a general council, not to convoke of his own authority an imperial diet, and further to pay to Rome double the sum fixed for the annates, or first-fruits. Dietrich demurred to the first two conditions, and positively refused to accede to the last; and as proceedings were instituted against him in the apostolic court, he appealed to the next general council. Pius declared such appeals to be heretical, and excommunicated and deposed him, appointing Adolph of Nassau in his place. The emperor acknowledged Adolph, but Dietrich being supported by the count palatine and the elector of Bavaria, a war ensued, which, after much mischief, ended in the submission of Dietrich. Those who remembered the sentiments of Piccolomini when imperial secretary, and especially his letter (Epistola 25) to the papal nuncio, John Carvajal, concerning the supremacy of the council, were inclined to think that change of station had, in him as it but too often does in men, produced a corresponding change of opinions.

As a learned man and a writer, Pius II is best known under the name of Aneas Sylvius, the most important part of his career being passed before he was elected pope. He was one of the first historians of his age, a geographer, a scholar, a statesman, and a divine. He was also a great traveler by sea and by land; he lived many years in Germany; he repeatedly visited France, went to Great Britain and as far as Scotland, and to Hungary. His biographer Campanus, bishop of Arezzo, speaks at length of his peregrinations, and his diligence in informing himself of everything worth noticing in the countries which he visited. His principal works, besides those already mentioned, are, Cosmographia, 6 de Mundo Universo Historiarum, libri 1 (a second book treats especially of Europe  and its contemporary history): — In Antonii Panormitae de Dictis et Factis Alphonlsi Arragonzum Regis, libris quatuor, Commentaria Epitome supra Decades Flavii Blondi Forliviensis, etb inclinatione Imperii usque ad tempora Johannmis 23 Ponf. Max. (in 10 books): — Historia Gothica (published first at Leipsic in 1730): — A Treatise on the Education of Children, with Rules of Grammar and Rhetoric: lastly, his numerous Epistles, which contain much varied information. A collection of his works was published at Basle, Enece Sylvii Piccolomini Senensis Opera quoe extant (1551, fol.), but this edition does not include all. Domenico de Rosetti has published a catalogue of all his woks and their various editions, and also of his biographers and commentators, Serie di Edizioni delle Opere di Pio II, o da lui intitolate (Trieste, 1830). Biographies of Pius II by Platina and Campanus are annexed to the Basle edition of his works, but a much more ample biography is found in the Commentaries published (Frankfort, 1614) under the name of John Gobellinus, his secretary, but which are known to have been written by himself or under his dictation, Pii II Pont. Max., Commentarii Rerum Memorabilium quce Temporibus suis contigerunt, libri 12: with a continuation by his intimate friend, James Ammanato, cardinal of Pavia, who had at his desire assumed the name of Piccolomini. See, besides these. Milman, Hist. of Latin Christianity, 8:120- 122; Riddle, Hist. of the Papacy, 2, 377 sq.; Bower, Hist. of the Popes (see Index); Hagenbach, Rückerinnerungen an Aeneas Sylvius (Basle, 1840); Verdiere, Sur AEneas Sylv. Piccolomini (Paris, 1843); Pfizer, Aeneas Sylv. Piccol., etc. (Stuttg. 1844); Helwing, De Pii II Pontificis maximi Rebus gestis et moribus commentatio (Berol. 1825); Voigt, Aeneas Sylv. Piccol. (Berlin, 1856-9); Düx, Kardinal Nicolaus 5. Cusa u. die Kirche seiner Zeit (Regensburg, 1847, 2 vols. 8vo).

## Pius III[[@Headword:Pius III]]

             pope of Rome in 1503, whose original name was Francesco Todeschini Piccolomini, was the child of pope Pius II's sister, and was born at Siena in 1439. He was made cardinal by pope Alexander VI, and succeeded him in 1503. His pontificate was of only a very short duration. Twenty-six days after his elevation he died, and Julius II (q.v.) became his successor. See Panvinius, Vita Pii II.

## Pius IV[[@Headword:Pius IV]]

             pope of Rome from 1560 to 1565, whose original name was Giovanni Angelo redici or Medichini, was born at Milan, Italy, March 31, 1499. He was originally a student of law and devoted to the legal profession, but his brother won him over to the ecclesiastical ranks, and in 1549 he was made cardinal by pope Paul III. Pius IV was elected successor to pope Paul IV (q.v.) about the close of 1559, a very critical period in papal history, and was crowned Jan. 6, 1560. The most important act of his pontificate was, at Easter, 1561, the reassembling of the Council of Trent which had been prorogued under Paul IV. Pius was particularly intent upon checking the spread of heresy, which had taken root in several parts of Italy, besides the valleys of Piedmont, and especially in some districts of Calabria. The Spanish viceroy of Naples sent his troops, assisted by an inquisitor and a number of monks, to exterminate by fire and sword the heretics of Calabria. Emmanuel Philibert, duke of Savoy, after attacking with an armed force the Waldenses, who made a gallant resistance, agreed to allow them the exercise of their religion within their own districts subject to certain regulations. The quarrels between the Catholics and Protestants in France were more difficult to settle. Some of the French Catholic prelates, among others Monluc, bishop of Valence, and the cardinal of Lorraine, recommended large concessions to be made to the Protestants with the hope of reconciling them to the Church, and queen Catharine di Medici wrote to the pope to that effect. The pope referred the matter to the council, and in the mean time Catharine published the edict of pacification, in January 1562, which allowed the Protestants liberty of conscience, and leave to perform their worship in country places, but not within walled towns. The prelates sent by France to the Council of Trent, and several councilors of the Parliament of Paris who were also ordered to attend in the name of the king, spoke loudly of the necessity of an extensive reform in the Church, and seemed disposed to render the bishops more independent of the see of Rome. The cardinal of Lorraine was of opinion that the mass and other offices should be performed in the vulgar or popular language of each country; but the Italian prelates, and Lainez, general of the Jesuits, supported the maintenance of the established form of worship, as well as of the papal authority in all its existing plenitude. The discussions grew warm, and it was only in the following year, 1563, that the two parties came to an understanding.

The council terminated its sittings in December of that year, and the pope confirmed its decrees by a  bull. This was the principal event of the life of Pius IV. True, the Tridentine Council was not the most important that has ever met, but at all events it is the most important that has met in modern times. Its importance is comprised in two grand principles.' By the one dogmatic theology, after divers fluctuations, separated itself from Protestant views forever, and the doctrine of justification as then established gave rise to the entire system of Roman Catholic dogmatics as maintained to our day. By the other the hierarchy became founded anew, theoretically by the decrees respecting ordination to the priesthood, practically by the resolutions on the subject of reform. The faithful were again subjected to an intolerant Church discipline, and in urgent cases to the sword of excommunication. As the pope held the exclusive right of interpreting the Tridentine decisions, it ever remains with him to prescribe the rules of faith and manners. All the threads of the restored discipline converged together in Rome. Such progress could only have been made by means of a community of sentiment and action with the leading Roman Catholic powers. In this union with the monarchies there lies one of the most important conditions for the whole subsequent development of Romanism, and were it for nothing else Pius IV would still be an important person in the history of the world, for he was the first pope that knowingly suffered or caused the claim of the hierarchy to place itself in opposition to monarchical government. After the council Pius IV relaxed all energy, neglected religion, ate and drank too eagerly, and took an excessive delight in the splendor of his court, in sumptuous festivities, and in costly buildings. He evidently had done his work. He died in December, 1565. His disposition was generous, and he embellished Rome; but he was guilty of the common fault of nepotism. He made his nephew, Charles Borromeo, a cardinal, who afterwards became celebrated as archbishop of Milan; and he instituted proceedings against the nephews of the late pope, cardinal Carlo Caraffa, and his brother the duke of Paliano, who were accused of various crimes, which were said to be proved against them, and both were executed. But in the succeeding pontificate of Pius V, the proceedings being revised, the two brothers Caraffa were declared to have been unjustly condemned. See Ranke, Papacy, 1, 234 sq., et al.; Bower, Hist. of the Popes (see Index): Leonardi, Oratio de laudibus Pii IV (Padua, 1565); Panvinius, Vita Pii IV; Jervis, Ch. Hist. of France, p. 147, 159, 162; Foulkes, Divisions of Christendom, vol. 1, § 68; Janus, Pope and Council, p. 418; Cramp, Popery, p. 264 sq.; Fisher, Reformation, p. 411; Montor, Hist. des Souver. Pontifes, 4, 183 sq.

## Pius IV, Creed of[[@Headword:Pius IV, Creed of]]

             This document, which forms one of the authorized standards of the Church of Rome, was prepared by pope Pius IV immediately after the rising of the Council of Trent, and is understood to embody in substance the decisions of that Council. The creed bears date November 1564, and was no sooner issued than it was immediately received throughout the Romish Church, and since that time it has continued to be accepted as an accurate summary of their faith. It is binding upon all clergymen, doctors, teachers, heads of universities, and of monastic institutions and military orders, and all reconciled converts. For this authoritative document, with the oath of promise appended, SEE PROFESSIO FIDEI.

## Pius IX[[@Headword:Pius IX]]

             the last of the Roman pontiffs who held both temporal and spiritual rule. His original name was Giovanni Maria ialstai Ferretti. He was of noble parentage, though there are writers claiming him to be of Jewish descent. He was born at Sinigaglia, May 13, 1792. As a youth he was distinguished for a mild disposition and for his works of charity. While still a child he was saved from drowning by a poor contadino, who lived to see him seated on what the historian Macaulay calls “the most ancient and venerable throne of Europe.” At the age of eighteen he went to Rome for the purpose of entering the body-guard of the reigning pontiff, Pius VII. An epileptic attack, however, prevented the attainment of his wishes, and he entered a religious seminary, where his gentleness and devotion proved  the foundation of his future distinction. While at Rome he lived under the protection of an uncle, an officer of the ecclesiastical establishment of the Vatican. In the troubled period which marked the closing days of Napoleon's reign, uncle and nephew removed to their estates at Sinigaglia. On a visit which pope Pius VII paid this place, Mastai was presented to his holiness, and when the pontiff was again able to return to Rome, after his long captivity in France, the young ecclesiastic of Sinigaglia was called to the holy city. In the meantime his health had improved, and he was able to prosecute his studies uninterruptedly. By invitation of cardinal Odescalchi, he took part in a mission to his native province, and when he returned was made deacon in 1818. He obtained a personal audience of the pontiff, and sought a dispensation which would allow him to be ordained without delay to the priesthood. The legend states that his holiness, laying his hands on the young aspirant, granted him the favor asked, together with the apostolic blessing, and thus forever cured him of his epilepsy. Secular writers less anxious to paint the miraculous manifestations in Pio Nono's youthful days declare that he was a libertine, and that, stretched upon a bed of sickness, he repented of his sins, and, by a life of abstinence and purity, gradually recovered.

In 1819 Mastai received priest's orders, and first exercised the sacerdotal functions in the hospital of San Giovanni at Rome-an institution founded for the education of poor orphans. He was assiduously devoted to his ministerial duties, and became noted for his charitable works also. In 1823 a wider field opened to him. A canon of the cathedral of Santiago, in Chili, had come to Rome to request of the pope the appointment of an apostolic delegate to that country, and when monsignor Muzi had been given this position, Mastai was selected to accompany him as auditor. Two years he spent in South America, and on his way home he also visited the North, and he is said to have been the only pope that ever saw America. Report will have it that he even visited a body of Freemasons in Philadelphia (see Princeton Rev. [March, 1878], p. 510). Nor need this surprise. “It is a fact,” says Trollope, “which may be relied on, that-of course in the days before he became a priest, or had thought of ever becoming one Pius IX had been a member of a lodge-or a vendetta, as the term was-of Carbonari.” This was a secret society, originally of charcoal-burners (as the name signifies), who were opposed to the tyranny of the times. In the summer of 1825 Mastai was taken into the household of pope Leo XII as domestic prelate. He became a favorite with the pontiff, and in December  was made superintendent of the hospital of St. Michael, founded two centuries ago by Innocent X, and comprising at this time not only a hospital for the sick, but a retreat for the aged, a refuge for boys, a house for magdalens, a home for virtuous girls, and a school of arts and industries. When he assumed the presidency of this vast and complicated institution it was on the decline. He reorganized every department of the hospital, repaired its dilapidated revenues, extended the range of its charities, and in less than two years brought order out of the confusion-by the sacrifice, however, of his own patrimony. He also preached much and obtained great distinction as a pulpit orator.

In 1829 Spoleto needed an archbishop. The political agitation was great throughout Italy. The approach of the disturbances which crowded the year 1830 was manifest in a thousand ways. The ecclesiastics, in order to be all-powerful and sufficient for the struggle, needed more than ordinary experience. A policy of anxious, irritated, and, at the same time, irritating repression had proved a failure. Mastai Ferretti was young enough to avoid falling into this error of his seniors, and as he had gained much political sagacity in his semipolitico-religious mission across the sea, he was selected for the vacant archiepiscopal chair. He quickly perceived that he must abandon the old receipts of the prison and the executioner, and by a wise rule maintained perfect order in the midst of general disturbance. While all Italy was in arms, the little archbishopric of Spoleto remained peaceful. When suddenly 5000 insurgents came there to seek refuge from the pursuing Austrians, he dealt so kindly and judiciously with them that he induced them to lay down their arms and submit to authority; and when the civil authority of the city submitted to him the lists of these insurgents, he tossed them into the fire, instead of forwarding them to Rome. Gregory XVI and his court were displeased and indignant at such procedure. Mastai was summoned to Rome to give an account of his conduct; but he succeeded without much difficulty in persuading Gregory that if their enemies could be put down without punishments, which left a fresh store of hatreds behind, it was all the better. Mastai's enemies said that his conduct towards the persecuted liberal party was not altogether straightforward and consistent, and that he even in those early days showed a certain tendency to run with the hare at the same time that he was hunting with the hounds. The archbishop certainly succeeded finally in obtaining the approbation of his holiness for on Dec. 17, 1832, he was translated to the see of Imola-a very important promotion, because it is  understood that this bishopric is a stepping-stone to the cardinalate. Mastai had not only proved his political sagacity, but his religious fervor and purity of life gave a most dignified position to the churchmen of the diocese of Spoleto, as well as later to that of Imola. Particularly was he noted for his charity and readiness to aid all good works, both public and private. The disturbed times required such ecclesiastics. It gave authority to the sees and influence to the pontificate. How well the pope appreciated Mastai is made apparent in his selection, a short time after, as apostolic nuncio to Naples. He so ably discharged his mission that he was rewarded with the cardinalate by secret conclave in 1839, though he did not receive the purple robe until the year after. He was yet comparatively a young man. There were many far his seniors in the college of cardinals. Certainly no one dreamed that the bestowal of the red hat upon Mastai Ferretti was likely to bring him the tiara soon.

In 1846 Gregory XVI died. When the news from Rome came to the archbishop-cardinal of Imola, he delayed to celebrate first the obsequies of the dead pope. Apparently he was in no haste to get to Rome; yet those who were close observers and less friendly say that he had an eye to the papal throne from the moment of his elevation to the cardinalate, and that he prudently forbore ever after to identify himself with the court of Gregory. There were two parties in the conclave. Each of these sought in the new pontiff the representative of their ideas. The one party, confined to the Jesuits and headed by Lambruschimni himself an aspirant for the vacant chair-determined to maintain the papacy of mediaeval times; the other party, moderately liberal, made up of better men than the Jesuits, yet also devoted to the fabric of mediaeval times, but with some show of concession to modern ideas, were disposed to compromise on a moderate man, and selected the virtuous Bianchi, the Dominican who never doffed the dress of his order for the purple robe, though he accepted its honors and eschewed the Austrian policy of the late pontificate. Outside of the conclave, however, there was a small but enthusiastic faction, called “Young Italy.” resolved to have a liberal pope, and they fastened upon the young cardinal who had espoused the Italian cause and had been a liberal in his past history. No one outside of the conclave imagined, when, on the 14th of June, it convened, that the party at whose simple mention the “holy” men were accustomed to cross themselves would be successful. The only hope was in the popular enthusiasm, which ran so high that there was hope the vox populi might possibly be turned into the vox Dei. On the very  first vote Lambruschini received fifteen votes and Mastai thirteen. On the afternoon of the 16th Mastai received on the fourth ballot thirty-six votes- making, of the fifty-two present, more than the necessary two thirds-when the assembly rose as one man to confirm the choice by unanimous acclamation. Young Italy had conquered against all the Jesuit machinations. But it was well that it was done so soon; for as Mastai -now Pius IX was bestowing his benediction (Urbi et orbi) from the balcony of St. Peter's, an Austrian cardinal drove into the Piazza with smoking post- horses and a “veto” from Vienna.

Various incidents in the reign of Pio Nono's predecessor had given rise to the wildest agitation in diplomatic circles. In 1845 there occurred the rising in the Romagna, which, when suppressed, revived in a far more effective shape in the famous pamphlet, I Casi delle Romagne, which circulated as the testament of a new political gospel throughout the peninsula. Then there came the memorable visit of the czar Nicholas to Rome, ‘-and those interviews in which the pope had dared to protest to the dreaded autocrat against the treatment to which he subjected the Romish Church in Russia. The interest excited in the political world was very great, for, on the one hand, the religious agitation in Poland had assumed serious proportions, while, on the other, speculation was stimulated by the mystery surrounding this interview, at which only two witnesses had been present (cardinal Acton and Mr. Boutevieff, the Russian minister at Rome). Finally, there came as French ambassador M. Rossi, a born subject of the pope-a fugitive professor from Bologna, and a notoriously compromised liberal-avowedly to obtain from the holy see its concurrence with the principles of free education, then advocated in France, and its compliance with the desire of the French government for the reduction within moderate limits of the establishments that had been opened in France, more or less clandestinely, by the Jesuits.

All these circumstances had brought about a degree of agitation which was acknowledged by all who had not some special interest in speaking against the truth. Gregory XVI had lived in hourly dread of revolutionary upheaval, and in constant fear of absolute neglect by the European states. He had always kept in his drawer a document empowering the cardinals, on his demise, to proceed to immediate election, if they saw danger to the free action of the conclave. Such times needed a popular priest in the pontificate. But Mastai disappointed both his friends and his enemies-the former so sorely that they were weakened beyond the possibility of recovery; the latter, by his forming an alliance with them, and  by the execution of schemes which they had never dreamed could be executed, even if Lambruschini himself had been in the papal chair. Pio Nono proved an impulsive, good-natured man, but ignorant and superstitious, vain and impetuous, weak and obstinate, without a mind of his own or settled policy. His reforms were, in reality, of little value. The best of them those devoid of any political significance — projects to regulate the finances, to reform the administration of justice, to introduce railways to ameliorate the condition of the Campagna — brought about merely a temporary improvement. The political measures were equally short-lived in their results, and, besides, were a burlesque on liberalism. Thus in March, 1847, an edict of the press was published with the intention of removing some of the restrictions under which it had labored till then; but strong hints were given as to the subjects which the government would allow to be discussed, and a censorship remained established in full force. The same year witnessed the institution of the Consulta under the presidency of Gizzi. This seemed like concession to popular demands, but the whole thing was a farce; the members were chosen by the pope, and the functions of the council of the most limited nature. Its duty was to give an opinion when called upon, leaving it to the pope to act upon the proffered advice or to do otherwise. In 1848 appeared the famous statuto creating a high council and a chamber of deputies, as the triumph of constitutionalism. But the chambers were forbidden to propose any law on ecclesiastical or mixed affairs, and every measure had to be submitted to the pope in a secret consistory, with the absolute right of veto.

When the national crusade was inaugurated in 1847, under the leadership of prince Charles Albert, of the house of Savoy-the grandfather of the present king of Italy-the pope went with the multitude. The Ultramontanes, of course, broke out against this manifest liberalism of the pontiff, but it only needed a little strategy on their part, and he was at their bidding. When his trusted adviser, count Rossi, was assassinated at the door of the Council of State, Pius IX as rapidly retraced his steps as he had advanced, and now unreservedly gave himself over to those very Jesuits who had plotted the death of his minister, that the liberals might be charged with desperate motives. Accordingly, the pope, on the 29th of April, 1848-his ministry, who had counseled that the abandonment of the people “would most seriously compromise the temporal “dominion of the holy see,” having left him-issued, in the form of an allocution addressed to the cardinals, that celebrated paper which put an end at once and forever to the brief season of popularity and affection of his subjects in which he had basked. The first  words of it declare the intentions of the Holy See “not to deviate from the institutions of our predecessors.” Then it goes on to state that evil-minded men had made it believed that the pope had encouraged the Italians in their revolutionary aspirations, and had endeavored to make his conduct in this respect a means of stirring up schism in Germany. The paper finally warns all the Italians against any such designs or aspirations, enjoining them to remain docile subjects to their princes. This “allocution” fell like a bombshell in the midst of the liberal party. The dismay, the disappointment, the rage, were indescribable. Many had been led-some of the princes of Italy among the number-to compromise themselves in a way they would not have done had they not supposed that the pontiff was at the head of the liberal movement.

This terrible announcement was made, too, when already the papal troops had passed the frontier of the States of the Church and joined the forces marching against the Austrians; so that these betrayed men were left to be treated by the Austrian soldiery as mere rebels and brigands. The king of Sardinia and the grand duke of Tuscany were equally placed in a most painful predicament by this sudden tergiversation of Pius IX. They acted, as is well known, differently in the difficulty. The king did not turn back from the plough to which he had put his hand. The weak grand duke made haste to follow the lead of the pontiff, and cast in his lot with him and with the Austrians. Such vacillation could not be other than destructive. When the hurricanes which swept over the political fabric of Europe reached the Italian shores, Rome's prince was the first to feel its severest touch. In France the citizen king was forced to exile; in Rome the citizen-pope suffered a like fate, and with this hegira from the Quirinal to Gaeta terminates Pio Nono's comedy of liberalism. The story of Pio Nono's extraordinary hegira we cannot detail. Suffice it to say that Pio Nono's exit from Rome was made with the aid of the Bavarian minister, and at Gaeta he was received with great honor by the king of Naples, who persuaded the pope to abandon his original intention of going to the Balearic Islands. He now enjoyed the sympathy of the reactionists all over the world who had looked so coldly upon his early efforts at reform, but gained, of course, the execrations of the liberals, whose cause he had abandoned. Rome, left without a ruler bloomed into a republic.

The pope protested against all its acts, and summoned the Catholic world to put it down. It was France which, having disgraced herself by the election of a Bonaparte as president, was condemned to finish her story of crime and humiliation by throttling the Roman republic and restoring the temporal authority of the papacy. French troops landed at Civita Vecchia on the  25th of April 1849, and besieged the capital, while the Austrians entered Italy from the north and the Spaniards from the south. The capital surrendered on the 1st of July; and pending the return of the pope-which did not take place until next year-the government was carried on by a papal commission, a council of state, a council of finances, and provincial councils. The pope returned in April 1850, surrounded by the bayonets of a French army, “to a capital torn and ravaged by bombardment, and drenched in the blood of his own subjects, slain for the crime of taking up and carrying on the government which he had abdicated.” His first act was the perfidy of destroying the constitution of chartered rights which he had guaranteed to his subjects. His second act was the granting of a mock amnesty, the exceptions to which were so framed as to put well-nigh the whole population under ban. The glutted prisons, which it had been his delight to empty at his first accession, filled up again as before. The Inquisition recommenced its sacred labors. Five hundred citizens were shot or decapitated and thirty thousand proscribed. Tribunals were established which condemned without trial, and without even open accusation. Speech was gagged, the press was muzzled, the Bible was prohibited. The stirring of resistance provoked by excess of tyranny, was seized as the pretext of wanton barbarity; and the kindhearted philanthropist of 1846 became an avenger at Perugia in 1859 a sad and black story, on which it is rather the province of the secular historian to dwell. In 1868, the Austrians broke the concordat and declared their spiritual emancipation.

The year after, queen Isabella was driven out of Spain, and the government of the people refused to be bound by any previous treaties with the papacy. In 1870, finally, the war with Prussia destroyed the empire in France, and with the fall of Napoleon not only the French refused to be bound to Rome, but the gates of the Eternal City opened to all Italy. Previous to the entry of the Italian troops, Victor Emmanuel wrote to Pio Nono a most dutiful and submissive letter, offering terms of establishment in Rome which would guarantee his entire spiritual freedom and authority, to which his holiness made characteristic reply-the most extraordinary defiance ever uttered in such extremity. Though the king might after this have taken matters in his own hand, he yet accepted an obedient relation to the Church, and caused Parliament to guarantee the liberty of the Church and the independence of the sovereign pontiff on May 13, 1871. Notwithstanding all efforts of Victor Emmanuel for peace, the pope sternly persisted in his firm protest against the inevitable change of things. He steadily refused to receive the Sardinian princes, or to enter into any arrangement with them. He yielded  merely to force, and evidently enjoyed his martyrdom much more than Emmanuel did his victory. For the first year after his dethronement, the pope talked of various changes of residence of Malta, of Avignon, and even of St. Louis. But this was probably never serious. His great age prevented any such adventure, if there were no other reasons against it. He lived retired in the Vatican, and called himself a prisoner. On the 3rd of June 1877, the Romish Church celebrated the fiftieth anniversary of his episcopate, and on Feb. 7, 1878, he died, after a protracted dropsical illness.

Pio Nono's name will always be prominent among Roman pontiffs. His long reign proved a contradiction of the traditional words uttered at his coronation—Non videbis annos Petri. Besides, his interest in archaeological pursuits, and the care he took in aiding in the preservation of the various monuments of Rome and in the embellishing of her churches, will hand his name down to remote generations. On the Forum, on the Coliseum, on fountains and in basilicas, the name of Pius IX is carved on large marble slabs, recording the part he has taken in preserving old structures from decay or in building new ones. In the tribune of the grand basilica of Sao Paolo-fuori-le-mura there is a memorial of one of the proudest moments of Pio Nono's life. An expensive and elegant memorial is that placed in 1871 over the well-known bronze statue of St. Peter. Those who desire to study its details are referred to the pages of the Civilta Cattolica.

In 1847 he began the reform of the great religious bodies.; On June 17 he appointed a commission to inquire into the laxity of discipline in religious communities, and in the issue he so modified the constitutions of several as to make the period of probation more protracted, and to raise among all the standard of discipline and intellectual training. The missions of the Church were also strengthened, being carried forward in partibus infidelinum, and great hierarchies, in lands formerly heathen or Protestant, were added to the vast clergy that owned “the Latin obedience.” Thus he provided by brief of 1850 for the ecclesiastical government of England, dividing that country into one metropolitan and twelve episcopal sees; and this was followed by a pastoral letter of cardinal Wiseman, on his appointment as archbishop of Westminster, exulting in the supposed triumph of his Church in the land which had been the home of the Reformation for three centuries. Then he created in this country a vast Roman Catholic hierarchy by elevating to the cardinalate the archbishop of  New York in 1875, and prepared the way for the re-establishment of the hierarchy in Scotland, which was effected in 1878. Finally, in 1854, without advice of a council, he ventured the utterance of a new dogma -the immaculate conception (q.v.) of the Virgin Mary -and the audacious promulgation, in 1864, of the bull Quanta Cura, which, with its accompanying “Syllabus” of damnable errors, was simply an attack on free governments and civilization itself, and rivalled the spirit and times of Hildebrand, the ecclesiastical absolutism of the 11th century. The consecration of these acts in the Vatican Council of 1870 by the decree of Infallibility (q.v.) was the logical completion of the Romish system and of the pontificate of Pius IX. The disturbances which have grown out of these steps are detailed in SEE OLD CATHOLICISM, etc. One of the foulest blots on the pages of history regarding his reign is the forcible conversion of the Jew boy Mortara, and of a piece with this is the abject condition of the Hebrews at Rome, where the walls of the Ghetto were only removed with the establishment of the Italian power. The private life of the pope was marked by great simplicity of habits.

See Balleydier, Histoire de la Revol. de Rome (Lyons, 1851, 2 vols. 8vo); Maguire, Rome, its Ruler and is Institutions (Lond. 1859); Saint-Alvin, Pie IX (Paris, 1860): Pius IX: the Story of his Life (Lond. 1875, 2 vols. 8vo); Trollope, Pope Pius IX (ibid. 1877, 2 vols. 8vo); Legge, Growth of the Temporal Power of the Papacy (ibid. 1870); also, Life of Pius IX (ibid. 1875, 8vo); Hitchmatan, Biog. of Pius IX (ibid. 1878, 12mo); New York Tribune, Feb. 8, 1878; Christian Union, vol. 17, No. 7; Christian Advocate, Feb. 1878; Thompson, The Papacy and the Civil Power (N. Y. 1877, 12mo); Princeton Review, March, 1878.

## Pius Societies[[@Headword:Pius Societies]]

             The stormy years of 1848 and 1849 brought great hopes and great dangers to the Roman Catholic Church of Germany, especially the hope of entire emancipation from the State, and the danger of enslavement to the despotism of a liberalism hostile to the Church. But its representatives knew how to steer skillfully between the Scylla and Charybdis. In November 1848, the German bishops of the Romish body assembled at Wilrzburg, to consult together concerning the best means to proceed in this critical period. Unvarying faithfulness to the papacy was the first point settled; voluntary co-operation with the “political regeneration” of the fatherland, the second; thankful acceptance of the promise of unconditional  freedom of conscience (in the fundamental rights of the Frankfort Parliament), in order to accomplish the most complete independence of the Church and absolute control of national education, from the elementary to the high schools, the third. Shortly before this, however, an organization of far-reaching significance had been effected, in which also-and prominently the laity were to co-operate, viz., the Pius Society, a Roman Catholic counterpart of the Protestant Church Dict (q.v.). Soon after the revolutionary struggles of March, unions were formed at several places in Germany having for their object the protection and advancement of Roman Catholic interests. At the anniversary of the building of the cathedral at Cologne, in August, 1848, the members of several of these unions met together and resolved upon a general convocation, in October, 1848, at Mayence, where the first union of this kind was formed, under the name of Pius Society. Here all the single unions were formed into a great collective union under the name of” Catholic Union of Germany;” although in practice the shorter name of Pius Society has been preferred. To direct the business of the collective union, one of the single unions was to be chosen every time from the annual general convention, which was called “Vorort.” The object of the union was “the obtaining and maintenance of the freedom of the Church and control of the same over the schools; national culture in the Roman Catholic spirit and practice of Christian mercy; as fundamental law, obedience to the pope and to the episcopate; pacific posture towards the State and towards every existing form of government, so far as the rights of the Church were not thereby prejudiced; and defensive, not aggressive, posture towards the non-Catholic confessions.

The Virgin Mary was chosen as patroness of the union, and every member bound himself to repeat a daily Paternoster and Ave Maria to further the objects of the union.” The first general assembly, which was held at Mayence in 1848, was represented by eighty-three different societies; and a letter received from the pope (Feb., 1849), in which he gave his approbation and blessing to this union, only strengthened the movement, and gave not only authority, but also the name. A second assembly was held at Breslaul, where the papal letter was received, and where the assembly openly expressed it that “a united Germany was only possible with a Catholic Christianity.” Here a new society was also organized, the Vincentius Society, for missionary work at home. The third general assembly was held at Regensburg (October, 1849). Here, besides the organization of the Botnaicius Society, a paper was started, Katholischer Vereinsbote fur das dettsche Reich, in the interest of all societies organized in the spirit of the  Pius societies. Every year new societies of like tendency and spirit were organized, till in the year 1851 the number was so great that the original Pius societies, with the now-existing branch associations, were finally amalgamated into one, as all were only serving one purpose-the advancement of ultramontanism in Germany. Yet, in spite of all these efforts, the seventh general assembly, held at Vienna (Sept., 1853), was forced to acknowledge that it had not succeeded in attracting the masses, for only the same faces were present. The meeting at Cologne in 1854 became discordant, because the committee refused to give the Prussian government a guarantee of abstinence from political utterances and confessional polemics. The ninth general assembly, held at Salzburg in 1857, was a living “testimonium paupertatis,” which the Roman Catholic world exhibited to the union. Little was felt here of important men, deeds, and speeches. The cathedral capitular Himioben of Mayence, the “real miles gloriosus of the meeting.” uttered hectoring fanfaronades about the glorious victories of Roman Catholicism in Germany, and expressed the confident hope, in regard to the forty new Protestant churches built by the Gustavus Adolphus Union, that these would shortly again be cast out into the garden of rejected stones. “Harlequinades also were not wanting. Prof. Kreuzer, of Cologne, e.g., comforted those present in regard to the charge of ultramontanism with the proverb, ‘There stands the ox at the mountain;' from which it follows incontestably that the oxen are the real Cismontanes, because they are not able to pass over the mountain; and as regards the papacy, it is evident that Christ himself, who called upon his Father-on the cross, was a papist; indeed, every man is a born papist because the child lisps ‘papa' already in the cradle; and other such comical things.” As a change, it was also greatly lamented that two hundred and seven large and twelve hundred and thirty-four small journals were in the service of the Protestants of Germany, while, on the other hand, the Roman Catholics had only six large and eighty-one small ones.

The tenth general assembly was held at Cologne (September, 1858). All agreed that the results hitherto achieved were satisfactory. In general, the deportment of this conference was more dignified, the contents of its speeches more important, than those of the former years. “Still the jester Himioben was not wanting this time also. He exhorted the women to form Parament unions, and informed them that the first union of this kind was formed in the year 33 after Christ, in consequence of the first secularization, when the soldiers cast lots for the garment of the Savior,  which he had worn the evening previous as a chasuble at the first celebration of the mass. Indeed, we can even go farther back than this: Mary, who made swaddling bands for the child Jesus, was the proper originator of the union. After being edified with such trifles, but also hearing many important truths, especially concerning the study of history and the musical culture of the young, the meeting was closed by consecrating the pillar of Mary built at Cologne in honor of the immaculate conception.” The eleventh annual conference, which was held at Freiburg in 1859, expressed the hope that soon all Germany will be brought back within the pale of the Roman Catholic Church; while the twelfth, held at Prague in 1860, lamented over the wounds which were inflicted upon the papacy in that same year. The thirteenth general meeting, held at Munich in 1861, extolled the virtues of the Holy Father, and declared the robbing of the pope's territory to be a robbery of God. The seventeenth, which was held at Treves in 1865, praised the encyclica published in 1864 in the bull “Quanta cira” as the greatest deed of the 19th century; pronounced John Goerres (q.v.) as the greatest German, and the holy coat at Treves as the symbol of Catholic unity. In this tenor it went on. “Half childish, half spleenish remained the rest of the meetings, until the day at Breslau, in 1872, when humor gave place to rage, naiveté to fanaticism, and the ostensible peace policy to the ringing of the alarm-bell” (Kurtz).

The most prominent societies in connection with the original Pius societies are the Bonifacius unions for the support of needy Roman Catholic congregations in Protestant Germany (an imitation of the Gustavus Adolphus Union); the Charles Borromeo unions, to spread good Roman Catholic writings; the Vincentius and Elizabeth unions, for visiting the sick and taking care of the poor; the Journeymen unions (founded by Kolping, of Elberfeld, in 1846), for the spiritual and temporal sustenance of journeymen; the unions of The Holy Childhood of Jesus, composed chiefly of children, who contribute monthly five pennies for the salvation of exposed heathen children (especially in China), and daily pray an Ave Maria for them. These are the most prominent organizations in the service of the hierarchy, and are found all over the world. In the United States there is hardly a large town in which one or the other of these societies is not to be found. The tendency is the same, although the name may be different. The purpose of these organizations in the United States is to bring the state as much as possible under the influence and control of the hierarchy, and the political arena is the field of labor. Already they  influence the legislatures, school boards; yea, we may say they form a state within the state. The clergy commands a great ignorant mass, easily fanaticized, and ready to do anything “in majorem Dei gloriam et honorom papas infallibilis.” The doctrines of the Vatican are promulgated through numerous papers, and the utterances made at the annual gatherings of the different organizations are the best proof of the spirit which animates these societies. See Herzog, Real-Encyklop, s.v. Piusvereine; Theolog. Universal-Lexikon, s.v.; Wetzer u. Welte, Kirchen-Lexikon, s.v.; more especially Kurtz, Lehrbuch der Kirchengesch. (Mitau, 1874), 2, 332 sq. SEE ULTRAMONTANISM (in its conflict with Germany). (B. P.)

## Pius V[[@Headword:Pius V]]

             pope of Rome, succeeded Pius IV in 1566. His family name was Michele Ghisleri; he was born of low descent, Jan. 17, 1504, at Bosco, not far from Alessandria, in Piedmont, Italy. Early in life he entered the Dominican order, and devoted himself soul and body to the monkish piety which his order demanded. He sided with the strict party professing the old opinions, and especially distinguished himself by his zeal in support of the Inquisition, of which tribunal he, as pope, became one of the leading members. As the tendency to which he attached himself triumphed, he rose with the ascendency which it gained. Pope Paul IV spoke of friar Michele as “an eminent servant of God, and much to be honored.” He made him bishop of Nepi, and in 1557 cardinal. In this new dignity Ghisleri continued as before, severe in his manner of life, poor and unpretending. He devoted himself to his religious exercises and to the Inquisition. He was austere in his morals, and wished to enforce a strict discipline among the clergy, and especially the monks and nuns, more than fifty thousand of whom are said to have been at that time living and strolling about Italy out of their respective convents, regardless of any of the obligations enjoined by their order (Botta, Storia d' Italia, bk. 12). There was also a monastic order in Lombardy called the “Umiliati,” possessed of considerable wealth, the heads of which led openly a most dissolute life, and even kept bravoes or hired assassins to execute their mandates. Charles Borromeo, archbishop of Milan, who endeavored to check these atrocities, was shot at by one of the monks while at prayers in his oratory. The ball, however, only grazed the skin: the assassin was taken, and revealed his employers, and several preposti or superiors of convents of the Umiliati, were executed. Pius V,  having examined the whole affair, suppressed the order, and gave their property to the Jesuits and other orders. He also enforced the authority of the Inquisition over all Italy. There were at that time in several towns, especially in Tuscany, some scholars and other men of learning who advocated the doctrines of the Reformation. Some ladies, also, of high rank, who enjoyed a reputation for learning, such as Vittoria Colonna, Giulia Gonzaga, and Margaret, the wife of Emmanuel Philibert, duke of Savoy, were suspected of a similar bias. Pius demanded of Cosmo, duke of Florence, the person of Carnesecchi, a Florentine nobleman who made a public profession of opinions considered as heretical; being given up to the Inquisition, he was put to death at Rome.

The same happened to Paleario, Bartocci, and Giuiio Zanetti; the last, who was at Padua, being given up to the pope by the Venetian senate, on the plea that he was a native of Fano, and a subject of the Papal States. Numerous informers were kept by the Inquisition in every town of Italy; and such was the terror produced by these severities that the University of Pisa was almost deserted both by teachers and students. The pope also enforced the strict observance of the index of forbidden books, and enacted severe penalties against those who printed or introduced or kept such books. The printing presses of Italy, those of Giunti of Florence, and others, declined greatly in consequence, and many printers emigrated to Switzerland or Germany. Pius V likewise enforced the canons against those priests who kept concubines; but instead of leaving to the civil magistrates the repression of this abuse, he insisted upon the bishops acting both as magistrates and judges, attached armed men to their episcopal courts, and provided prisons for the punishment of offenders. Thus frequent collisions were occasioned between the secular and the ecclesiastical authorities, especially at Naples and Milan. Similar disputes took place also concerning the ecclesiastical inspectors and collectors sent by the pope to visit and demand accounts of all Church property throughout Italy. Pius proceeded on the principle asserted in the false decretals that the pope has the disposal of all the clerical benefices throughout the world. Hence he was also led to reintroduce the famous bull called “In coena Domini,” which excommunicates all princes, magistrates, and other men in authority who in any way favor heresy, or who attempt to circumscribe the ecclesiastical jurisdiction, spiritual and temporal, or to touch the property or revenues of the Church; and all those who appeal from the decision of the pope to the general council, as well as those who say that the pope is subject to the council. He ordered this bull, so ultramontane in spirit and tendency, to be read every Thursday before  Easter in every parish church throughout the Christian world. France, Spain, and the emperor of Germany strenuously resisted the publication of this bull. In Italy the senate of Venice likewise forbade its publication. At Naples and Milan the Spanish governors did the same, but the bishops and monks refused absolution to those who in any way opposed the bull. After much altercation and some mischief, the civil power attained its object, and the bull was set aside. In Tuscany the bull was allowed to be published, but rather as a matter of form than as a measure upon which judicial proceedings could be grounded. The monks and some of the parochial clergy, however, pretended by virtue of the bull to be exempt from all taxes, and refused the sacrament to the collectors and other revenue officers and their families. The duke of Florence, Cosmoo de Medici, threatened to put the monks in prison and prosecute them.

The Tuscan bishops tried to conciliate matters, and to repress the arrogance of the clergy, but the disturbances continued till the death of Pius V. To conciliate the Tuscan house, Pius created Cosmo de Medici, duke of Florence, by a bull dated Aug., 1569, grand-duke, and his successors heirs to the title, and sent with the bull the model of a crown ornamented with a red lily, the former ensign of the Florentine republic. In the struggle with the Saracens, Pius was a great promoter of the Christian league; and after the glorious victory of Lepanto, won by the Christian combined fleet against the Turks in Sept., 1571, Pius caused Marc Antonio Colonna, commander of the papal galleys, who had distinguished himself in the battle, to make his triumphal entry into Rome on horseback, preceded by the Turkish captives and spoils, and accompanied by the magistrates, noblemen, and heads of trades of the city of Rome. Pius died in May 1572, and was succeeded by Gregory XIII (q.v.). Pius V was canonized by pope Clement XI in 1713.

Though a truly pious man, seeking only the good of the Church, he yet failed, because extremely obstinate in maintaining his opinions. There was no getting him to retract even for the strongest reasons. He was opinionated; and whatever estimate he made he was sure to adhere to inflexibly. Unfortunately he suspected most men, and was not, therefore, very charitable towards any who incurred his displeasure. Besides, he was often disappointed; for a character so stern was sure to make demands no one could meet, and hence he frequently alienated men, until his popedom proved nothing but an annoyance to its ruler, and he was led to declare that it was not propitious to his piety; that it contributed nothing to the salvation of his soul, or to his obtaining the glory of paradise (Ranke, 1, 262). His religion was certainly of a strange composition. He was so  exclusive and bigoted as to cherish a bitter hatred against all Christians who differed from him in matters of faith; and while he strove with indefatigable zeal to root our every vestige of dissenting agitation that yet survived in Roman Catholic countries, he persecuted with a still more savage, inveteracy Protestants, whether such as had become free or those still struggling to be so. Thus he gave the papal troops who fought against the Huguenots the injunction “to take no prisoners, but to put all to death,” and signified his approbation of Alva's sanguinary proceedings by sending him a consecrated hat and sword. Queen Elizabeth of England he put under ban, and Maximilian II he threatened with excommunication if he should grant toleration (religious) to the Protestants. Surely this was a medley of simplicity, nobleness, personal strictness, devoted religiousness, and morose exclusiveness, of bitter hate and bloody persecution. See Walch, Entwurfeiner vollst. Geschichtk der rom. Papste, p. 392 sq.; Catena, Vita del gloriosissimo papa Pio V; Ranke, Papacy, 1, 259-277; Agatio di Somma, Vida de Pio Quinto; Furillet, Vie du Pape Pie V (1674); Falloux, Hist. de Saint Pie V (1844, 2 vols.); Mendham, Life and Pontificate of Saint Pius V (Lond. 1832, 1844); Bower, Hist. of the Popes (see Index); Soames, Elizabethean Hist. (see Index); Collier, Eccles. Hist. (see Index); Fisher, Hist. of the Reformation, p. 302, 411.

## Pius VI[[@Headword:Pius VI]]

             pope of Rome, whose original name was Giovanni Angelo di Braschi, descended from a noble family, and was born at Cesela, Italy, Dec. 27, 1717. He made his reputation very early in life, and was elevated to important ecclesiastical dignities at an unusually early period. In 1766 he was made keeper of the papal exchequer, and in 1773 was honored with the cardinal's hat. In 1775, upon the death of pope Clement XIV, better known as Ganganelli, cardinal Braschi, who had then the reputation of being of a generous disposition, fond of learning and the arts, and had besides the advantages of a handsome person, a graceful demeanor, and easy and affable manners, was chosen successor to the vacant pontifical chair. In his previous office of treasurer he had managed the financial affairs of the country with prudence and disinterestedness. In the first five years of his pontificate he occupied himself largely with public improvements, and displayed the same care and independence. But in his political career pope Pius VI was rather unfortunate. Even at his elevation, feeling that he had not the qualifications of a politician, he predicted himself, to the conclave, an unhappy termination of his reign. Conciliatory  in spirit, and determined upon the preservation of unity in the Church, he would frequently make concessions where stern opposition was more in place; then again he would hesitate, often where prompt measures alone would suffice.

Thus in 1777 a serious dispute arose with Leopold I, grand- duke of Tuscany, and Ricci (q.v.), bishop of Pistoja, on the subject of some grave moral offences which had been discovered in several convents. The bishops, to be sure, had taken the liberty to act without papal consent, but the case warranted prompt proceedings, and these were not anticipated from Pius VI. Jealous of his authority in Church affairs, he endeavored to interfere, but without success, and saw himself at last passed by in the Council of Pistoja (q.v.), and when the question of jurisdiction was finally settled in a more satisfactory manner, it yet left a coldness between the courts of Rome and Tuscany. A more important disagreement took place in 1780 with emperor Joseph II. Leopold's brother, who, having control of the reins of power under the emperor's queen, Maria Theresa, was bent on separating the Church from all papal jurisdiction. His first step was to suppress superfluous convents without papal consent, and to emancipate the clergy of his dominions from all papal interference in matters of discipline. It was the same question previously raised in Tuscany by Leopold. Joseph even went further, and took upon himself the nomination of bishops-even of those in Italy, and the pope readily saw in these proposed reforms nothing short of a design to weaken the influence of the see of Rome. Pius VI, not willing to leave unemployed any conciliatory offices at his command, believed that his duty lay in a visit to the emperor, and accordingly he set out for Vienna in 1782, to settle matters by personal arrangement. The step was in itself a novelty. For several centuries no pontiff had ever left Italy. Monti wrote a poem on the remarkable event, entitled 11 Pellegrino Apostolico. At Vienna the pope was received with every honor; yet Pius failed to make any impression on the emperor, and the matter in discussion was referred to a ministry unfavorable to papal claims. It was the same struggle as that of France,' Gallicanism against Ultramontanism, only this time the pope was himself inclined to be the peace-maker between the contending factions in the Church. Pius VI failed utterly in his mission, and returned to Rome disappointed ant dejected, to be reproached for his good intentions, with having lowered the dignity of his office, and encouraged the Gallican tendencies in the Church at large. The troubles doubled upon the outbreak of the French Revolution, and rendered the remaining years of his pontificate gloomy and calamitous. In the early period of that fearful struggle Pius VI had solemnly condemned  the abrupt changes made in France concerning the discipline and the property of the clergy, though in all secular matters he had wisely abstained from interference of any sort.

But in January 1793, a complication arose of a most serious nature. A young man, Hugo Basseville, an agent of the French republican party, while on his way to Naples, where he was to be secretary of embassy, stopped in the Eternal City, and made a foolish demonstration in the Corso, apparently to sound the opinions of the people. He appeared in a carriage with several tricolored flags, and distributed revolutionary tracts, vociferating something about liberty and against tyrants; but a mob collected; he was dragged out of his carriage, and mortally stabbed in several places by the populace. The military arrived too late, and though some of the murderers were arrested and tried, the French government charged the papal authorities with having been a party to the crime. The result was that the breach widened, and that finally the pope joined the league of the sovereigns against France. In 1796, when Bonaparte invaded Northern Italy, he took possession of the legations, but at the same time offered to the pope conditions of peace. These, however, it was impossible for Pius to accept, and the papal troops were marched against the French. The defeat of the papacy followed, and after the possession of Ancona and Loreto, peace was established at Campo Formio in October 1797. The condition's of peace were very onerous, and added vexation to vexation against the unfortunate pope, who, old and infirm, was unequal to the difficulties which crowded upon him. Heavy contributions were imposed by the French Directory, and Ferrara, Romagna, and the Bolognese were incorporated with the newly founded Cisalpine republic; the price of peace, in fine, was the revocation of the papal edicts launched against the. Jansenists, and the acknowledgment of the civil constitution of the French clergy. To make bad matters worse, some disorders in Rome between the French and Italians, in the course of which the French general Duphot was shot, gave a pretext to the French Directory for the expedition of Berthier, who arrived in Rome on February 10, and occupied the Vatican. Pius VI, forsaken by most of the cardinals, who had escaped, remained in the Vatican. On the 15th a tree of liberty was raised in the Campo Vaccino, and Rome was formally declared a republic. Berthier afterwards sent an officer to intimate to the pope that he must renounce his temporal sovereignty. Pius answered that he had received it from God and by the free election of men, and could not renounce it; that he was eighty years old, and his troubles could not be of long duration, but that he was determined to do nothing derogatory to his  high office. Next came the commissary-general of the French army, who, after taking an inventory of all the valuables that still remained in the papal residence, ordered Pius to prepare to set out in two days. The pope said he could not oppose force, but protested against this new act of violence.

On Feb. 20 Pius VI left the Vatican with a few attendants, and, escorted by a strong detachment of cavalry, took the road to Florence. He was lodged at first in a convent near Siena, and afterwards in the Carthusian convent near Florence, where he remained till the following year, when the French, having driven out of Tuscany the grand-duke Ferdinand, and being threatened by the Austro-Russians who were advancing to the Adige, ordered the pope to be transferred to France. He was taken to Grenoble, and afterwards to Valence, on the Rhone, where he died in August of that year (1799). Just before his death the Roman republic had ceased to exist, the French being driven out of Italy by the Austro-Russians, and Rome was occupied by Austrian and Neapolitan troops. In the year 1802, after the restoration of the papal government, the remains of Pius VI were transferred to Rome by leave of the first consul Bonaparte, at the request of his successor, Pius VII, and deposited with solemn pomp in the church of St. Peter. The bulls published by Pius VI are in Bullar. Romlan. contin. summimor. Pontif: Clementis 13 Clem. 14, Pii VI constitutiones, etc., quas Coll. Btarbieri, opp. et stud. R. Segredi (Rom. 1835, f. t. 7-10); cent. constit. Pii VI. Pius VI greatly enlarged the museum of the Vatican, which he made one of the richest in Europe in works of sculpture, vases, precious marbles, and other remains of antiquity; and he caused a splendid set of engravings of the objects in this museum to be published, under the title of Museo Pio Clementino. He made additions to the church of St. Peter, and embellished Rome with new palaces, fountains, and other structures. His internal administration was liberal and mild, an unusual freedom of opinion and speech prevailed at Rome, and a number of learned men gathered thither from other parts of Italy. Many foreigners came to settle in that capital, the fine arts were encouraged by the pope and several of the cardinals, and modern Rome was reviving the brilliant period of Leo X when the struggle with the French Directory darkened the scene. See, besides the memoirs by Becattine (Venice, 1801,4 vols.); Tavanti (Flor. 1804, 3 vols. 4to); Gesch. des Papstes Pius VI (Vienna, 1799); Bourgoing's Memoires de Pie VI (Par. 1799); Ferrari, Vita Pii VI (Patav. 1802); Novaes, Sommi Pontifici, vol. 16. 17; Artaud, Hist. des souv. Pontif: Rom. (Par. 1849), vol. 8; Wolff, Gesch. der kathol. Kirche unter Pius VI (Zurich, 1797-1802, 7 vols. 8vo).

## Pius VII[[@Headword:Pius VII]]

             pope from 1800 to 1823, was successor of the preceding. He was originally called Gregorio Bernabat Chiarumonti, being also of noble descent, and was born in 1742 at Cesena. He first studied in the college of Ravenna, and subsequently entered the Order of Benedictines in 1758. He was appointed lecturer on philosophy, and afterwards on theology, to the novices of his order, first at Parma and then at Rome. Pius VI appointed him bishop of Tivoli and in 1785 made him a cardinal and bishop of Imola. When Bonaparte took possession of the legations, and annexed them to the Cisalpine republic, cardinal Chiaramonti in a homily exhorted his flock to submit to the new institutions, and to be faithful to the state of which they had become a part. This conduct is said to have gained the approval of Bonaparte. When the news of the death of Pius VI, in his exile at Valence, in August 1799, came to Italy, the conclave was summoned to assemble at Venice, then under the dominion of Austria, as Rome was in a state of anarchy. Thirty-five cardinals accordingly assembled in the Benedictine convent of St. Giorgio Maggiore, in order to elect one of their number to the papal office, a dignity apparently not very enviable in those troubled times.

The deliberations of the conclave lasted several months, and at last, on March 14, 1800, cardinal Chiaramoiti was chosen, and crowned pope on the 21st of the same month, under the name of Pius VII. In the following July the pope made his entrance into Rome, and soon after appointed cardinal Consalvi his secretary of state, or prime minister. In the following year the peace of Luneville, between France and Austria, was made, and Bonaparte, first consul of France, ordered his troops to evacuate the papal territories, with the exception of the legations, which had been formally incorporated with the so called “Italian Republic.” Meantime the ecclesiastical affairs of France were in a state of the greatest confusion. France was still nominally Roman Catholic, but the clergy were no longer in communication with the see of Rome, and were divided into parties. In the midst of this confusion about one half of the population of France followed no mode of worship, and professed no religion whatever. A vast number of parish churches were shut tip, and had been so for ten years. Bonaparte saw clearly that a nation could not subsist without a religion, and that the genius of the French demanded it rather as an institution than an internal life. He therefore resolved upon a concordat with Rome. The pope appointed the prelate Spina and the theologian Caselli, who proceeded to Paris, and Bonaparte named his brother Joseph,  Cretet, councilor of state, and Bernier, a Vendean priest, to treat with the pope's negotiators. But on an intimation from Bonaparte, who was above all things anxious that the matter should be promptly settled, the pope despatched to Paris cardinal Consalvi, who smoothed down all difficulties, and the concordat was signed at Paris, July 15, 1801, and was ratified by Pius at Rome, after some hesitation and consultation, on August 14th following. The principal scruples of the pope were concerning certain articles called “organic,” which Bonaparte appended to the concordat, as if they had formed part of it, and which were proclaimed as laws of the state. Henceforth Romanism was the establishment of France; but, on the other hand, pope Pius VII was bound to recognize the independence of the French Church. SEE FRANCE.

From 1801 till 1804 Pius VII enjoyed tranquility at Rome, which he employed in restoring order to the finances, in ameliorating the judicial administration, in promoting the agriculture of the Campagna, and in other similar cares. His personal establishment was moderate, his table frugal, his habits simple, and his conduct exemplary. In May 1804, Napoleon was proclaimed emperor, and some time after he wrote to the pope requesting him to crown him solemnly at Paris. After considerable hesitation Pius consented, and set out from Rome at the beginning of November of that year. The ceremony of the coronation took place in the cathedral of Notre Dame, after which the pope spent several months in Paris, visiting the public establishments, and receiving the homage of men of all parties, who were won by his unassuming yet dignified behavior and his unaffected piety. In May 1805, he returned to Rome; and his troubles began soon after. In October 1805, a body of French troops suddenly took military possession of Ancona. Pius remonstrated in a letter which he wrote to Napoleon, who was at that time at the head of his army in Austria. It was only after the peace of Pressburg that he received an answer, in which Napoleon said that he considered himself as the protector of the Church against heretics and schismatics, like his predecessors from the time of Charlemagne, and that as such he had occupied Ancona to prevent it from falling into the hands of the English or the Russians.

Soon after Napoleon officially required the pope, through his ambassador at Rome, to expel from his dominions all English, Russian, Swedish, and Sardinian subjects, and to close his ports to the vessels of those powers who were then at war with France. Pius replied at length in a letter to Napoleon, representing to him that his request was destructive of the independence of the Papal State,  and of its political neutrality, which were necessary to the welfare of the Church, and for the security of the numerous members of it who were living in those very countries with which the emperor was then at war. He said that the head of the Church ought to be a minister of peace, and not to take part in a war which has not religion for its object; that if some of his predecessors had not always abided by this rule, he at least should not follow their example. Napoleon, however, insisted, and an angry correspondence was carried on between the two courts for about two years on this subject of contention, the neutrality of the Papal States being all the while merely nominal, as the French troops marching from and to Naples crossed and re-crossed it at their pleasure, and the French also kept a garrison at Ancona, the only papal port of any importance. By degrees they extended their posts all along the Adriatic coast, and garrisoned the various ports. Some time after a body of French troops, coming from Naples, passed through Rome, ostensibly to proceed to Leghorn; but they suddenly turned out of the main road and surprised in the night the town of Civita Vecchia, of which they took military possession. In all these places they confiscated whatever English property they could find. The papal troops at Ancona, Civita Vecchia, and other places were ordered to place themselves under the direction of the French commanders, and some officers who refused to do so were arrested and kept in confinement.

Napoleon in the mean time found fresh grounds of quarrel with the pope lie wished to declare the marriage of his brother Jerome with an American Protestant lady null; but Pius refused, saying that although the Church abhorred marriages between Catholics and heretics, yet if they were contracted in Protestant countries according to the laws of those countries they were binding and indissoluble. [Letter of Pius VII on this important subject in Artaud, Vie du Pape Pie VII (Paris, 1826).] He next accused the pope of dilatoriness in giving the canonical institution to the bishops elected to vacant sees in the kingdom of Italy. Eugene Beauharnais, viceroy of the kingdom of Italy, wrote an able and conciliatory letter to the pope, in order to bring about an arrangement; and the pope was induced to invite the bishops elect to Rome in order to receive the canonical institution, when a threatening letter came, written by Napoleon from Dresden after the peace of Tilsit in the summer of 1807, in which he said that “the pope must not take him for a Louis le Debonnaire; that his anathemas would never make his soldiers drop their muskets; that he, Napoleon, if provoked too far, could separate the greater part of Europe from the Roman Church, and establish a more rational form of worship than that of which the pope was  the head; that such a thing was easy in the actual state of people's minds,” etc.; and he forbade Eugene to correspond any longer with the pope, or send the bishops elect to Rome, for, he said, “they would only imbibe there principles of sedition against their sovereign.”

Matters were now brought to an open rupture. A French force under general Miollis entered Rome in February 1808, and took possession of the castle and the gates, leaving however the civil authorities undisturbed. The pope was prevailed upon to send cardinal de Bayanne as his legate to Paris, to make a last effort at reconciliation; but the cardinal had not arrived at his destination when a decree of Napoleon, dated April 2, 1808, united the provinces of Ancona, Macerata, Fermo, and Urbino to the kingdom of Italy. Fresh remonstrances on the part of Pius were answered by threats of further hostile measures on the part of Napoleon, unless the pope entered into an offensive and defensive league with the kingdoms of Naples and Italy, and by a declaration that “the pope would lose his temporal sovereignty and remain bishop of Rome as his predecessors were during the first eight centuries, and under the reign of Charlemagne” (Note de M. de Champagny, Ministre des Affaires Etrangeres a son Eminence le Cardinal Capara, April 18, 1808). The war which began soon after Spain prevented Napoleon from occupying himself with the affairs of Rome, which remained in a state of uncertainty amid frequent clashing between the French military authorities and the papal civil officers. The papal territory, impoverished as it was by the loss of its finest provinces, was obliged to pay the French troops which garrisoned the towns that still nominally belonged to the pope. All the disaffected and the turbulent, trusting to French protection, openly insulted the papal government. The pope remained confined to his palace on the Quirinal, with his Swiss guard at the gates, not wishing to expose himself to violence by venturing out. On May 17, 1809, Napoleon, who was then making war against Austria, issued a decree from Vienna, in which he resumed the grant of his illustrious predecessor Charlemagne, and united the remainder of the Roman states to the French empire, leaving to the pope his palaces and an income of two millions of francs. On June 10, 1809, the pope issued a bull of excommunication against all the perpetrators and abettors of the invasion of Rome and of the territories of the Holy See. The bull was affixed to the gates of the principal churches of Rome and in other public places. The text of the bull is given by cardinal Pacca, in his Memodie Storiche, Appendix to pt. 1, No. 5.

The French commander, Miollis, being  afraid of an insurrection of the people of Rome, who had shown unequivocal signs of attachment to their sovereign, thought it expedient to remove Pius from the capital. The Swiss guards made no resistance, having orders to that effect from the pope; and, protesting that he “yielded to force,” Pius took his breviary under his arm, accompanied the general to the gate, where his carriage was ready, and drove off under an escort. He was taken first to Grenoble, in Dauphine, from whence he was removed, by order of Napoleon, to Savona, in the Riviera of Genoa, where he remained till June, 1812. While Pius was at Savona, Napoleon convoked a council at Paris of the bishops of his empire; but he found that assembly less docile than he expected, and he dissolved it without reaching any conclusion. The great question was how to fill up the vacant sees, when the pope refused the canonical institution. The pope at the same time would not recognize Napoleon's divorce from his first wife Josephine. In short, Napoleon found that unarmed priests were more difficult to conquer than the armies of one half of Europe (Thibaudeau, Le Consulau et I'Empire, ch. 77; Botta, Storia d'Italiar, bk. 25). The plan of Napoleon was to have the pope settled at Avignon, or some other town of his empire, as his subject and his pensionary, and to control himself the nomination not only of the bishops, but of the cardinals also, by which means he would have added to his already overbearing temporal power the incalculable support of a spiritual authority which extends over a great part of the world. The resistance of Pins disconcerted his views. Napoleon at last imagined that by changing Pius to Fontainebleau he might succeed in overcoming his firmness.

He therefore caused Pius to be removed with the greatest secrecy. He was brought to Fontainebleau in June 1812, lodged in the imperial palace, and treated with marked respect. Napoleon had set out on his Russian expedition. After his return from that disastrous campaign, in December, 1812, he went to see the pope, embraced him, and treated him with studied attention; he also allowed several cardinals who were at Paris to repair to Fontainebleau, and at last, chiefly through their persuasions, he prevailed upon the pope to sign a new concordat, Jan. 25, 1813. It is not true, as some have stated, that Napoleon, in one of his conferences with Pius, lifted his hand against him and struck him. Pacca (Memorie Storiche, pt. 3, ch. 1) denies this on the authority of Pius himself, but thinks it very probable that Napoleon spoke to his prisoner in an authoritative and threatening tone. Napoleon hastened to publish the articles of the concordat, and to give them the force of laws of the empire; after which he granted free access to the pope, to all cardinals, and others who chose to repair to Fontainebleau.  Pius, who had scruples concerning some of the articles which he had signed, laid them before the cardinals and asked their opinion. Several of the cardinals, especially the Italian ones, such as Consalvi, Pacca, Litta, and Di Pietro, stated that some of the articles were contrary to the canon law and the legitimate jurisdiction of the Roman see, and pregnant with the most serious evils to the Church, and they urged the necessity of a prompt retraction. They quoted the example of Paschal II, who, in similar circumstances having ceded to the emperor Henry V the right of investiture, hastened to submit his conduct to the judgment of a council assembled in the Lateran, and the council revoked the cession. SEE PASCHAL II.

Upon this Pius wrote to Napoleon, March 24, retracting his concessions, but proposing a new basis for a concordat; Napoleon, however, took no notice of the retraction, except to exile some of the cardinals who, he thought, had influenced it. Napoleon soon after set off for his army in Germany, and the affair with the pope remained in suspense. It was only after the defeat of the French armies and their expulsion from Germany that Napoleon proposed to restore to the pope the Papal States south of the Apennines, if the pope would agree to a concordat. Pius answered that he would not enter into any negotiations until he was restored to Rome. On Jan. 22, 1814, an order came for the pope to leave Fontainebleau the following day. None of the cardinals were allowed to accompany him. He set out, accompanied by an escort, and was taken to Italy. On arriving at the bridge on the river Nura, in the state of Parma, he met the advanced posts of the Neapolitan troops under Mulrat, who was then making common cause with the allied powers against Napoleon. Murat had taken military occupation of the Roman state, but he offered to give up Rome and the Campagna. Pius, however, preferred stopping at Cesena, his native town, until the political horizon was cleared up. After the abdication of Napoleon and the peace of Paris, Pius made his entrance into Rome, May 24,1814, in the midst of rejoicings and acclamations. His faithful Consalvi soon after resumed his office of secretary of state. By the articles of the congress of Vienna the whole of the Papal States were restored, including the legations, which were not, however, evacuated by the Austrian troops until after the fall of Murat, in 1815.

The remaining years of the life of Pius VII were spent in comparative tranquillity, though not in idleness. He applied himself to adapt, as far as it was practicable, the civil institutions of his dominions to the great changes which had taken place in the social state. By a “motu proprio” of the year  1816 he confirmed the suppression of all feudal imposts, privileges, monopolies, and jurisdictions; he abolished every kind of torture, including that called the “corda,” or “estrapade.” which was formerly a frequent mode of punishment at Rome; he diminished the land-tax; retained the register of “hypothques,” or mortgages, instituted by the French; laid down the basis of a new code of public administration, and in November of the following year he published a new code of civil procedure, in which he regulated the costs of judicial proceedings. He maintained the commercial courts established by the French, as well as the new system of police, enforced by a regular corps of carabineers, instead of the old “sbirri,” who were ineffective and corrupt (Tournon, Etudes statistiques sur Rome, bk. 4, ch. 6). Unfortunately, however, the old system of secret proceedings in criminal matters was restored, as well as that of the ecclesiastical courts, which have jurisdiction also over laymen. Pius, however, also made some important alterations in the form of proceeding of the Inquisition, abolishing torture as well as the punishment of death for offences concerning religion. He did perhaps all that he could do as a pope, and certainly more than any pope had done before him. Cardinal Consalvi took vigorous measures to extirpate the banditti of the Campagria; and in July, 1819, he ordered the town of Sonnino, a nest of incorrigible robbers, to be razed to the ground. With regard to spiritual matters, Pius concluded a new concordat with France, Naples, Bavaria, and other states.

He condemned by a bull the political society of Carbonari, as well as other secret societies. In the month of July 1823, the aged pontiff had a fall in his apartments and broke his thigh. This accident brought on inflammation, and he died Aug. 20. He was succeeded by Leo XII (q.v.). Thorwaldsen was commissioned to make his monument, which has been placed in St. Peter's. Pius VII stands prominent among the long series of popes for his exemplary conduct under adversity, his Christian virtues, and his general benevolence and charity. Free from nepotism, virtuous, modest, unassuming, and personally disinterested, he was a stanch, though temperate, defender of the rights of his see; and his meek bearing and unblemished character engaged on his side the sympathies of the whole Christian world, without distinction of community or sect, during the long struggle with his gigantic and ungenerous adversary. A selection of his bulls, breves, etc., are found in Roskovany, Monum. Cath. pro independentiaupotest. eccl. Quinque eccl. (1847), 2, 1 sq. The Bullarium Romanum continuat contains in vol. 11 and 12 (Rom. 1846) all bulls and breves till 1806. See Cohen, Precis histor. sur Pie VII (Par. 1823); Simon, La Vie politique et privee de Pie VII (ibid.  1824); Jager, Lebensbeschreibung des Papsfes Pius VII (Frkf. 1824); Artaud de Montor, Hist. de la Vie et du Pontificat du Pupe Pie VII, (3rd ed. Paris, 1839, 2 vols. 8vo); and Cardinal Pacca's Historical Memoirs, transl. into English by Sir George Head (Lond. 1850, 2 vols. post 8vo); the London Review, 1854, pt. 2, p. 77; Ranke, History of the Papacy, 2, 311 sq., et al.; Bower, History of the Popes, vol. 8; Church Journal, vol. 7; Stud. und Krit. 1867, No. 1; English Cyclopedia.

## Pius VIII[[@Headword:Pius VIII]]

             pope of Rome, was born at Cingoli, in the province of Ancona, Italy, Nov. 20, 1761. His original name was Francis Xavier Castiglioni. He was the friend of Pius 7, and was by him created bishop of Montalto in 1800, and elevated to the cardinalate in 1816. He was generally regarded as the most learned canonist of the papal court. He was desired for successor of pope Leo XII. During Pius VIII's short pontificate of one year and eight months (from March 31, 1829 till Nov. 30, 1830) nothing remarkable occurred. He warred against indifferentism, Bible societies, Freemasonry, and all secret associations, and successfully labored for the establishment of a patriarchate at Constantinople for the United Armenians. He deserves to be especially commended for his humane efforts with Dom Pedro of Brazil to suppress the slave traffic and system. His bulls, canons, etc., are in Roskovany, Monument. Cath. 2, 292-317. He was succeeded by pope Gregory XVI. See Artand de Montor, Hist. du Pape Pie VIII (Par. 1843); Nodari, Vitae Pontificum Pii 6, 7, Leonis XII, et Pii VIII (Padua, 1840). (J.H.W.)

## Pix[[@Headword:Pix]]

             SEE PYX.

## Pizzez[[@Headword:Pizzez]]

             SEE APHSES.

## Placaeus[[@Headword:Placaeus]]

             SEE PLACE, JOSUE DE LA.

## Place (Placceus), Josue De La[[@Headword:Place (Placceus), Josue De La]]

             a celebrated French Protestant divine, was born in Bretagne about the close of the 16th century some put the date at 1596, some as late as 1606. His parents died while he was in his infancy, and he was educated under the guidance of his elder brothers. When yet very young he was made teacher of philosophy at Saumur, where he had been a student. In 1625 he was made pastor of the Protestant Church at Nantes, and there remained until  1632, when he was called, with Amyraldus and Capellus, to a professorship of theology at Saumnur. He died in 1665. An excellent teacher and a pious Christian, he yet offended greatly, and provoked much strife and controversy by his tendency to Arminian theology in his views on the doctrine of Imputation (q.v.). The theory of original sin, as consisting only in native corruption, was condemned by the French synod of 1645, though Placaeus himself was not named. Strictly speaking, his theory was only a modification of Jean Cameron's (q.v.), who had succeeded Gomarus (q.v.) at Saumur in 1618. Cameron himself taught, after Piscator, the imputation of Christ's passive obedience alone; and advocated the theory of the hypothetic universalism of divine grace, which was more fully developed by Amyrant. “The peculiarity of Amyraldism,” says Schweizer, ‘is in the combination of a real particularism with a merely ideal universalism.” Placaeus accepted the statement of the synod of 1645, by distinguishing between immediate and mediate imputation, and advocated the mediate, instead of the immediate imputation of Adam's sin to his posterity. He was opposed by Anton Garissol (q.v.), professor in Montauban, and defended by Charles Drelincourt (q.v.), pastor at Charenton. His defence, Disputationes academicae, sub paesidio J. Placaei, de imputatione primi peccati Adami, de argumentis quibus eficitur, Christun priusfuisse, quam in utero B. V. conciperetur, et de testimoniis et argumentis quibus probatur Jesum Christum esse Deum, was published at Salm (1649-51, 3 vols. 4to), and in an enlarged form the year of his death (1665), and since. His works (Opera) were published in collected form at Franeker in 1699, and again in 1702. See Schweizer, Centraldogmen, 2, 234 sq., 319; Haag, Hist. des Dogmes; Ebrard, Dogmatik, vol. 1. § 43; Müller, On Sin (see Index); Theological Essays from Princeton Review (N. Y. 1846), p. 195 sq.; Cunningham, Reformers, p. 379 sq.; Dorner, Gesch. der protestant. Theologie, 2, 447; Brit. and For. Ev. Rev. July, 1860, p. 585; New-Englander, July, 1868. (J. H. W.)

## Place, Absaloms[[@Headword:Place, Absaloms]]

             SEE ABSALOM.

## Place, Conyers[[@Headword:Place, Conyers]]

             an English divine of some note, flourished in the first half of last century, very near the opening of that sera. We know nothing of his personal history. He has left several valuable publications, among which we note, besides his Sermons (Lond. 1702, 4to; 1721, 8vo; 1705, 4to), Adversaria (1709): — Remarks, with Queries put to Mr. Bolde, concerning his wild Pamphlet. or clouterly Invective, against the Christian Ministry and World, called Some Thoughts concerning Church Authority (1724, 8vo): — Space is Necessary Being, etc. (1728): Essay towards the Vindication of' the Visible Creation (1729, 8vo): — Reason an Insufficient Guide (1735): — Remarks on a Treatise entitled A Plain Account, etc., of the  Lord's Supper, in which all the texts in the New Testament which relate to it are produced and explained, and the whole doctrine about it is drawn from them alone (1735). See Blakey, Hist. of the Philosophy of the Mind, 3, 31; Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors, s.v.; Hook, Eccles. Biog. s.v.

## Place, Enoch[[@Headword:Place, Enoch]]

             an American minister in the Freewill Baptist Church, was born in Rochester, N. I., July 13, 1786. He was converted in March. 1807, while engaged in teaching, and soon felt called of God to enter the work of the ministry. He preached his first sermon June 2, 1807, and was ordained Jan. 23, 1813. Forty-one years of his public life he passed in Strafford, N. H., laboring also much in adjoining towns. He had a thirst for knowledge, and from youth to manhood availed himself of the means within his reach to acquire an education, though his denomination at that period was not in favor of a learned ministry. By personal effort he advanced until he became eminent among his own people and a leader in his town. His gifts and position eminently qualified him for usefulness both as a minister and citizen. He was called to fill high positions in his denomination, such as moderator of General Conference, trustee of printing establishment, member of mission boards, etc. As a preacher, he was earnest and warm. At times he would have such a sense of the sinner's condition and obligation to God that he would speak as one having authority. Occasionally he would rise to such a height in feeling and eloquence as to be almost overwhelming and irresistible. His personal appearance was commanding, his voice sonorous and rich. He was also eloquent and mighty in prayer. Mr. Place, with many other Free-will Baptists, early espoused the antislavery cause. Abundant in labors and rich in faith Father Place, as he came to be called, died March 23, 1865. See Barrett, Mem. of Eminent Preachers, p. 86 sq.

## Place, Fruitful[[@Headword:Place, Fruitful]]

             SEE CARMEL.

## Placebo[[@Headword:Placebo]]

             an office in the Church of Rome, so called from its first word, has for its purpose the prayer for souls. It is the antiphon (q.v.) at vespers in the office of the dead, as the dirge is at matins. See Procter, Book of Common Prayer; Elliott, Delineation of Romanism.

## Placentia, Councils Of (Concilium Placentinum)[[@Headword:Placentia, Councils Of (Concilium Placentinum)]]

             Several important ecclesiastical gatherings were held there. The first of importance was convened March 1, 1095, and concluded March 5, by pope Urban II. Two hundred bishops attended, with nearly 4000 other ecclesiastics and 30,000 laymen. So innumerable were the multitude of persons who flocked- to it that no church could be found in those parts capable of containing them, therefore the pope was compelled to hold the first and third sessions of this assembly in the open air. The empress Praxedis in person made complaint against her husband the emperor Henry, who divorced her and treated her infamously. Ambassadors from the emperor of Constantinople were present, who demanded help against the infidels, with the approbation of the pope. Fifteen canons were published, by which the heresy of ‘Berenger was again condemned, and the truth of the real presence of the Lord Jesus Christ in the holy Eucharist clearly set forth. The sect of the New Nicolaitans (who favored incontinence in the clergy) was also condemned. The orders conferred by Guibert, the antipope, and others who had been excommunicated, were declared null. The Ember fasts were also fixed. After this Urban proceeded to France, and in the autumn of the same year held the celebrated Council of Clermont. See Labbe, Concilia, 10, 500.

Another important council was held after Easter, 1132, by Innocent II, assisted by several bishops of Lombardy. It was forbidden to receive to penitence those who refused to renounce fornication, hatred, and every mortal sin. In this council the antipope Anacletus was excommunicated. See Labbe, Concilia, 10:988.

## Places, Besieged[[@Headword:Places, Besieged]]

             SEE MAZOR.

## Placet[[@Headword:Placet]]

             (placi[e]tum regium, literceparcatis seu exequatur) is the sanction by a reigning prince to the promulgation and execution of an ecclesiastical ordinance. The placet is necessitated as soon as ecclesiastical ordinances transgress the purely religious boundaries, and come in contact with those of the state. As soon as the mutual boundaries had acquired a relative independence, which drew a line of demarcation between both the State and Church, the right of the placet was established, and the first traces of it  we find in the quarrels of Philip le Bel of France with Boniface VIII (q.v.), and Louis of Bavaria with John XXII (q.v.). In the 15th century we find this right of assent fully established in different countries. Thus Louis XI, in 1495, appointed a commission at Amiens to examine all persons coming from Rome whether they had any papal briefs upon them “et icelles voir et visiter, pour stavoir s'elles sont aucunement contraires ou prejudiciables a nous et a la dite eglise Gallicane. Et au cas qu'en trouverez aucunes qui y fussent contraires ou prejudiciables, prenez les et retenez par devers vous, et les porteurs arrestez et constituez prisonniers, si vous voyez que la matiere y soit sujette; et du contenu esdites lettres nous advertissez, ou les nous envovez a toute diligence, pour y donner la provision necessaire” (comp. Preuves, Les Libertes de l'Eglise Gallicane, ch. 10). Martin V (q.v.), in a letter to the archbishops of Portugal, complains, anno 1427, of Portugal: “Dicitur enim nobis, quod statuto regio mandatum est, ne quis audeat sine ipsius regis licentia sub poena mortis et perditionis bonorum in dictis regnis literas apostolicas publicare.” When John II, king of Portugal, instigated by Innocent XIII, repealed the Placetum Regium, in 1486, the peers of the realm resisted, and declared that without the consent of the states such a repeal was void (Augustini Manuelis, Hist. Joan. II). Philip the Good, duke of Burgundy, decreed, Jan. 3, 1447: “Dat niemandt en brenghe, oft en exequere eenighe geestelycke monitien, inhibitien oft andere gheboden, op eelighe ondersaeten des Landts van Brabandt, uyt wat saecke dat het zy, hy eerst kome by onse Officiere ende Wetholderen, ende geoe hem klaerlyck te kennen de saecke waerom, ende verkryghe oorlof ende consent. Den gene die dat dede, sal daer an verbeurt hebben alle sine goederen, ende te dien aen syn lyf eenen wegh te S. Peter ende S. Pauls te Roomen te doen.”

By 1594 the placet was already regarded as a customary right. Doctrine, usage, and legislature, however, developed more fully the cases in which the placet should be used, and thus in matters of conscience, according to a royal declaration of March 8, 1772, reissued Feb. 28, 1810, no placet was required. In Austria the necessity of the placet was emphasized as early as the 16th century. In addition to former ordinances, the decree of Leopold II, dated March 17, 1791, decreed that “papal bulls, briefs, and constitutions must have the sanction of the reigning prince before they can be promulgated and accepted. This ordinance also refers to all previous papal edicts, without exception, in such a manner that whenever use is made of an ancient bull the sanction is required, and even such bulls as  have been sanctioned shall only be valid as long as new decrees of the state do net affect their validity.” According to another decree, dated April 2 and 7, 1784, the placet was also required for all instructions, orders, etc., given to preachers and priests, no matter as to the form in which they are made known to them. The Austrian decree of 1791 was also adopted Jan. 30, 1830, for the province of the Upper Rhine. In Bavaria the same principles, which were still adhered to in the edict dated May 26, 1818, were already the same as in the edict dated April 3, 1770, that all ecclesiastical edicts are subject to the placet, with the exception of summons issued by the ecclesiastical authorities, provided they only refer to the lower clergy, and are the natural issues of ordinances already sanctioned. These claims of the state had always been the subject of protest on the part of the Roman See. The bull “In ccena domini” (q.v.) excommunicates all those who prevent the promulgation and annunciation of papal bulls and briefs (comp. the bull Pastoraelis of Urban VIII, anno 1627, § 7, 13, in the Bullarium Romanum, 6, 38, 40). When Leopold I, while governor of Belgium. would not allow the publication of the papal prohibition of Jansen's (q.v.) work Augustinus without the sanction of the government, appealing to privileges, liberties, and usages, Innocent X, in 1651, protested against it most decidedly: “Quod equidem audiri sine horrore animi non potest.” “Never has such a privilege been granted either by a pope or a council, which must needs destroy the papal power.

None, however, dare to refer to the privilege of a worldly prince, because it would be nothing else but a foolhardy arrogance to bind and loose the souls, which right the Lord Jesus Christ has granted to none else than to his vicar” (Roskovany, Monumenta catholica pro independentia potestatis ecclesiasticae b imperio civili, pt. 1, p. 203, Quinque Ecclesiis, 1847). In this sense the popes have continually protested against the placet, and the brief of Pius VIII (q.v.), “Pervenerat 1 non ita pridem,” dated June 30, 1830, is a bitter protest against the edict of Jan. 30, 1830. This persevering opposition was finally crowned with a result, but the hierarchy owes this' result to an institution which is anything but desirable to the Church, viz. the liberty of the press. The Belgian Constitution of Feb. 25, 1831, art. XVI, decreed: “The state has no right to interfere with the appointment or election of ministers of any denomination, or to prevent them from having intercourse with their superiors and promulgating their records; in the latter case with the proviso of the usual responsibility concerning the press and promulgation.” This example was followed in Holland and Prussia in 1848. in Austria in 1855, and in Würtemberg in 1857. In other countries the purely ecclesiastical  edicts are freed from the placet; all that is required is that the civil authorities get an insight at their publication. Since the ascendency obtained by Prussia in the German empire at the close of the Franco- German war, the system of Church legislation has undergone a complete change, the details of Church government being largely taken into the control of the state, and obedience to the new code of Church laws being exacted from the clergy under penalty of forfeiture of income, of deprivation of office, and in some cases of exile. For the present status quo of Rome in the German empire. comp. Kurtz, Lehrbuch der Kirchengeschichte (Mitalu 1874), 2, 389 sq. See Wetzer u. Welte, Kirchen-Lexikon, s.v. Placet; Herzog, Real-Encyklop. s.v.; Theolopisches Universal-Lexikon, s.v.; Aschbach, KirchenLexikon, 4, 596-601; Gieseler, Eccles. Hist. (Smith's transl.), 3, 340, note 5; Van Espen, Tractatus de promulgatione legum ecclesiasticarum ac speciatim Bullarum et rescriptorum Curiae Romanae (Opera omnia, Lovanii, 1753, fol. 4:123 sq.); Stockman, Jus Belgarum circa Bullarum pontificum receptionena (Opera, Brux. 1760); Besier, Specimen dejuris placeti historia in Belgio (Trajecti ad Rh. 1848); Philipp, Kirchenrecht, 2, 557 sq.; 3, 556 sq.; Eichhorn, Kirchesnrecht, 1, 772, 782 sq.; Richter, Kirchenrecht, § 66, 177 (5th ed.).

## Placette, Jean de la[[@Headword:Placette, Jean de la]]

             a noted French Protestant divine, whose religious convictions caused his exile, was born at Pontac in 1639. His father was himself a minister, and trained Jean with great care for the preaching of the glad tidings. In 1660 he was ordained, and continued faithfully to discharge the obligations of his sacred ministry until after the revocation of the Edict of Nantes in 1685, when he was obliged to seek refuge from persecution in Denmark. He was there brought to the notice of the queen, who recognized in him great worth, and determined to enjoy his associations and teachings. After her death in 1711 he went over to Holland, residing for a while at the Hague, and then at Utrecht, where he died in 1718. He was the author of many works on practical religion and morals, which are highly esteemed. He also wrote several works in the department of Protestant polemics, and his influence was much dreaded by the Romanists. See Hook, Eccles. Biog. 8, 97. (J. H. W.)

## Placeus[[@Headword:Placeus]]

             SEE PLACE, JOSUE DE LA.

## Placidus, Sr[[@Headword:Placidus, Sr]]

             a Christian martyr of the 6th century, was of pious parentage, and was born probably in 515. When only seven years old he was entrusted by his father, the Roman patrician Tertullus, to the care of St. Benedict of Nursia. Placidus, thus religiously trained, grew up in the service of the Church, and in 541 became abbot of a newly founded monastery at Messina. In 546 he was killed, with his companions, by pirates. He is commemorated in the Church of Rome July 11. See Wetzer u. Welte, Kirchen-Lexikon, vol. 12, s.v.; Alzog, Kirchengesch. 2, 22.

## Plague[[@Headword:Plague]]

             is used in the A. V. as the rendering of five Hebrew words:

1. De'ber, דֶּבֶר, which properly means destruction, death (as Hos 13:14), and is hence applied to pestilence (as Lev 26:25; Deu 28:21; 2Sa 24:13; 1Ki 8:37), and to a murrain among beasts (as Exo 3:9). The Sept. mostly has θάνατος.

2. Maggephah', מִגֵּפָה, from the root נָגִ, to smite; hence a plague as actively considered, a pestilence sent from God (Exo 9:14; comp. Num 14:37; Num 17:13; Num 25:18, etc.). It is also used of slaughter in battle (1Sa 4:17; 2Sa 17:9).

3. Makkah', מִכָּה, from the root נָכָה, to smite, properly the act of smiting; hence a blow, a stroke; and so it should be rendered, rather than plague (Lev 26:21; Num 11:33; Deu 28:59; Deu 28:61; Deu 29:22; 1Sa 4:8; Jer 19:8; Jer 49:17; Jer 1:13).

4. Ne'ga, נֶגִע, from נָגִע, to smite; hence the meaning is like that of the foregoing. But it is often used to mean a spot, mark, cut, upon the skin, from the common effects of a blow. This is its meaning throughout the 13th and 14th chapters of Leviticus, where it is rendered plague in the A.V.

5. Ne'geph, נֶגֶפ, from נָגִפ, to strike, as above; hence a plague, as a divine judgment (Exo 12:13, and often). SEE PLAGUES OF EGYPT. To  these should be added the following Greek words, which are usually translated “plague” in the A.V.: μάστιξ, properly a scourge or whip (Mar 3:10; Mar 5:29; Mar 5:34; Luk 7:21); and πλήγη, a stroke or wound, whether of natural or artificial infliction (Rev 9:20; Rev 11:6; Rev 15:1; Rev 15:6; Rev 15:8; Rev 16:9; Rev 16:21; Rev 18:4; Rev 18:8; Rev 21:9; Rev 22:18). It is evident that not one of these words can be considered as designating by its signification the plague. Whether the disease be mentioned must be judged from the sense of passages, not from the sense of words. The discrimination has already been pretty fully considered under the word PESTILENCE SEE PESTILENCE (q.v.). In the following treatment of the term we use it in its strict medical application.

In noticing the places in the Bible which might be supposed to refer to the plague, we must bear in mind that, unless some of its distinctive characteristics arc mentioned, it is not safe to infer that this disease is intended. In the narrative of the Ten Plagues there is none corresponding to the modern plague. The plague of boils has indeed some resemblance, and it might be urged that as in other cases known scourges were sent, (their miraculous nature being shown by their opportune occurrence and their intense character), so in this case a disease of the country, if indeed the plague anciently prevailed in Egypt, might have been employed. Yet the ordinary plague would rather exceed in severity this infliction than the contrary, which seems fatal to this supposition. Those pestilences which were sent as special judgments, and were either supernaturally rapid in their effects, or in addition directed against particular culprits, are beyond the reach of human inquiry. But we also read of pestilences which, although sent as judgments, have the characteristics of modern epidemics, not being rapid beyond nature, nor directed against individuals. Thus in the remarkable threatenings in Leviticus and Deuteronomy, pestilence is spoken of as one of the enduring judgments that were gradually to destroy the disobedient. This passage in Leviticus evidently refers to pestilence in besieged cities: “And I will bring a sword upon you, that shall avenge the quarrel of [my] covenant: and when ye are gathered together in your cities, I will send the pestilence among you; and ye shall be delivered into the hand of the enemy” (Deuteronomy 26:25).

Famine in a besieged city would occasion pestilence. A special disease may be indicated in the parallel portion of Deuteronomy (Deu 28:21): “The Lord shall make the pestilence cleave unto thee, until he [or “it”] have consumed thee from off the land whither-thou goest to possess it.” The word rendered  “pestilence” may, however, have a general signification, and comprise calamities mentioned afterwards, for there follows an enumeration of several other diseases and similar scourges (Deu 28:21-22). The first disease here mentioned has been supposed to be the plague (Bunsen, Bibelwerk). It is to be remembered that “the botch of Egypt” is afterwards spoken of (Deu 28:27), by which it is probable that ordinary boils are intended, which are especially severe in Egypt in the present day, and that later still “all the diseases of Egypt” are mentioned (Deu 28:60). It therefore seems unlikely that so grave a disease as the plague, if then known, should not be spoken of in either of these two passages. In neither place does it seem certain that the plague is specified, though in the one, if it were to be in the land, it would fasten upon the population of besieged cities, and in the other, if then known, it would probably be alluded to as a terrible judgment in an enumeration of diseases. The notices in the prophets present the same difficulty; for they do not seem to afford sufficiently positive evidence that the plague was known in those times. With the prophets, as in the Pentateuch, we must suppose that the diseases threatened or prophesied as judgments must have been known, or at least called by the names used for those that were known. Two passages might seem to be explicit. In Amos we read, “I have sent among you the pestilence after the manner of Egypt: your young men have I slain with the sword, and have taken your horses; and I have made the stink of your camps to come up into your nostrils” (Amo 4:10). Here the reference is perhaps to the death of the first-born, for the same phrase, “after the manner of Egypt,” is used by Isaiah (Isa 10:24; Isa 10:26), with a reference to the Exodus, and perhaps to the oppression preceding it; and an allusion to past history seems probable, as a comparison with the overthrow of the cities of the plain immediately follows (Amo 4:11). The prophet Zechariah also speaks of a plague with which the Egyptians, if refusing to serve God, should be smitten (Amos 4:14, 18); but the name and the description which appears to apply to this scourge seem to show that it cannot be the plague (Amo 4:12).

Hezekiah's disease has been thought to have been the plague, and its fatal nature, as well as the mention of a boil, makes this not improbable. On the other hand, there is no mention of a pestilence among his people at the time, unless we so regard the sudden destruction of Sennacherib's army (2Ki 20:1-11). Severe epidemics are the common accompaniments of dense crowding in cities and of famine; and we accordingly often find them mentioned in connection (Lev 26:25; Jer 14:12; Jer 29:18; Mat 24:7; Luk 21:11). But there is no better argument for believing that “pestilence” in these instances means the glandular plague, than the fact of its being at present a prevalent epidemic of the East. It is also remarkable that the Mosaic law, which contains such strict rules for the seclusion of lepers, should have allowed a disease to pass unnoticed, which is above all others the most deadly, and at the same time the most easily checked by sanatory regulations of the same kind. Michaelis endeavors to explain why the Law contained no ordinances about the plague by arguing that, on account of the sudden appearance and brief duration of the disease, no permanent enactments could have been efficient in moderating its ravages, but only such preventive measures as varied according to the ever-varying circumstances of the origin and course of its visitations (Mos. Recht, 4, 290). The destruction of Sennacherib's army (2Ki 19:35) has also been ascribed to the plague. But-not to insist on the circumstance that this awfully sudden annihilation of 185,000 men is not ascribed to any disease, but to the agency of an angel (since such passages as 2Sa 24:15-16, weaken this objection, and even Josephus understood the cause to be a pestilence, Ant. 10, 1, 5)-it is impossible that such a mortality could have been produced, in one night, by a disease which spread itself by contagion, like the Oriental plague; and the same remark applies, though in a less degree, to the three days' pestilence in the reign of David (2Sa 24:13). There does not seem, therefore, to be any distinct notice of the plague in the Bible, and it is most probable that this can be accounted for by supposing either that no pestilence of antiquity in the East was as marked in character as the modern plague, or that the latter disease then frequently broke out there as an epidemic in crowded cities, instead of following a regular course. SEE DISEASE.

The disease now called the plague, which has ravaged Egypt and neighboring countries in modern times, is supposed to have prevailed there in former ages. Manetho, the Egyptian historian, speaks of “a very great plague” in the reign of Semempses, the seventh king of the first dynasty, B.C. cir. 2275. The difficulty of determining the character of the pestilences of ancient and mediaeval times, even when carefully described, warns us not to conclude that every such mention refers to the plague, especially as the cholera has, since its modern appearance, been almost as severe a scourge to Egypt as the more famous disease, which indeed, as an epidemic seems there to have been succeeded by it. Moreover, if we admit, as we must, that there have been anciently pestilences very nearly  resembling the modern plague, we must still hesitate to pronounce any recorded pestilence to be of this class unless it be described with some distinguishing particulars. The plague in recent times has not extended far beyond the Turkish Empire and the kingdom of Persia. It has been asserted that Egypt is its cradle, but this does not seem to be corroborated by the later history of the disease. It is there both sporadic and epidemic; in the first form it has appeared almost annually, in the second at rarer intervals. As an epidemic it takes the character of a pestilence, sometimes of the greatest severity. Our subsequent remarks apply to it in this form. It is a much-vexed question whether it is ever endemic: that such is the case is favored by its rareness since sanitary measures have been enforced. Respecting the causes and origin of plague nothing is known.

There cannot be the slightest doubt that it is propagated by absolute contact with, or a very near approach to, the bodies or clothes of persons infected; but we are entirely at a loss to know how it is generated afresh. Extremes of temperature have a decided effect in putting a stop to it; but Dr. Russell observed that in the year 1761 the plague at Aleppo was mild in 1762 it was severer, and in 1763 it was very fatal; and yet there was no appreciable difference in the respective seasons of these years. In Egypt, the plague commences in autumn, and is regularly put an end to by the heats of summer; and it is even asserted that contaminated goods are also disinfected at this time (see Russegger, Reisen, 1, 236 sq.; Mariti, Trav. p. 199; Prosp. Alp. Rer. AEg. 1, 19). In Europe the plague disappeared during the winter. This was remarked in all the epidemics except that from 1636 to 1648, called the Great Plague, on account of its long duration; but even in this instance it abated considerably during the winter. It was a common superstition that the plague abated on St. John's day. The plague when most severe usually appears first on the northern coast of Egypt, having previously broken out in Turkey or North Africa west of Egypt. It ascends the river to Cairo, rarely going much farther. Thus Mr. Lane has observed that the great plague of 1835 “was certainly introduced from Turkey” (Modern Egyptians, 5th ed., p. 3, note 1). It was first noticed at Alexandria, ascended to Cairo, and farther to the southern part of Egypt, a few cases having occurred at Thebes; and it “extended throughout the whole of Egypt, though its ravages were not great in the southern parts” (ibid.). The mortality is often enormous, and Mr. Lane remarks of the plague just mentioned: “It destroyed not less than eighty thousand persons in Cairo, that is, one third of the population; and far more, I believe, than two hundred thousand in all Egypt” (ibid.).

When this pestilence visited  Egypt, in the summer of 1843, the deaths were not numerous, although, owing to the government's posting a sentry at each house in which any one had died of the disease, to enforce quarantine, there was much concealment, and the number was not accurately known (Mrs. Poole, Englishman in Egypt, 2, 32-35). Although since then Egypt has been free from this scourge, Benghazi (Hesperides), in the pashalic of Tripoli, was almost depopulated by it during part of the years 1860 and 1861. The most fatal, and at the same time the most general epidemic, was that which ravaged Asia, Africa, and the .whole of Europe in the 14th century. It was called by the northern European nations “the Black Death,” and by the Italians “la Mortilega Grande” — the great mortality. According to Dr. Hecker, not less than twenty-five millions perished by it in the short space of three years, from 1347 to 1350. Since the commencement of this century Europe has been free from the plague, with the exception of two or three instances. It occurred at Noja, in the kingdom of Naples, in 1815 and 1816; at the Lazaretto of Venice in 1818; in Greifenberg, in Silesia, in 1819. It has not been seen in Great Britain since the great epidemic of 1665, which is stated to have carried off eight thousand in one week. Quarantine was first performed in one of the islands near Venice in 1485. Persons who had been cured of plague in the Lazaretto on one of the adjoining islands were sent there, and all those with whom they had had intercourse, where they were detained forty days. This period was probably fixed upon on account of some medical hypothesis. The fortieth day was regarded as the last day of ardent diseases, and that which separated them from chronic. Forty days constituted the philosophical month of alchemists. Theological, and even legal derivations have also been given. The forty days of the flood; Moses's sojourn on Mount Sinai; our Lord's fast; and, lastly, what is called the “Saxon term” (Sachsische Frist), which also lasts forty days. Bills of health were probably first established in 1507, by a council of health established at Venice during a fatal plague that visited Italy for five years; but they were not generally used until 1665. It is to these great measures that Europe is indebted for its present immunity from this terrible scourge; and it cannot be doubted that but for the callous indifference of the Orientals (which proceeds from their fatalism, love of gain, and ignorance), the same measures would be adopted in the East with the same success (Hecker's Hist. of the Epidemics of the Middle Ages; Dr. Brown, art. Plague, in Cyclop. of Pract. Med.). SEE PESTILENCE.

The glandular plague, like the small-pox, is an eruptive fever, and is the most virulent and most contagious disease with which we are acquainted. The eruption consists of buboes, carbuncles, and petechiae. Buboes are inflamed and swollen glands; and the glands so affected are generally those of the groin, axilla, neck, and the parotid glands. More frequently there are two, three, or even four such tumors. They sometimes subside of themselves; or, what is more commonly the case, they suppurate; and as this process seldom commences before the disease has taken a favorable turn, it is regarded as the cause, but more correctly as a sign, of approaching recovery. A carbuncle is an inflammation of the skin, giving rise to a hard tumor, with pustules or vesicles upon it. It resembles a common boil, but differs from it in this important respect. The carbuncle becomes gangrenous throughout its whole ex-tent, so that when the eschar separates a large deep ulcer is left. Under the term petechiae are included evanescent spots and streaks of various hues, from a pale blue to a deep purple, which give a marbled appearance to the skin. When such livid streaks occur in the face, they disfigure the countenance so much that a patient can hardly be recognized by his friends. The disease varies so considerably in its symptoms and course that it is impossible to give one description that will suit even the majority of cases. Sometimes the eruption does not appear at all, and even the general symptoms are not of such violence as to lead an ignorant person to suspect the least danger.

The patient is suddenly attacked with a loss of strength, a sense of confusion, weight in the head, oppression at the heart, and extreme dejection of spirits. Such cases sometimes terminate fatally within twenty-four hours, and occasionally on the second or third day. Generally, however, the patient is attacked with shivering or coldness, which is soon followed by fever, giddiness, pain in the head, occasionally also by vomiting. Buboes and carbuncles in most cases make their appearance on the first day; and successive eruptions of them are not unusually observed during the course of the disease. There is a peculiar and characteristic muddiness of the eye, which has been described by Dr. Russell as a muddiness and luster strangely blended together. The fever remits every morning, and increases during the day and night. The vomiting then increases; the tumors become painful; and the patient wanders, and is inclined to stupor. On the morning of the third day, in favorable cases, a sweat breaks out, which produces great relief, and sometimes even proves critical. The exacerbation on the fourth day is more severe than on the preceding ones, and continues intense until it is terminated by the sweat on the morning of the fifth day,  which leaves the patient weak, but in every respect relieved. After this the exacerbations become slighter and slighter; and the buboes, advancing favorably to suppuration, little or no fever remains after the beginning of the second week. In other cases, again, the symptoms are -far more urgent. Besides vomiting, giddiness, and headache, there is also diarrhea at the outbreak of the fever. During the night the patient becomes delirious or comatose. The pulse is full and strong; and though the tongue is not dry, the thirst is excessive. The fever abates somewhat on the succeeding morning, but the pulse is frequent, the skin hot and dry, and the patient dejected. As the second day advances, the vomiting and diarrhea become urgent, the eyes are muddy, the expression of countenance confused, the pulse quick, and sometimes low and fluttering, external heat moderately feverish, or occasionally intense in irregular flushings.

There is pain at the heart, burning pain at the pit of the stomach, and incessant restlessness. When to these symptoms are joined faltering of the tongue or loss of speech, and the surface of the body becomes cold or covered with clammy sweats, death is inevitable, although it may still be at some distance. When the patient has been much weakened by the vomiting, diarrhea, or hemorrhage, the third day proves fatal; but more commonly the disease is prolonged two or three days longer. In this form of plague buboes appear on the second or third day, and sometimes later; but whether they advance towards suppuration or not, they seem to have no effect in hastening or retarding the termination of the disease. Lastly, in some cases, the eruption of buboes and carbuncles constitute the principal symptoms of the disease; and patients are so little indisposed that they are able to go about the streets, or attend to their usual avocations, if not prevented by the inflammation of inguinal tumors. The disease has never been successfully treated, except in isolated cases, or when the epidemic has seemed to have worn itself out. Depletion and stimulants have been tried, as with cholera, and stimulants with far better results.

See Ludecke, Beschreib. des türk. Reichs, p. 62 sq.; Olivier, Voyage, vol. 1, c. 18; Soninii, Reise nach Griechenland. p. 358 sq.; Descript. de t'Egypte, 13:81 sq.; Bulard de Mern; De la Peste Orient. (Paris, 1839); L'Aubert, De la Peste, ou Typhus (ibid. 1840); Russell, Nat. Hist. of Aleppo; Clot-Bey, De la Peste en Egypte (1840), and Apersu general sur l'Egypte, 2, 348-350. SEE MEDICINE.

## Plagues of Egypt[[@Headword:Plagues of Egypt]]

             (for the use of the Hebrew word, SEE PLAGUE ), the term usually applied to the series of divine visitations of wrath with which Jehovah punished the Egyptians, and especially their king, for their refusal to let Israel go. In considering the history of the Ten Plagues we have to notice the place where they occurred and the occasion on which they were sent, and to examine the narrative of each judgment, with a view to ascertain what it was and in what manner Pharaoh and the Egyptians were punished by it, as well as to see if we can trace any general connection between the several judgments; and we shall thus be prepared to estimate their providential character, as well as to determine how far they were miraculous events, and how far natural or simulated. In this discussion we combine the Scriptural information with that derived from modern investigations. SEE EGYPT; SEE MOSES.

I. The History of the Occurrences. —

1. The Place. Although it is distinctly stated that the plagues prevailed throughout Egypt, save, in the case of some, the Israelitish territory, the land of Goshen, yet the descriptions seem principally to apply to that part of Egypt which lay nearest to Goshen, and more especially to “the field of Zoan,” or the tract about that city, since it seems almost certain that Pharaoh dwelt in the Delta, and that territory is especially indicated in Psa 78:43. That the capital at this time was not more distant is evident from the time in which a message could be sent from Pharaoh to Moses on the occasion of the Exodus. The descriptions of the first and second plagues seem especially to refer to a land abounding in streams and lakes, and so rather to the Lower than to the Upper country. We must therefore look especially to Lower Egypt for our illustrations, while bearing in mind the evident prevalence of the plagues throughout the land.

2. The Occasion. — When that Pharaoh who seems to have been the first oppressor was dead, God sent Moses to deliver Israel, commanding him to gather the elders of his people together, and to tell them his commission. It is added, “And they shall hearken to thy voice: and thou shalt come, thou and the elders of Israel, unto the king of Egypt, and ye shall say unto him, The Lord God of the Hebrews hath met with us: and now let us go, we beseech thee, three days' journey into the wilderness, that we may sacrifice to the Lord our God. And I am sure that the king of Egypt will not let you  go, no, not by a mighty hand. And I will stretch out my hand, and smite Egypt with all my wonders which I will do in the midst thereof: and after that he will let you go” (Exo 3:18-20). From what follows, that the Israelites should borrow jewels and raiment, and “spoil Egypt” (Exo 3:21-22), it seems evident that they were to leave as if only for the purpose of sacrificing; but it will be seen that if they did so, Pharaoh, by his armed pursuit and overtaking them when they had encamped at the close of the third day's journey, released Moses from his engagement.

When Moses went to Pharaoh. Aaron went with him, because Moses, not judging himself to be eloquent, was diffident of speaking to Pharaoh. “And Moses said before the Lord, Behold, I [am] of uncircumcised lips, and how shall Pharaoh hearken unto me? And the Lord said unto Moses, See, I have made thee a god to Pharaoh: and Aaron thy brother shall be thy prophet” (Exo 6:30; Exo 7:1; Exo 4:10-16). We are therefore to understand that even when Moses speaks it is rather by Aaron than himself. It is perhaps worthy of note that in the tradition of the Exodus which Manetho gives, the calamities preceding the event are said to have been caused by the king's consulting an Egyptian prophet; for this suggests a course which Pharaoh is likely to have adopted, rendering it probable that the magicians were sent for as the priests of the gods of the country, so that Moses was exalted by contrast with these vain objects of worship.

It has been, asked, What period of time was occupied in the infliction of these successive plagues? In answer to this, some contend for a year; but they have no better reason for this than that it enables them to compare the plagues with certain natural phenomena occurring at fixed seasons of the year in Egypt. This has been done with considerable ingenuity, though not without some rather violent straining in particular cases; but without some better reason than this we should not feel justified in accepting a hypothesis which the general tone of the narrative does not suggest. Each plague, according to the historian, lasted only for a short time; and unless we suppose an interval of several weeks between each, a few months or even weeks would afford sufficient time for the happening of the whole. We may now examine the narrative of each plague.

3. The Plagues themselves. — We here notice first a preliminary phenomenon of the same general character with the “plagues.” When Moses and Aaron came before Pharaoh a miracle was required of them. Then Aaron's rod became a “serpent” (A.V.), or rather “a crocodile”  (תִּנַּין). Its being changed into an animal reverenced by all the Egyptians, or by some of them, would have been an especial warning to Pharaoh. The Egyptian magicians called by the king produced what seemed to be the same wonder, yet Aaron's rod swallowed up the others (Exo 7:3-12). This passage, taken alone, would appear to indicate that the magicians succeeded in working wonders, but if it is compared with those others relating their opposition on the occasions of the first three plagues, a contrary inference seems more reasonable. In this case the expression “they also did in like manner with their enchantments” (Exodus Exo 7:11) is used, and it is repeated in the cases of their seeming success on the occasions of the first plague (Exodus ver; 22), and the second (Exo 8:7), as well as when they failed on the occasion of the third plague (Exo 8:18). A comparison with other passages strengthens us in the inference that the magicians succeeded merely by juggling. Yet, even if they were able to produce any real effects by magic, a broad distinction should be drawn between the general and powerful nature of the wonders wrought by the hand of Moses and Aaron and their partial and weak imitations. SEE MAGIC.

(1.) The “Plague” of Blood. — When Pharaoh had refused to let the Israelites go, Moses was sent again, and, on the second refusal, was commanded to smite upon the waters of the river, and to turn them and all the waters of Egypt into blood. The miracle was to be wrought when Pharaoh went forth in the morning to the river. Its general character is very remarkable, for not only was the water of the Nile smitten, but all the water, even that in vessels, throughout the country. The fish died, and the river stank. The Egyptians could not drink of it, and digged around it for water. This plague appears to have lasted seven days, for the account of it ends, “And seven days were fulfilled, after that the Lord had smitten the river” (Exo 7:13-25), and the narrative of the second plague immediately follows, as if the other had then ceased. Some difficulty has been occasioned by the mention that the Egyptians digged for water, but it is not stated that they so gained what they sought, although it may be conjectured that only the water that was seen was smitten, in order that the nation should not perish. It appears that the water, when filtered through the soil of the banks, regained its salubrity. This plague was doubly humiliating to the religion of the country, as the Nile was held sacred, as well as some kinds of its fish, not to speak of the crocodiles, which probably were  destroyed. It may have been a marked reproof for the cruel edict that the Israelitish children should be drowned, and could scarcely have failed to strike guilty consciences as such, though Pharaoh does not seem to have been alarmed by it. He saw what was probably an imitation wrought by the magicians, who accompanied him, as if he were engaged in some sacred rites, perhaps connected with the worship of the Nile. Events having some resemblance to this are mentioned by ancient writers; the most remarkable is related by Manetho, according to whom it was said that, in the reign of Nephercheres, seventh king of the second dynasty. the Nile flowed mixed with honey for eleven days. Some of the historical notices of the earliest dynasties seem to be of very doubtful authenticity, and Manetho seems to treat this one as a fable, or perhaps as a tradition. Nephercheres, it must be remarked, reigned several hundred years before the Exodus. Those who have endeavored to explain this plague by natural causes have referred to the changes of color to which the Nile is subject, the appearance of the Red Sea, and the so-called rain and dew of blood of the Middle Ages; the last two occasioned by small fungi of very rapid growth. But such theories do not explain why the wonder happened at a time of year when the Nile is most clear, nor why it killed the fish and made the water unfit to be drunk. These are the really weighty points, rather than the change into blood, which seems to mean a change into the semblance of blood. The employment of natural means in effecting a miracle is equally seen in the passage of the Red Sea; but the divine power is proved by the intensifying or extending that means, and the opportune occurrence of the result, and its fitness for a great moral purpose. SEE NILE.

(2.) The “Plague” of Frogs. — When seven days had passed after the smiting of the river, Pharaoh was threatened with another judgment, and, on his refusing to let the Israelites go, the second plague was sent. The river and all the open waters of Egypt brought forth countless frogs, which not only covered the land, but filled the houses, even in their driest parts and vessels, for the ovens and kneading-troughs are specified. The magicians again had a seeming success in their opposition; yet Pharaoh, whose very palaces were filled by the reptiles, entreated Moses ‘to pray that they might be removed, promising to let the Israelites go; but, on the removal of the plague, again hardened his heart (Exo 7:25; Exo 8:1-15). This must have been an especially  trying judgment to the Egyptians, as frogs were included among the sacred animals, probably not among those which were reverenced throughout Egypt, like the cat, but in the second class of local objects of worship, like the crocodile. The frog was sacred to the goddess Hekt, who is represented with the head of this reptile. In hieroglyphics the frog signifies “very many,” “millions,” doubtless from its abundance. In the present day frogs abound in Egypt, and in the summer and autumn their loud and incessant croaking in all the waters of the country gives some idea of this plague. They are not, however, heard in the spring, nor is there any record, excepting the Biblical one, of their having been injurious to the inhabitants. It must be added that the supposed cases of the same kind elsewhere, quoted from ancient authors, are of very doubtful authenticity. The species of reptile which was made the instrument of this infliction was probably the small frog of Egypt called by the natives dofda, the Rana Mosaica of Seetzen (Reisen, 2, 245, 350 sq.). SEE FROG.

(3.) The “Plague” of Lice. — The account of the third plague is not preceded by the mention of any warning to Pharaoh. We read that Aaron was commanded to stretch out his rod and smite the dust, which became, as the A. V. reads the word, “lice” in man and beast. The magicians again attempted opposition; but, failing, confessed that the wonder was of God (Exo 8:16-19). There is much difficulty as to the animals meant by the term כנם. The Masoretic punctuation in Exo 8:13-14 is כַּנָּם, kinnoam, which would probably make it a collective noun with םformative; but the pointing כַּנַּם(Exo 8:12) and the more decided plural form כַּנַּים, kinnim, also occur (Exo 8:13-14; Psa 105:31), of which we once find the singular כֵּןin Isa 51:6. It is therefore reasonable to conjecture that the first form should be punctuated כַּנַּם, as the defective writing of כַּנַּים; and it should also be observed that the Samaritan has כנים. The Sept. has σκνίφες, and the Vulg. sciniphes, mosquitoes, mentioned by Herodotus (2, 95) and Philo (De Vilt Mosis, 1, 20, p. 97, ed. Mang.) as troublesome in Egypt. Josephus, however, makes the כנםlice (Ant. 2, 14, 3), with which Bochart agrees (Hieroz. 2, 572 sq.). The etymology is doubtful, and perhaps the word is Egyptian. The narrative does not enable us to decide which is the more probable of the two renderings, except, indeed, that if it be meant that exactly the same kind of animal attacked  man and beast, mosquitoes would be the more likely translation. In this case the plague does not seem to be especially directed against the superstitions of the Egyptians; if, however, it were of lice, it would have been most distressing to their priests, who were very cleanly, apparently, like the Moslems, as a religious duty. In the present day both mosquitoes and lice are abundant in Egypt: the latter may be avoided, but there is no escape from the former, which are so distressing an annoyance that an increase of them would render life almost insupportable to beasts as well as men. It is therefore probable that ‘some species of gnat or mosquito is meant. SEE LICE.

(4.) The “Plague” of Flies. — In the case of the fourth plague, as in that of the first, Moses was commanded to meet Pharaoh in the morning as he came forth to the water, and to threaten him with a judgment ‘f he still refused to give the Israelites leave to go and worship. He was to be punished by עָרֹב, aro'b, which the A.V. renders “swarms [of flies],” “a swarm [of flies],” or, in the margin, “a mixture [of noisome beasts].” These creatures were to cover the people, and fill both the houses and the ground. Here, for the first time, we read that the land of Goshen, where the Israelites dwelt, was to be exempt from the plague. So terrible was it that Pharaoh granted permission for the Israelites to sacrifice in the land, which Moses refused to do, as the Egyptians would stone his people for sacrificing their “abomination.” Then Pharaoh gave them leave to sacrifice in the wilderness, provided they did not go far; but on the plague being removed broke his agreement (Exo 8:20-32). The proper meaning of the word עָרֹבis a question of extreme difficulty. The explanation of Josephus (Ant. 2, 14, 3), and almost all the Hebrew commentators, is that it means “a mixture,” and here designates a mixture of wild animals, in accordance with the derivation from the root עָרִב, “he mixed.” Similarly, Jerome renders it onune genus muscarum, and Aquila πάμμυια. The Sept., however, and Philo (De Vita Mosis, 1, 23; 2, 101, ed. Mang.) suppose it to be a dog-fly, κυνόμυια. The second of these explanations seems to be a compromise between the first and the third. It is almost certain, from two passages (Exo 8:29; Exo 8:31; Hebrew, 25, 27), that a single creature is intended. If so, what reason is there in favor of the Sept. rendering? Oedmann (Verm. Sammlunegen, 2, 150, ap. Gesen. Thesaur. s.v.) proposes the blatta orientalis, a kind of beetle, instead  of a dog-fly; but Gesenius objects that this creature devours things rather than stings men, whereas it is evident that the animal of this plague attacked or at least annoyed men, besides apparently injuring the land. From Psa 78:45, where we read, “He sent the עָרֹב, which devoured them,” it must have been a creature of devouring habits, as is observed by Kalisch (Comment. on Exodus p. ,138), who supports the theory that a beetle is intended. The Egyptian language might be hoped to give us a clew to the rendering of the Sept. and Philo. In hieroglyphics a fly is af, and a bee sheb, or kheb, sh and kh being interchangeable in different dialects; and in Coptic these two words are confounded in aaf, ar; ab, haf, meaning musca, apis, scarabceus. We can therefore only judge from the description of the plague; and here Gesenius seems to have too hastily decided against the rendering “beetle,” since the beetle sometimes attacks men. Yet modern experience does not bear out the idea that any kind of beetle is injurious to man in Egypt; but there is a kind of gadfly found in that country which sometimes stings men, though usually ‘attacking beasts. The difficulty, however, in the way of the supposition that a stinging fly is meant is that all such flies are, like this one, plagues to beasts rather than men; and if we conjecture that a fly is intended, perhaps it is more reasonable to infer that it was the common fly, which in the present day is probably the most troublesome insect in Egypt. That this was a more severe plague than those preceding it appears from its effect on Pharaoh, rather than from the mention of the exemption of the Israelites, for it can scarcely be supposed that the earlier plagues affected them. As we do not know what creature is here intended, we cannot say if there were any reference in this case to the Egyptian religion. Those who suppose it to have been a beetle might draw attention to the great reverence in which that insect was held among the sacred animals, and the consequent distress that the Egyptians would have felt at destroying it, even if they did so unintentionally. As already noticed, no insect is now so troublesome in Egypt as the common fly, and this is not the case with any kind of beetle, which fact, from our general conclusions, will be seen to favor the evidence for the former. In the hot season the flies not only cover the food and drink, but they torment the people by settling on their faces, and especially round their eyes, thus promoting ophthalmia. SEE FLY.

(5.) The “Plague” of the Murcrin of Beasts. — Pharaoh was next warned that, if he did not let the people go, there should be on the day following “a very grievous murrain,” upon the horses, asses, camels, oxen, and sheep of Egypt, whereas those of the children of Israel should not die. This came to pass, and we read that “all the cattle of Egypt died, but of the cattle of the children of Israel died not one.” Yet Pharaoh still continued obstinate (Exo 9:1-7). It is to be observed that the expression “all the cattle” cannot be under-stood to be universal, but only general, for the narrative of the plague of hail shows that there were still at a later time some cattle left, and that the want of universal terms in Hebrew explains this seeming difficulty. The mention of camels is important, since it appears to favor, our opinion that the Pharaoh of the Exodus was a foreigner, camels apparently not having been kept by the Egyptians of the time of the Pharaohs. This plague would have been a heavy punishment to the Egyptians as falling upon their sacred animals of two of the kinds specified, the oxen and the sheep; but it would have been most felt in the destruction of the greatest part of their useful beasts. In modern times murrain is not an infrequent visitation in Egypt, and is supposed to precede the plague. A very severe murrain occurred in that country in 1842, which lasted nine months, during the latter half of that year and the spring of the following one, and was succeeded by the plague, as had been anticipated (Mrs. Poole, Englishwoman in Egypt, 2, 32; 1, 59, 114). ‘A very grievous murrain,' forcibly reminding us of that which visited this same country in the days of Moses, has prevailed during the last three months” the letter is dated Oct. 18, 1842, “and the already distressed peasants feel the calamity severely, or rather (I should say) the few who possess cattle. Among the rich men of the country the loss has been enormous. During our voyage up the Nile,” in the July preceding, “we observed several dead cows and buffaloes lying in the river as I mentioned in a former letter; and some friends who followed us, two months after, saw many on the banks; indeed up to this time “great numbers of cattle are dying in every part of the country” (ibid. 1, 114,115). The similarity of the calamity in character is remarkably in contrast with its difference in duration: the miraculous murrain seems to have been as sudden and nearly as brief as the destruction of the first-born (though far less terrible), and to have therefore produced, on ceasing, less effect than other plagues upon Pharaoh, nothing remaining to be removed. SEE MURRAIN.

(6.) The “Plague” of Boils. — The next judgment appears to have been preceded by no warning, except, indeed, that when Moses publicly sent it abroad in Egypt, Pharaoh might no doubt have repented at the last moment. We read that Moses and Aaron were to take ashes of the furnace, and Moses was to “sprinkle it toward the heavens in the sight of Pharaoh.” It was to become “small dust” throughout Egypt, and “be a boil breaking forth [with] blains upon man and upon beast.” This accordingly came to pass. The magicians now once more seem to have attempted opposition, for it is related that they “could not stand before Moses because of the boil; for the boil was upon the magicians, and upon all the Egyptians.” Notwithstanding, Pharaoh still refused to let the Israelites go (Exo 9:8-12). This plague may be supposed to have been either an infliction of boils, or a pestilence like the plague of modern times, which is an extremely severe kind of typhus fever, accompanied by swellings. SEE PLAGUE. The former is, however, the more likely explanation, since, if the plague had been of the latter nature it probably would have been less' severe than the ordinary pestilence of Egypt has been in this 19th century, whereas with other plagues which can be illustrated from the present phenomena of Egypt: the reverse is the case. That this plague followed that of the murrain seems, however, an argument on the other side, and it may be asked whether it is not likely that the great pestilence of the country, probably known in antiquity, would have been one of the ten plagues; but to this it may be replied that it is more probable, and in accordance with the whole narrative, that extraordinary and unexpected wonders should be effected than what could be paralleled in the history of Egypt. — The tenth plague, moreover, is so much like the great Egyptian disease in its suddenness, that it might rather be compared to it if it were not so wholly miraculous in every respect as to be beyond the reach of human inquiry. The position of the magicians must be noticed as indicative of the gradation of the plagues: at first they succeeded, as we suppose, by deception, in imitating what was wrought by Moses, then they failed, and acknowledged the finger of God in the wonders of the Hebrew prophet, and at last they could not even stand before him, being themselves smitten by the plague he was commissioned to send. The boil (שְׁחַין, shechin) was a scab or pustule, which might of might not break out into an ulcerous sore (Lev 13:18 sq.). With this, in one of its worst forms, Job was afflicted (Job 2:7), and by this Hezekiah was brought to the verge of the grave (2Ki 20:7;  Isa 38:21): it was an eruption of a very painful kind, accompanied with a burning itch, and tending to produce a permanent state of foul and wasting disease. One species of it which seized upon the legs and knees, and was regarded as incurable, was peculiar to Egypt, and was hence called “the botch of Egypt” (Deu 28:27; Deu 28:35). In the case before us, this eruption had a tendency to break out into larger swellings (אנעבעת, from unused בוע, to boil up, to swell), and became probably the disease called elephantiasis, a disease said to be peculiar to Egypt, or the black leprosy, a disease which also affects cattle under the name of melandria (Jahn, Arch Sol. I, 1, 381 sq.). It was something evidently more severe and deadly than the endemic Nile-fever, or eruption which visits Egypt periodically about the time of the overflowing of the Nile; and with which some writers would identify it. SEE BOIL.

(7.) The “Plague” of Hail. — The account of the seventh plague is preceded by a warning, which Moses was commanded to deliver to Pharaoh, respecting the terrible nature of the plagues that were to ensue if he remained obstinate. First of all of the hail it is said, “Behold, tomorrow about this time I will cause it to rain a very grievous hail, such as hath not been in Egypt since the foundation thereof even until now.” He was then told to collect his cattle and men into shelter, for everything hailed upon should die. Accordingly, such of Pharaoh's servants as “feared the Lord,” brought in their servants and cattle from the field. We read that “Moses stretched forth his rod toward heaven: and the Lord sent thunder and hail, and the fire ran along upon the ground.” Thus man and beast were smitten, and the herbs and every tree broken, save in the land of Goshen. Upon this Pharaoh acknowledged his wickedness and that of his people, and the righteousness of God, and promised if the plague were withdrawn to let the Israelites go. Then Moses went forth from the city, and spread out his hands, and the plague ceased, when Pharaoh, supported by his servants, again broke his promise (Exo 9:13-35). The character of this and the following plagues must be carefully examined, as the warning seems to indicate an important turning-point. The ruin caused by the hail was evidently far greater than that effected by any of the earlier plagues; it destroyed men which those others seem not to have done, and not only men, but beasts and the produce of the earth. In this case Moses, while addressing Pharaoh, openly warns his servants how  to save something from the calamity. Pharaoh for the first time acknowledges his wickedness. We also learn that his people joined with him in the oppression, and that at this time he dwelt in a city. Hail is now extremely rare, but not unknown, in Egypt, and it is interesting that the narrative seems to imply that it sometimes falls there. Thunder- storms occur, but, though very loud and accompanied by rain and ‘wind, they rarely do serious injury. Those long resident in Egypt do not remember to have heard while there of a person struck by lightning, nor of any ruin excepting that of decayed buildings washed down by rain. SEE HAIL.

(8.) The “Plague” of Locusts. — Pharaoh was now threatened with a plague of locusts, to begin the next day, by which everything the hail had left was to be devoured. This was to exceed any like visitations that had happened in the time of the king's ancestors. At last Pharaoh's own servants, who had before supported him, remonstrated, for we read, “And Pharaoh's servants said unto him, How long shall this man be a snare unto us? let the men go, that they may serve the Lord their God: knowest thou not yet that Egypt is destroyed?” They suggested a compromise with Moses, proposing that the men should be allowed to go with him to offer sacrifice to Jehovah in the wilderness, while by retaining the females they made sure of the men's returning to their servitude. Then Pharaoh sent for Moses and Aaron, and offered to let the people go, but refused when they required that all should go, even with their flocks and herds. “And Moses stretched forth his rod over the land of Egypt, and the Lord brought an east wind upon the land all that day, and all [that] night; [and] when it was morning the east wind brought the locusts. And the locusts went up over all the land of Egypt, and rested in all the coasts of Egypt: very grievous [were they]; before them there were no such locusts as they, neither after them shall be such. For they covered the face of the whole earth, so that the land was darkened; and they did eat every herb of the land, and all the fruit of the trees which the hail had left: and there remained not any green thing in the trees, or in the herbs of the field, through all the land of Egypt.” Then Pharaoh hastily sent for Moses and Aaron, and confessed his sin against God and the Israelites, and begged them to forgive him: “Now, therefore, forgive, I pray thee, my sin only this once, and entreat the Lord your God that he may take away from me this death only.” Moses accordingly prayed. “And the Lord turned a mighty strong west wind,  which took away the locusts, and cast them into the Red Sea; there remained not one locust in all the coasts of Egypt.” The plague being removed, Pharaoh again would not let the people go (Exo 10:1-20). This plague has not the unusual nature of the one that preceded it, but it even exceeds it in severity, and so occupies its place in the gradation of the more terrible judgments that form the later part of the series. Its severity can be well understood by those who have been in Egypt in a part of the country where a flight of locusts has alighted. In this case the plague was greater than an ordinary visitation, since it extended over a far wider space, rather than because it was more intense; for it is impossible to imagine any more complete destruction than that always caused by a swarm of locusts. So well did the people of Egypt know what these creatures effected, that when their coming was threatened Pharaoh's servants at once remonstrated. In the present day locusts suddenly appear in the cultivated land, coming from the desert in a column of great length. They fly rapidly across the country, darkening the air with their compact ranks, which are undisturbed by the constant attacks of kites, crows, and vultures, and making a strange whizzing sound like that of fire, or many distant wheels. Where they alight they devour every green thing, even stripping the trees of their leaves. Rewards are offered for their destruction, but no labor can seriously reduce their numbers. Soon they continue their course, and disappear gradually in a short time, leaving the place where they have been a desert. The following careful description of the effects of a flight of locusts is from Mr. Lane's manuscript notes. He writes of Nubia:

“Locusts not infrequently commit dreadful havoc in this country. In my second voyage up the Nile, when before the village of Bustán, a little above Ibrim, many locusts pitched upon the boat. They were beautifully variegated, yellow and blue. In the following night a southerly wind brought other locusts in immense swarms. Next morning the air was darkened by them, as by a heavy fall of snow; and the surface of the ground was thickly scattered over by those which had fallen and were unable to rise again. Great numbers came upon and within the boat, and alighted upon our persons. They were different from those of the preceding day, being of a bright yellow color, with brown marks. The desolation they made was dreadful. In four hours a field of young durrah [millet] was cropped to the ground. In another field of durrah more advanced only the stalks were left. Nowhere was there space on the ground to set the foot  without treading on many. A field of cotton-plants was quite stripped. Even the acacias along the batiks were made bare, and palm-trees were stripped of the fruit and leaves. Last night we heard the creaking of the sekiyehs [water-wheels], and the singing of women driving the cows which turned them: today not one sakiyeh was in motion, and the women were going about howling, and vainly attempting to frighten away the locusts. On the preceding day I had preserved two of the more beautiful Kind of these creatures with a solution of arsenic: on the next day some of the other locusts ate them almost entirely, poisoned as they were, unseen by me till they had nearly finished their meal. On the third day they were less numerous, and gradually disappeared. Locusts ate eaten by most of the Bedawin of Arabia, and by some of the Nubians. We ate a few, dressed in the most approved manner, being stripped of the legs, wings, and head, and fried in butter. They had a flavor somewhat like that of the woodcock, owing to their food. The Arabs preserve them as a common article of provision by parboiling them in salt and water, and then drying them in the sun.”

The parallel passages in the prophecy of Joel form a remarkable commentary on the description of the plague in Exodus, and a few must be here quoted, for they describe with wonderful exactness and vigor the devastations of a swarm of locusts: “Blow ye the trumpet in Zion, and sound an alarm in my holy mountain: let all the inhabitants of the land tremble: for the day of the Lord cometh, for [it is] nigh at hand; a day of darkness and of gloominess, a day of clouds and of thick darkness, as the morning spread upon the mountains: a great people and a strong; there hath not been ever the like, neither shall be any more after it, [even] to the years of many generations. A fire devoureth before them; and behind them a flame burneth: the land [is] as the garden of Eden before them, and behind them a desolate wilderness; yea, and nothing shall escape them. The appearance of them [is] as the appearance of horses; and as horsemen, so shall they run. Like the noise of chariots on the tops of mountains shall they leap, like the noise of a flame of fire that devoureth the stubble, as a strong people set in battle array.... They shall run like mighty men; they shall climb the wall like men of war; and they shall march every one on his ways, and they shall not break their ranks.... The earth shall quake before them; the heavens shall tremble: the sun and the moon shall be dark, and the stars shall withdraw their shining” (2:1-5, 7, 10; see also 6:8 & 9, 11- 25; Rev 9:1-12). Here, and probably also in the parallel passage  of Revelation, locusts are taken as a type of a destroying army or horde, since they are more terrible in the devastation they cause than any other creatures. SEE LOCUST.

(9.) The “Plague” of Darkness. — After the plague of locusts we read at once of a fresh judgment: “And the Lord said unto Moses, Stretch out thine hand toward heaven, that there may be darkness over the land of Egypt, that [one] may feel darkness. And Moses stretched forth his hand toward heaven; and there was a thick darkness in all the land of Egypt three days: they saw not one another, neither rose any from his place for three days: but all the children of Israel had light in their dwellings.” Pharaoh then gave the Israelites leave to go if only they left their cattle; but when Moses required that they should take these also he again refused (Exo 10:21-29). The expression we have rendered “that [one] may feel darkness,” according to the A.V. in the margin, where in the text the freer translation “darkness [which] may be felt” is given, has occasioned much difficulty. The Sept. and Vulg. give this rendering, and the moderns generally follow them. It has been proposed to read “and they shall grope in darkness,” by a slight change of rendering, and the supposition that the particle בְּ is understood (Kalisch, Comment. on Exodus p. 171). It is unreasonable to argue that the forcible words of the A. V. are too strong for Shemitic phraseology. The difficulty is, however, rather to be solved by a consideration of the nature of the plague. It has been illustrated by reference to the simuim and the hot wind of the khamsin. The former is a sandstorm which occurs in the desert, seldom lasting, according to Mr. Lane, more than a quarter of an hour or twenty minutes (Mod. Eg. 5th ed. p. 2); but for the time often causing the darkness of twilight, and affecting man and beast. Mrs. Poole, on Mr. Lane's authority, has described the simûm as follows:

“The ‘simfir,' which is a very violent, hot, and almost suffocating wind, is of more rare occurrence than the khamsin winds, and of shorter duration; its continuance being more brief in proportion to the intensity of its parching heat and the impetuosity of its course. Its direction is generally from the southeast, or south southeast. It is commonly preceded by a fearful calm. As it approaches, the atmosphere assumes a yellowish hue, tinged with red; the sun appears of a deep blood color, and gradually becomes quite concealed before the hot blast is felt in its full violence. The sand  and dust raised by the wind add to the gloom, and increase the painful effects of the heat and rarity of the air. Respiration becomes uneasy, perspiration seems to be entirely stopped; the tongue is dry, the skin parched, and a pricking sensation is experienced, as if caused by electric sparks. It is sometimes impossible for a person to remain erect, on account of the force of the wind; and the sand and dust oblige all who are exposed to it to keep their eyes closed. It is, however, most distressing when it overtakes travelers in the desert. My brother encountered at Kus, in Upper Egypt, a simûm, which was said to be one of the most violent ever witnessed. It lasted less than half an hour, and a very violent simûm seldom continues longer. My brother is of opinion that, although it is extremely distressing, it can never prove fatal, unless to persons already brought almost to the point of death by disease, fatigue, thirst, or some other cause. The poor camel seems to suffer from it equally with his master; and will often lie down with his back to the wind, close his eyes, stretch out his long neck upon the ground, and so remain until the storm has passed over” (Englishwoman in Egypt, 1, 96, 97).

The hot wind of the khamsin usually blows for three days and nights, and carries so much sand with it that it produces the appearance of a yellow fog. It thus resembles the simûm, though far less powerful and far less distressing in its effects. It is not known to cause actual darkness; at least residents in Egypt mention no example either on experience or hearsay evidence. By a confusion of the simûm and the khamsin wind it has even been supposed that a simûm in its utmost violence usually lasts three days (Kalisch, Comment. on Exodus p. 170), but this is an error. The plague may, however, have been an extremely severe sandstorm, miraculous in its violence and its duration, for the length of three days does not make it natural, since the severe storms are always very brief. Perhaps the three days was the limit, as about the longest period that the people could exist without leaving their houses. It has been supposed that this plague rather caused a supernatural terror than actual suffering and loss, but this is by no means certain. The impossibility of moving about, and the natural fear of darkness which affects beasts and birds as well as men, as in a total eclipse, would have caused suffering; and if the plague were a sandstorm of unequalled severity, it would have produced the conditions of fever by its parching heat, besides causing much distress of other kinds. An evidence in  favor of the wholly supernatural character of this plague is its preceding the last judgment of all, the death of the first-born, as if it were a terrible foreshadowing of that great calamity. SEE SIMUM.

(10.) The Death of the First-born. — Before the tenth plague Moses went to warn Pharaoh: “And Moses said, Thus saith the Lord, About midnight will I go out into the midst of Egypt: and all the first-born in the land of Egypt shall die, from the first-born of Pharaoh that sitteth upon his throne, even unto the firstborn of the maidservant that [is] behind the mill; and all the first-born of beasts. And there shall be a great cry throughout all the land of Egypt, such as there was none like it, nor shall be like it any more.” He then foretold that Pharaoh's servants would pray him to go forth. Positive as is this declaration, it seems to have been a conditional warning, for we read, “And he went out from Pharaoh in heat of anger,” and it is added that God said that Pharaoh would not hearken to Moses, and that the king of Egypt still refused to let Israel go (Exo 11:4; Exo 11:10). The Passover was then instituted, and the houses of the Israelites sprinkled with the blood of the victims. The first-born of the Egyptians were smitten at midnight, as Moses had forewarned Pharaoh. “And Pharaoh rose up in the night, he, and all his servants, and all the Egyptians; and there was a great cry in Egypt; for [there was] not a house where [there was] not one dead” (Exo 12:30). The clearly miraculous nature of this plague, in its severity, its falling upon man and beast, and the singling out of the first- born, puts it wholly beyond comparison with any natural pestilence, even the severest recorded in history, whether of the peculiar Egyptian plague, or other like epidemics. The Bible affords a parallel in the smiting of Sennacherib's army, and still more closely in some of the punishments of murmurers in the wilderness. The prevailing customs of Egypt furnish a curious illustration of the narrative of this plague. It is well known that many ancient Egyptian customs are yet observed. Among these one of the most prominent is the wailing for the dead by the women of the household, as well as those hired to mourn. It was thus in the great cholera of 1848 at Cairo. This pestilence, as we all know, frequently follows the course of rivers. Thus, on that occasion, it ascended the Nile, and showed itself in great strength at Bulak, the port of Cairo, distant from the city about a mile and a half to the westward. For some days it did not traverse this space. Every evening at sunset it is the custom to go up to the terrace on the roof of the house. There, in  that calm, still time, might be heard each night the wail of the women of Bulak for their dead borne along in a great wave of sound a distance of two miles, the lamentation of a city stricken with pestilence. So, when the first-born were smitten, “there was a great cry in Egypt.” SEE FIRST-BORN.

The history of the ten plagues strictly ends with the death of the first-born. The pursuit and the passage of the Red Sea are discussed elsewhere. SEE RED SEA, PASSAGE OF. Here it is only necessary to notice that with the event last mentioned the recital of the wonders wrought in Egypt concludes, and the history of Israel as a separate people begins. SEE EXODE.

II. General Considerations. — Having examined the narrative of the ten plagues in detail, we can now speak of their character and relations as a whole.

1. Miraculous Nature of the Inflictions. — In the above account we have constantly kept in view the arguments of those who hold that the plagues were not miraculous, and, while fully admitting all the illustration that the physical history of Egypt has afforded us, both in our own observation and the observation of others, we have found no reason for the naturalistic view in a single instance, while in many instances the illustrations from known phenomena have been so different as to bring out the miraculous element in the narrative with the greatest force, and in every case that element has been necessary, unless the narrative be deprived of its rights as historical evidence. Yet more, we have found that the advocates of a naturalistic explanation have been forced by their bias into a distortion and exaggeration of natural phenomena in ‘their endeavor to find in them an explanation of the wonders recorded in the Bible. As miraculous the historian obviously intends us to regard them, and they are elsewhere spoken of as the “wonders” (מופתים) which God wrought in the land of Ham (Psa 105:27), as his miracles (נפלאותים) in Egypt (Psa 106:7), as his signs and prodigies (אתות ומפתים) which he sent into the midst of Egypt (Psa 135:9), etc. It is only under this aspect that we can accept the narrative as historical. It is true that many of them appear to have been of the same kind with phenomena natural to the country; but this cannot be said of all of them; and in the case of those of which it can be said, the presence of the supernatural is seen not only in the unparalleled degree to which the infliction reached, but still more in the complete  command which was exercised by Moses as the agent of Jehovah over the coming and going of the visitation. The exemption of the Israelites from the general calamity is also clearly assigned to the miraculous. The only alternative, therefore, allowed to us is to reject the whole narrative as mythic, or to accept it as miraculous. The attempts made by Eichhorn and the older rationalists to give natural explanations of these plagues, only exhibit the deplorable expedients to which an unsound hypothesis may compel able men to resort. They were evidently nearly all miraculous in time of occurrence and degree rather than essentially, in accordance with the theory that God generally employs natural means in producing miraculous effects. They seem to have been sent as a series of warnings, each being somewhat more severe than its predecessor, to which we see an analogy in the warnings which the providential government of the world often puts before the sinner. The first plague corrupted the sweet water of the Nile and slew the fish. The second filled the land with frogs, which corrupted the whole country. The third covered man and beast with vermin or other annoying insects. The fourth was of the same kind, and probably a yet severer judgment. With the fifth plague, the murrain of beasts, a loss of property began. The sixth, the plague of boils, was worse than the earlier plagues that had affected man and beast. The seventh plague— that of hail— exceeded those that went before it, since it destroyed everything in the field, man and beast and herb. The eighth plague was evidently still more grievous, since the devastation by locusts must have been far more thorough than that by the hail, and since at that time no greater calamity of the kind could have happened than the destruction of all remaining vegetable food. The ninth plague we do not sufficiently understand to be sure that it exceeded this in actual injury, but it is clear from the narrative that it must have caused great terror. The last plague is the only one that was general in the destruction of human life, for the effects of the hail cannot have been comparable to those it produced, and it completes the climax, unless indeed it be held that the passage of the Red Sea was the crowning point of the whole series of wonders, rather than a separate miracle. In this case its magnitude, as publicly destroying the king and his whole army, might even surpass that of the tenth plague.

2. Their Historical Character. — These events, though supernatural, all find a foundation in the natural phenomena of Egypt, and stand in close connection with ordinary occurrences. Hence the rationalist Bohlen says that “Moses, in order to avoid the suspicion of self-deception, was at least  obliged to express himself in the mildest manner possible among his contemporaries, who were so well acquainted with Egypt, if he wished to make the commonly observed natural phenomena avail as miracles.” To this remark Hengstenberg replies (Egypt and the Books of Moses, in English, Edinb. 1851):

“But it is perfectly clear that these occurrences, as they are related, In withstanding their foundation in nature, always maintained their character as miracles, and consequently are sufficient to prove what they are intended to prove, and to accomplish what they did accomplish. Indeed, the unusual force in which the common exhibitions of nature here manifest themselves, and especially their rapid succession, while at other times only am single one exhibits itself with unusual intensity-if we at the same time consider these events in connection with the changing cause of them, and also take into account the exemption of the land of Goshen—bring us to the limits of the miraculous; for the transition to the miraculous is reached through the extraordinary in its highest gradation. But we are brought into the sphere of the miraculous itself, by the circumstance that these things are introduced and performed by Moses, that they cease at his request, and a part of them at a time fixed upon by Pharaoh himself (Exo 8:5 sq.). Hence the connection with natural phenomena can be made to avail against the Pentateuch only when, going beyond the present narrative, we limit what in it can be explained by the natural occurrences of Egypt, and establish the presumption that the remainder belongs to fiction. But this assumption wants all foundation. The supernatural presents generally, in the Scriptures, no violent opposition to the - natural, but rather unites in a friendly alliance with it. This follows from the most intimate relation in which natural events also stand to God. The endeavor to isolate the miraculous can aid only impiety. But there was here a particular reason also for uniting the supernatural as closely as possible with the natural. The object to which all of these occurrences were directed, according to Exo 8:20, was to show that Jehovah is Lord in the midst of the land. Well-rounded proof of this could not have been produced by bringing suddenly upon Egypt a succession of strange terrors. From these it would only have followed that Jehovah had received a momentary and external power over Egypt. On the contrary, if  their annual return were placed under the immediate control of Jehovah, it would be appropriately shown that he was God in the midst of the land, and the doom of the false gods which had been placed in his stead would go forth, and they would be entirely driven out of the jurisdiction which was contested as belonging to them.”

Some objectors have affected to throw discredit upon the Mosaic narrative by remarking that no traces of any allusion to these plagues of the Egyptians are discoverable upon the monuments of that country. To this the reply is easy. The monuments in question were reared under the superintendence of the heathen priesthood, and miracles such as these were too humbling to their pride, and too destructive of their influence with the people, to render it likely that they would allow them to be recorded in any manner. Victories triumphs, religious processions, and whatever was calculated to exalt the gods and kings in the minds of the people, were the only subjects permitted to be sculptured on the walls of the temples; and the usages of domestic life furnish the subjects of the paintings of the tombs. In the examination we have made it will have been seen that the Biblical narrative has been illustrated by reference to the phenomena of Egypt and the manners of the inhabitants, and that, throughout, its accuracy in minute particulars has been remarkably shown, to a degree that is sufficient of itself to prove its historical truth. This in a narrative of wonders is of no small importance. SEE MOSES.

3. The Egyptian Counterfeits. — Of the deeds performed by Moses some were imitated by the magicians of the Pharaoh. To account for this, various hypotheses have been resorted to.

1. It has been supposed that they were enabled to do this by diabolic aid. But this assumes the position that men can enter into agreement or compact with evil spirits so as to receive their aid-a position which has never been proved, and consequently cannot be legitimately assumed to explain an actual phenomenon. This hypothesis assumes also that evil spirits can work miracles, a position no less gratuitous and improbable.

2. It has been maintained that the magicians were aided by God to do what they did; that they were instruments in his hand, as was the witch who raised Samuel, and were therefore as much surprised at their own success as she was; and that God thus employed them probably to show in the most decisive manner that the agency at work was his, and  that it was just as he gave the power or withheld it that the miracle was performed. For this hypothesis there is much to be, said. At the same time it is open to objection, for

(1) While Moses distinctly asserts that it was by divine power that he and Aaron wrought, he never hints, even in the most distant way, that it was by this that the magicians succeeded in their attempts; and

(2) It is expressly said, on the contrary, that what they did they did by means of their “enchantments.” The word here used (להט) means a secret art-hence magical arts, enchantments; and may be properly used to designate the covert, tricks or juggling artifices by which practicers of legerdemain impose upon others. This leads to the 3rd hypothesis, which is that the achievements of the magicians were merely clever tricks by which they imposed upon the people, and tended to confirm the Pharaoh in his obduracy. This hypothesis has in its favor the fact that the magicians of Egypt, and of the East generally, have always, down: to our own day, possessed an unparalleled and almost incredible dexterity in artificial magic (see Lane, Modern Egyptians, p. 352 sq.). It is to be borne in mind, also, that in the cases before us these magicians were allowed time: to prepare themselves, and to go through those introductory processes by means of which jugglers mainly succeed in cheating the beholders; and, moreover, it is important to keep in view that they performed before witnesses who were interested in believing in their success. Above all, in the three feats in which they succeeded, there was really nothing but what the jugglers of the present day could easily do. The jugglers- of India will, for a few pence, do tricks with serpents far more wonderful than making them rigid so as to resemble staves; and any juggler could make water in a basin or a tank resemble blood, or, when the country was already swarming with frogs, could cover some place that had been cleared for the purpose with these reptiles, as if he had suddenly produced them. The performances of these magicians are really below par as compared with those which may be witnessed in the room of any travelling conjurer among ourselves. Let it be noted, also, that they failed as soon as they were required to perform the miracle on the instant, as in the case of the plague of lice, for their attempts to imitate which no time was allowed; and, as a consequence of this it is emphatically said, “they could not.” When to all this it is added that they were impotent not only to remove the infliction, but even to  exempt themselves from it, there seems abundant reason for concluding that these magicians attained to nothing beyond the performance of a few successful tricks (Scot, Congregational Lecture, p. 210-226; Wardlaw, On Miracles, p. 231 sq.). SEE JANNES AND JAMBRES.

4. The Design of these Inflictions. — This-is a most important inquiry. That their ultimate object was the effecting of the liberation of the Israelites from their cruel bondage lies on the surface of the narrative; but with this there may have been, and probably were, other ends contemplated. We may suppose.

1. That God designed to produce an effect on the mind of Moses himself, tending to educate and discipline him for the great work on which he was about to enter—the conduct and rule of the people during their passage through the wilderness. For such a task great fortitude and implicit confidence in the power and majesty of Jehovah were required; and as Moses, timid at first, and ready to retire on the first rebuff, gradually acquired courage and determination as the manifestations of God's power in the chastisements inflicted on the Pharaoh and his land proceeded, it is very probable that the series of inflictions of which he was the instrument were designed to confirm him in faith, obedience, and confidence, and so fit him for his great work.

2. We may suppose that a salutary effect was intended to be produced on the minds of the Israelites, the mass of whom had, under their long protracted debasement, sunk low in religious and intellectual life. The marvelous manner in which God interposed for their deliverance, and the mighty power by which he brought them forth, could not but arouse them to thought, and elevate and quicken their religious emotions.

3. It appears that a salutary religious effect was, produced on many of the Egyptians themselves, as is evidenced by the multitudes who united themselves to the Israelites when they made their escape; and also on the surrounding nations, as is attested by Jethro, the father-in-law of Moses (Exo 18:10-11). We may presume, therefore, that this also was part of the design of these inflictions, especially as we find God expressly declaring to Moses that these judgments were intended to make the Egyptians know that he was God (Exo 8:5).

4. But these ends were included in the great end of demonstrating the vanity of those idols in which the Egyptians trusted. “Against all the gods of Egypt,” said the Lord to Moses, “I will execute judgment: I am Jehovah” (Exo 12:12). On these idols God would pour contempt; and in connection with this it is noticeable, that nearly every miracle performed by Moses had relation to some object of idolatrous worship among the Egyptians. The devouring of the serpents by the serpent into which the rod of Moses had been turned was directed against the serpent-worship of Egypt; the turning of the water into blood was an assault on their sacred river the Nile; the plague of the  frogs, the gnats, the flies or scarabei, all tended to bring objects of idolatrous worship among the Egyptians into contempt; the murrain on the cattle was directed against their Apis-worship; the plague of boils, brought on by the casting of ashes from the altar into the air, a rite which they followed to arrest evil, showed how God could reverse their omens, and make what they used for good to turn to evil; the hail and storm plague was directed against their worship of the elements, or of deities supposed to preside over them; the plague of locusts showed that this great scourge which they were accustomed to trace to the wrath of their deities was entirely in the power of Jehovah; the plague of darkness poured contempt on their worship of the sun-god; and the death of the first-born wound up this terrible series by showing that in the hand of Jehovah alone was the life of all his creatures. A mighty and memorable lesson was thus read out before both Egyptians and Israelites, which could not but have its effect in weakening among the former the attachment of many to their idols, and confirming the latter in their reverence for Jehovah as the only true God.

5. The gradual increase in severity and frequent remission of the plagues are perhaps the best key to their meaning as to the king of Egypt himself. They seem to have been sent as warnings to the oppressor, to afford him a means of seeing God's will and an opportunity of repenting before Egypt was ruined. It is true that the hardening of Pharaoh's heart is a mystery which St. Paul leaves unexplained, answering the objector, “Nay but, O man, who art thou that repliest against God?” (Rom 9:20). Yet the apostle is arguing that we have no right to question God's righteousness for not having mercy on all, and speaks of his long-suffering towards the wicked. The lesson that Pharaoh's career teaches us seems to be that there are men whom the most signal judgments do not affect so as to cause any lasting repentance. In this respect the after-history of the Jewish people is a commentary upon that of their oppressor. The “hardening” of Pharaoh's heart was evidently nothing more than that permissive act of providence by which a long-delayed punishment encourages to the persistence in sin (Ecc 8:11; Rom 2:5). God's design in so often releasing him (ἐξήγειρα, Rom 9:17) from the earlier stages of the inflictions was that the final blow might fall with full effect, both as to Pharaoh and the world at large. SEE JUDICIAL BLINDNESS.

See Stackhouse, Hist. of the Bible; Bryant, Observations on the Plagues inflicted on the Egyptians (Lond. 1794); Eichhorn, De Egypti anno mirabili. in the Comment. Soc. Reg. Scient. Göttingen. Recentior. 4, 45; Schwarz, De plaqis Pharonis (Wittemb. 1724); Bonsdorf, De plumis Egypt. (Aboae, 1809-10); Hengstenberg, — Egypt and the Books of Moses; Millington, Signs and Wonders (Lond. 1874); British Quarterly Review, July, 1874, p. 153 sq.; and the various commentaries, ad loc.

## Plaifere (or Playfere), John, D.D[[@Headword:Plaifere (or Playfere), John, D.D]]

             an English divine of some note, flourished near the close of the 16th and the opening of the 17th century. He was educated at St. John's College, Cambridge, and was for some time fellow of his alma mater. About 1596 he was made Margaret professor of divinity in the same college. He died in 1608. He was an Arminian in theology, and his writings circulated extensively and had great renown. Thomas Baker, the antiquary, says that if Plaifere's sermons had never been printed, his name would yet have been honored in history, so decidedly marked was his influence on his time. Among his works we mention Appello Evangeliunt for the True Doctrine of Divine Predestination, etc. (Lond. 1652, 12mo); republished in Cambridge Tracts (1803, 8vo). See Catter-mole, Literature of the Ch. of England. 10, 334; Churchman's Remembrancer, vol. 1.

## Plain[[@Headword:Plain]]

Text>

## Plain[[@Headword:Plain]]

             I. This term, either in the singular or plural, does duty in the A.V. for no less than seven distinct Hebrew words, each of which had its own independent and individual meaning, and could not be-at least is not- interchanged with any other. We frequently find two, three, and even more equivalents for the same Hebrew term; and, besides, some of the words are manifestly mistranslated, and some of them are proper names. SEE TOPOGRAPHICAL TERMS.

1. אָבְל, abel, like the Arabic abala, signifies moisture and the verdure produced by it, as in a meadow, to which last term it chiefly corresponds. Hence it came to be applied to a low green plain. It occurs frequently as a proper name in Scripture; chiefly, however, in composition, as Abel-beth- maachah (2Ki 15:29; 1Ki 15:20), Abel-meholah (Jdg 7:22), Abel-maim (2Ch 16:4), Abel-shittim (Num 33:49); also alone, as in 2Sa 20:14; 2Sa 20:18. In 1Sa 6:18 the  A. V. reads” unto the great stone of Abel;” but the Hebrew is עד אבל הגדולה, “unto Abel the great.” Several MSS. read אבן, “stone” (the Sept. has λίθου), and this is probably the true reading (De Rossi, Var. Lect. ad loc.). Jdg 11:33 is the only passage in which it is rendered “plain,” “and he smote them from Aroer, even till thou come to Minnith... and unto the plain of the vineyards” (עד אבל כרמים; Sept. ἕως Ε᾿βελχαρμίμ, v. r. Α᾿βὲλ ἀμπελώνων; Abel qua est vineis consita). There can scarcely be a doubt that this is a proper name, and it should be rendered Abel-keramim. Eusebius and Jerome mention it as a village of the Ammonites still existing in their day, situated six miles from Philadelphia, in the midst of vineyards (Onomnast. s.v. Abelavinearum). SEE ABEL.

2. אֵלוֹן, elon. This word is derived from the root אוּל, to be strong; and hence it is used in Scripture to signify a strong tree, and most probably the oak, which grows to a great size in central and southern Palestine (Gesenius, Thesaur. p. 42, 50, 51). In the A.V. it is rendered “plain” (Gen 12:6; Gen 13:18, etc.), or “plains' (18, 1; Deu 11:30), but in one place the margin has “oak” (Jdg 9:6). It is difficult to account for this rendering. Probably it was adopted from the Vulgate, which translates convallis in four places, vallis in two, and quercus in three. The Sept. has δρῦς, except in Jdg 9:9, where it has βάλανος; and Jdg 9:37, ῾Ηλωνμαωνενίμ,I. The word should always be rendered “oak.” It was considered a sacred tree. Under “the oak of Moreh,” at Manure, Abraham pitched his tent, and worshipped God (Stanley, S. and P. p. 508). SEE OAK.

3. בַּקְעָה, bik'ah, is from the root בָּקִע, to cleave asunder, and signifies literally a cleft, or place formed by dividing mountains, then a valley between mountains; It is equivalent to the Arabic buk'ah. It is generally used in the Bible to denote a low widely extended plain: as “the plain of Shinar” (Gen 11:2; Sept. πεδίον; campus); “the valley of Jericho” (Deu 34:3); “the valley of Megiddo” (2Ch 35:22; Zec 12:1-1); “the valley of Lebanon” (Jos 11:17, called in Amo 1:5 “the plain of Aven”), which is now called el-Bukaa; “the plain of Ono” (Neh 6:2), which appears to have been a portion of southern Sharon, where the town of Ono was situated. This word is rendered “plain” in the following passages: Gen 11:2; Neh 6:2; Isa 40:4; Eze 3:22-23; Eze 8:4; Amo 1:5; elsewhere it is translated “valley.” It is generally rendered πεδίον in the Sept. and  campus in the Vulgate. בַקְּעָא, bik'a, the Chaldee form of בקעה, found only in Daniel 3. Nebuchadnezzar set up “the golden image in the plain of Dura.” SEE VALLEY.

4. כַּכָּר, kikkar, seems to be equivalent to כַּרְכָּר, from the root כָּרִר, to move in a circle; ככרtherefore signifies a circuit, or” the region round about any place” (allied to which are κύκλος, circus, and circle; Gesenius, Thesaur. p. 717). Hence, with the article הִכַּכָּר, hakkikkar, it was applied topographically to “the region of the Jordan,” especially the southern part of it, in which the cities of Sodom and Gomorrah once stood. It is so used seven times in Genesis (Gen 13:10-12; Gen 19:17; Gen 19:25; Gen 19:28-29); also in 2Sa 18:23; 1Ki 7:46; 2Ch 4:17; and apparently in Neh 3:22; Neh 12:28. Reland suggests that the name may have been derived from the windings of the river (Palaest. p. 274; comp. Stanley, S. tad P. p. 278). Though uniformly rendered plain in the A. V., and περίχωρος or περίοικος in the Sept., it appears to have all the definiteness of a proper name. It must be confessed that it is not easy to trace any connection between a “circular form” and the nature or aspect of the Jordan valley, and it is difficult not to suspect that kikk-ar is an archaic term which existed before the advent of the Hebrews, and was afterwards adopted into their language. SEE JORDAN.

The word is also very frequently used in Scripture to signify “a piece of money,” generally “a talent” in the A. V. (Exo 25:39; 1Ch 20:2, etc.); also “a cake” or “loaf of bread” (1Sa 10:3; Pro 6:26). Their circular form doubtless suggested the name.

5. מַישׁוֹר. mishor, with the article הִמַּישׁוֹר. This word comes from the root יָשִׁר, to be straight or even; hence mishor signifies a plain or level country; thus in Psa 26:12, “My foot standeth in an even place,” that is, “in a plain;” also, figuratively, rectitude or justice, as in Psa 67:4, “Thou shalt judge the people righteously” (with justice). With the article it has a topographical signification, and has usually the definiteness of a proper name. In the A. V. it is uniformly rendered plain. It occurs in the Bible in the following passages: Deu 3:10; Deu 4:43; Jos 13:9; Jos 13:16-17; Jos 13:21; Jos 20:8; 1Ki 20:23; 1Ki 20:25; 2Ch 26:10; Jer 48:8; Jer 48:21. In each of these, with one exception, it is used for the district in the neighborhood of Heshbon and Dibon—the Belka of the modern Arabs, their most noted pasture-ground; a district which, from the  scanty descriptions we possess of it, seems to resemble the “Downs” of England in the regularity of its undulations, the excellence of its turf, and its fitness for the growth of flocks.

There is no difficulty in recognizing the same district in the statement of 2Ch 26:10. It is evident from several circumstances that Uzziah had been a great conqueror on the east of Jordan, as well as on the shore of the Mediterranean (see Ewald's remarks, Geschichte, 3, 588, note), and he kept his cattle ion the rich pastures of Philistines on the one hand, and Ammonites on the other. Thus in all the passages quoted above the word mishbo seems to be restricted to one special district, and to belong to it as exclusively as shephelah did to the low land of Philistia, or arabah to the sunken district of the Jordan valley. It is therefore puzzling to find it used in one passage (1Ki 20:23; 1Ki 20:25) apparently with the mere general sense of low land, or rather flat land, in which chariots could be maneuvered-as opposed to uneven mountainous ground. There is some reason to believe that the scene of the battle in question was on the east side of the Sea of Gennesareth, in the plain of Jaulan; but this is no explanation of the difficulty, because we are not warranted in extending the mishor farther than the mountains which bounded it on the north, and where the districts began which bore, like it, their own distinctive names of Gilead, Bashan, Argob, Golan, Hauran, etc. Perhaps the most feasible explanation is that the word was used by the Syrians of Damascus without any knowledge of his strict signification, in the same manner indeed as it was employed in the later Syro-Chaldee dialect, in which meshra is the favorite term to express several natural features which in the older and stricter language were denominated each by its own special name. SEE MISHOK.

6. עֲרָבָז, arabah, pl. עִרְבוֹת(from the root עָרִב, to be dry), signifies an arid region. In poetry it is applied to any dry pastureland, like Midbar; but with the article it means the valley of the Jordan, and has the force of a proper name. In the A.V. it is commonly rendered “plain” (Deu 1:1; Deu 1:7, etc.); but in Deu 11:30, “champaign;” in Eze 47:8, “desert;” and, in Jos 15:6; Jos 18:18, “Arabah” (Gesen. Thesaur. p. 1066; Stanley, S. and P. p. 481). The Sept. usually has ῎Αραβα, but sometimes δυσμή. SEE ARABAH.

7. שְׁפֵלָה, shephelah, a low plain, from the root שׁפל, to be depressed. In the A. V. it is rendered “plain” in Jer 17:26; Oba 1:19; Zec 7:7; “low plains” in 1Ch 27:28; 2Ch 9:27; but elsewhere “vale” or “valley.” It has all the definiteness of a proper name, being the specific designation of the maritime plain of Philistia. To the Hebrews this, and this only, was the Shephelah. Shephelah has some claims of its own to notice. It was one of the most tenacious of these old Hebrew terms. It appears in the Greek text and in the A. V. of the book of Maccabees (1Ma 12:38), and is preserved on each of its other occurrences, even in such corrupt dialects as the Samaritan version of the Pentateuch, and the Targums of Pseudo-Jonathan and of rabbi Joseph. And although it would appear to be no longer known in its original seat, it has transferred itself to other countries, and appears in Spain as Seville, and on the east coast of Africa as SoJala. SEE SHEPHELAH.

The plain of Esdraelon, which to the modern traveler in the Holy Land forms the third of its three most remarkable depressions, is designated in the original by neither of the above terms, but by עֵמֶק, êmek, an appellative noun frequently employed in the Bible for the smaller valleys of the country—” the valley of Jezreel.” Perhaps Esdraelon may anciently have been considered as consisting of two portions: the valley of Jezreel, the eastern and smaller; the plain of Megiddo, the western and more extensive of the two. SEE ESDRAELON.

II. The following are the principal plains of Palestine alluded to in the Bible, proceeding from north to south:

1. The great plain or valley of Caele-Syria, the “hollow land” of the Greeks, which separates the two ranges of Lebanon and Antilebanon, is the most remarkable of them all. It is called in the Bible the Bika'ath Aven (Amo 1:5), and also probably the Bika'ath Lebanon (Jos 11:17; Jos 12:7) and Bika'ath Mizpeh (Jos 11:8), and is still known throughout Syria by its old name, as el Beka'a, or and el-Beka'a. “A long valley, though broad,” says Dr. Pusey (Comment. on Amo 1:5), “if seen from a height looks like a cleft;” and this is eminently the case with the “valley of Lebanon” when approached by the ordinary roads from north or south. It is of great extent, more than sixty miles long by about five in average breadth, and the two great ranges shut it in on either hand, Lebanon especially, with a very wall-like appearance. SEE COELE-SYRIA.

2. The plain (called עֵמֶק) of Jezreel or Esdraelon, which runs from the bay of Ptolemais to the Jordan, dividing the mountains of Galilee from those of Ephraim. It is well watered and grassy. SEE JEZRREEL.

3. The flat along the Mediterranean from Carmel to the brook of Egypt (whose northern part near Joppa is called Sharon, שָׁרוֹן, the southern part Shephelah, שְׁפֵלָה). The plain of the tribe of Judah stood in connection with the latter (1Ma 3:24; 1Ma 3:40; 1Ma 13:13). SEE SHARON.

4. The meadow of Jordan, or the plain on both sides of that river, from the Sea of Gennesareth to the Dead Sea, usually called simply The Plain (הָעֲרָבָה). In the neighborhood of Jericho this valley widens out into a great plain, thence called עֵיְבוֹת יְרַיחוֹ, The Plains of Jericho (Jos 4:13; Joshua 5, 10; 2Ki 25:5; Jer 39:5), as the Dead Sea is called the “Sea of the Plain” (Deuteronomy 3, 17; Deu 4:49). SEE JORDAN.

5. The elevated plain (הִמַּישׁוֹר) in the tribe of Reuben, in which lay Bezer and Medeba (Jos 13:16; Jos 20:8; Deu 4:43). It belongs to the large but rather dry (Burckhardt, 2, 626) plateau of modern Belka (Ritter, 2, 368). SEE MOAB.

6. For “the plains of Jericho,” SEE JERICHO. Plain Song (canto fermo, cantus planus) is' one of the terms applied to the monotonic recitative melody in ancient chants of the liturgy. In later times it became one of the parts in elaborate pieces, services, and anthems, originally the tenor, but afterwards assigned to the treble. The Cantus Prophetarum Epistolarum et Evanzgelii admitted certain inflections; the Cantus Psalmorum adopted inflections in the middle and end of the verse. An unrestricted melody was used in prefaces, anthems, and hymns, and the plain song is this cantus collectarunz. — Staunton, Eccles. Dict. p. 536.

## Plaister [[@Headword:Plaister ]]

             SEE PLASTER.

## Plaiting [[@Headword:Plaiting ]]

             SEE HAIR.

## Plan of Salvation[[@Headword:Plan of Salvation]]

             SEE SALVATION.

## Plancius, Pieter[[@Headword:Plancius, Pieter]]

             a Dutch preacher of renown, was born at Drenoutre, Flanders, in 1552. Having imbibed the principles of the Calvinistic faith in the schools of Germany and England, he embraced the evangelical ministry in 1577, and discharged its duties in Brabant and Flanders, in the midst of the persecutions of the Spanish government. After the taking of Brussels (1585), where he was pastor, he fled to Holland, and was soon attached to the Church of Amsterdam. Being a zealous defender of orthodoxy, he displayed great animosity against the Lutherans and Arminians. He was in 1619 a member of the Synod of Dort and was then one of the revisers of the version of the Old Testament. He is entitled to the gratitude of the Dutch people for the services which he rendered them by his geographical and nautical acquirements. He counseled the first expeditions sent by the Dutch to both Indies, and traced even the itineraries of those expeditions. He is much spoken of in Jeannin's negotiations, where he is called “a great cosmographer.” He died May 25, 1622, at Amsterdam. — Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Géneralé, 40, 403.

## Planck, Gottlieb Jacob[[@Headword:Planck, Gottlieb Jacob]]

             a noted Protestant divine, was born at Nürtingen, in the kingdom of Würtemberg, Nov. 15, 1751. He was educated at the university in Tübingen, and in 1784 was made ordinary professor of theology in the University of Göttingen. In this capacity he exerted a remarkable influence throughout Germany, as he wielded a powerful pen, and wrote many essays upon the history of the Church and its doctrines. He is a leading representative of “pragmatic” historiography. His principal work is his Geschichte des protestaeitischen Systems in seinem Ursprung, seiner Verandersprung, it. seiner Fortbildung (Leips. 1781-1800, 6 vols. 8vo), which was continued in a work published after a long interval under the title of Geschichte des protestantischen Lehrbegrifes von der Concordiem formel bis zur Mitte des 18ten Jahrhunderts (Gött. 1831). Another great work of his is Gesch. der christl. — kirchl. Gesellschaftsverfassung (Hann. 1803-9, 5 vols. 8vo). Planck, though widely read and followed, does not deserve the great renown he has secured. He exhibits too much indifference to doctrine to be trusted implicitly in his judgments, and yet no one can withhold from him the tribute for application. But, like a too obtrusive cicerone, Planck, in these works, requires great judgment in the reader. He everywhere discovers purpose, pre-concerted design, ambition,  hatred, and other passions, as having been the motive forces in the process of doctrinal history.

Thus the progressive and independent development of dogma is resolved into psychological dispositions and tendencies, while, at the same time, the author's own doctrinal indifference is unconsciously transferred to the agents of the dogma forming process, by the axiomatic assumption that doctrine alone would have been incapable of exciting so much interest or contention. In his eves doctrine is an antiquated matter, which is properly destined to oblivion. In this method, the view being restricted to efficient causes, and the inherent activity of final causes lost sight of, even the efficient causes are not comprehended in their entirety. Planck died in 1833. “With Planck the subjective, pragmatic method reaches its height. History is only the dreary theatre of human interests and passions. It is therefore truly amazing that, with his indifference to Church doctrine, he could bestow so much toilsome study and learned industry on such ‘perfectly indifferent antiquations' as the theological contentions of the 16th and 17th centuries. Of course his work, with all its great and enduring merits, and the relative truth and necessity of its position, could not fail to have a bad effect, in completely sundering the doctrinal consciousness of its age from the basis of the older Church orthodoxy, and in justifying this rupture as a pretended advance. In his other large work, The History of Church Government, Planck likewise starts from that rationalistic conception of the Church, which dates from Locke, viz., that this divine establishment was originally a mere voluntary association, which formed its laws and institutions in accordance with the changing wants of the times, and under the influence of fortuitous, external circumstances; and that, in this way, it gradually assumed an aspect altogether different from what its founder and first members intended or foresaw. In this way he accounts for the gigantic hierarchy of the Middle Ages, which he looks upon in a simply political light, with the calmness of a learned but indifferent spectator; while the older Protestant orthodoxy had held it in pious abhorrence, as the broken bulwark of the veritable Antichrist” (Schaff, Hist. of the Apostolic Church, p. 73). A complete list of all his writings is given in Pütter, Gesch. der Universitit Göttingen, 2, 121; 3, 283 sq.; 4:270. See Lücke, Gottlieb Jacob Plaunck, ein biographischer Versuch (Gött. 1838, 8vo); Illgen, Zeitschr. für histor. Theol. 1843, 4:75- 88; Rheinwald, Repert. of theol. Literatur, 1839, 25:105 sq.; Hallesche allgem. Zeit. 1837, 3, 281 sq.; Dorner, Hist. of Protestant Theology, 2, 283; Kahnis, Hist, of German Protestantism, p. 176; Hurst's Hagenbach,  Church [list. of the 18th and 19th Centuries; Alzog, Kirchengesch. 2, 286, 731. (J.H.W.)

## Planck, Heinrich Ludwig[[@Headword:Planck, Heinrich Ludwig]]

             another German Protestant divine, son of the preceding, was born at Göttingen July 19, 1785, and educated at the university of that place, where his father was then a professor. In 1809 young Planck appeared as author of a work entitled Versuch einer neuen synoptischen Zusammensteliung der drei ersten Evangelien, nach Gerundsätzen der hohern Kritik (Götting. 1809, 8vo). In 1810 he was appointed extraordinary professor of theology at Göttingen; and his introductory program, De vera natura atque indole orationis Graecae Novi Testamenti Commentatio (Göttingen, 1810, 4to), added greatly to his reputation. The value of this essay can scarcely be overrated, and its influence has been equal to its worth. It has wrought an entire change of opinion respecting the N.T. Greek, and upon the views which it enforced all subsequent investigations have been based. An English translation is published in the second volume of the Edinburgh Biblical Cabinet. It was Planck's intention, as stated in this essay, to exhibit his views in a more perfected form, in a work to be entitled Isagoge Philologica in Novum Testamentum; but from this he was diverted by an engagement into which he entered upon the strong recommendation of Gesenius, namely, to prepare a lexicon of the N.T. similar to that which the latter had published of the O.T. Unhappily the expectations awakened by his early promise were unfulfilled. His health was undermined by frequent attacks of epilepsy, and it was with difficulty that he could go through the duties of his office as ordinary professor of theology, to which he was appointed in 1823. Other works of his are, New Revelation and Inspiration (1817), and a Short Scheme of the Philosophic Doctrines of Religion (1821). He died Sept. 23,1831. See Lücke's biography of Gottlieb Jacob Planck. (J.H.W.)

## Planck, Karl Christian[[@Headword:Planck, Karl Christian]]

             a philosophical writer of Germany, was born at Stuttgart, January 17, 1819. He studied theology at Tubingen, and commenced his academical career in 1848 as lecturer in philosophy. In 1856 he was professor at the  gymnasium in Ulm, in 1869 at the seminary in Blaubeuren, in 1879 ephorus of the seminary at Maulbronn, and died June 7, 1880. He published, Gesetz und Ziel der neueren Kunstentwickelung (Stuttgart, 1870): — Seele und Geist (1871): — Wahrheit und Flachheit des Darwinismius (1872): Arundriss der Logik (1873): — Anthropologie und Psycholoqgie (1874): — Logisches Causalgesetz und naturliche Zweckthatigkeit (1877): — Ziel und Entwickelungsgesetz der alten Philosophie (1877): — Testament eines Deutschen (edited after the author's death by K. Klstlin, Tubingen, 1881). (B.P.)

## Plane[[@Headword:Plane]]

             (מִקְצֻעָה, n. akstuah, a chisel for carpenter's work, Isa 44:13). SEE HANDICRAFT.

## Plane, Giovanni Maria Delle[[@Headword:Plane, Giovanni Maria Delle]]

             (called Il Molina retto), a Genoese painter, was born at Genoa in the year 1660. According to Ratti, he studied under Gio.Battisti Gaulli, whose style he adopted, and distiinguished himself by some excellent works which he executed for the churches at Genoa, but more by the excellence of his portraits. Lanzi highly extols his Decodation of St. John the Baptist, at Sestri di Ponente. He also says that he was particilarly excellent in portraits, anmd that Genoa is full of his works in this branch. He was also invited to Parma and Piacenza, where he furnished the court with portraits, and executed some works for the churehes. He was afterwards invited to  Naples by king Charles of Bourbon, who appointed him his painter, with, a liberal pension, and he continued, in this service, till his death in 1745.

## Plane-tree[[@Headword:Plane-tree]]

             (Sir 24:14). SEE CHESTNUT.

## Planet[[@Headword:Planet]]

             SEE MAZZAROTH. Planet-worship is a prominent constructive feature in all mystic systems of antiquity. Thus the primitive worship of all objects like Osiris (q.v.) may be contemplated under two aspects, differing somewhat from each other, but incapable of any rigorous or formal separation. That worship seems to be in some localities directly solar. Fortunes of Osiris have been interwoven or identified with those of the great orb of the day. His votaries have an eye exclusively to periodic motions of the sun and the vicissitudes of the seasons; not so much in reference to the increase or the decrease of his luminous functions as to seeming changes in his fructifying, fertilizing power. In winter he appears to the imagination of the worshipper as languishing and dying; and all nature, ceasing to put forth her buds and blossoms, is believed to suffer with him; while at other seasons of the year the majesty of this great king of heaven is reasserted in the vivifying of creation and the gladdening of the human heart.

There is an annual resurrection of all nature, for the sun- god is himself returning from the under-world-the region of the dead. Or, if we study the same representation in its more telluric aspect, what is there depicted as a mourning for Osiris is no longer emblematic merely of prostration in the sun-god: it imports more frequently the loss of vital forces in the vegetable kingdom as the consequence of the withdrawal of the celestial heat. The earth herself becomes the principal sufferer; and the cause of all her passionate and despairing lamentations is the influence that dries up the fountains of her own vitality. Now, whichever be adjudged the primitive form or the correct interpretation of this old Osirian myth, we must remember that, historically speaking, the substance of the myth itself is not by any means peculiar to the valley of the Nile. It recurs in nearly all countries bordering on' the Mediterranean. It can often be directly traced to Asia, and as often to the agency of those Phoenician colonists who, scattered thickly in the islands to the west of Syria, were importing to far distant havens not their amber only, but their civilization and religious knowledge. In the mother country of Phoenicia, the Osirian worship had its ancient counterpart in the mysteries of Adonis and the annual weeping for Tammuz” (Eze 8:14).

There, again, the fate of the divinity was rigorously identified with periodic changes in the aspect of external nature. The idea of an Adonis in the prime of life was the most vivid image which the Syrian mind could fashion of all fertilizing and benignant powers. At length, however, the divinity sinks down oppressed and overwhelmed; his  heart is pierced by some mysterious arrow: he dies, and in the sacred month, “the month of Tammuz,” when the scorching blasts of summer are well-nigh exhausted, a large crowd of Syrian maids and matrons flock together from all quarters; they bemoan the loss of Tammuz; but their vehement ejaculations are all quickly followed by a series of impure and diabolic orgies; symptoms of returning life in nature are to them a signal for festivity as frantic as their former grief. Vitality is coming back to earth; and in its advent they perceive another “finding” of their lost Adonis, εὕρεσις Α᾿δώνιδος. Nor is this the only instance of some close affinity between the old mythographers of Egypt and Phoenicia. Mingling with the other progeny of Ptah, or the Egyptian Vulcan, stand the great Cabirian brothers, whose repute and worship were extensively diffused in various provinces of the West. The word Cabeiri is itself immediately explainable, if we resort to the Shemitic languages; for there it means the “Great” or “Mighty Ones;” and thus is pointing in the same direction as the ancient dwarf gods, which were also sacred images of Cabeiri, and were venerated with a kindred fervor by the rude Phoenician pilot and the polished priest of Memphis. The Cabeiri seem to have been eight in number, or, excluding Esmun (literally the eighth), that one of the fraternity who was regarded as the chief or aggregate expression for the whole, we limit them to seven; which strongly indicates, in the opinion of some writers, an original identity of the Cabeiri with the more conspicuous of the heavenly bodies. In the sacred books of China the “seven brilliant ones” deemed worthy of peculiar homage are the sun, the moon, and the five planets; while the planets, when regarded singly, have been made to bear the corresponding title of the “five heavenly chiefs.” The Greek had similarly his seven θεοὶ μεγάλοι, and the Persian his seven ministers of the highest; examples which appear to be suggestive of the early spread of planet-worship, if they do not absolutely prove that astronomical principles had entered largely into the construction of all mythic systems, that of Egypt not excepted. See Hardwick, Christ and other Masters, 2, 264-267; Uhlemann, Aegypt. Alterthümer, 2, 162 sq.; Movers, Die Religion und die Gottheiten der Phonizier (Bonn, 1841), p. 12 sq.; Lucian, De Dea Syria, c. 6 sq.; Bunsen, Egypt's Place, 1, 144; Journal of Asiatic Society, 1864, p. 53 so.

## Planeta[[@Headword:Planeta]]

             SEE CHASUBLE.

## Planetdes Maximus[[@Headword:Planetdes Maximus]]

             a Byzantine monk noted as a literary character, flourished in the 14th century. He was born, as he says himself in one of his works, at Nicomedia. The time of his birth is unknown, and almost the only circumstance of his life which is beyond doubt is that in the year 1327 he was sent on an embassy to Venice by the emperor Andronicus the elder. At this time he must have been of a mature age. That he was yet alive in 1340 is evident from a letter still extant, which he wrote to the emperor Johannes Palseologus, who ascended the throne in that year. D'Orville places his death in 1353, for which, however, he adduces no testimony. Gerhard Vossius prolongs his life to the year 1370, and others place it still later. Towards the close of his life Planudes, it is said, was imprisoned on account of his partiality for the doctrines of the Church of Rome; and when afterwards compelled to write against that Church, to have done so in such a manner and with such feeble arguments that cardinal Bessarion declared that the heart of Planudes had no share in what he had written on that occasion. His works, of which several exist only in MS. form, are not of sufficient importance to be enumerated here. They consist of orations and homilies; translations fronu Latin into Greek of several works of such  classics as Cicero, Caesar, Ovid, etc.; also of Boethitus's De Consolatrione; St. Augustine. De Trinitate and De Cicitate Dei; a collection of AEsop's Fables; commentaries on the Rhetoric of Hermogenes, and other Greek writings. See Fabricius, Biblioth. Graeca, 11, 682 sq.; Hoffman, Lexicon Bibliog. Script. Graec. s.v.

## Plank[[@Headword:Plank]]

             (עֵוֹ, ets, Eze 41:25, a tree [i.e. beam], as elsewhere usually rendered; צֵלָע, tseld, a rib [or side], 1Ki 6:15, as elsewhere generally rendered; עֹב, ob [probably the same as עָב, ab, a threshold, or “thick beam,” 1Ki 7:6; “thick (plank),” Eze 41:25], “thick plank,” Eze 41:26).

## Plant[[@Headword:Plant]]

             Under this general term we classify and explain the several plants mentioned in Scripture, as edible, flowering, or medicinal, in order.

I. Edible Plants. — Among these, with which we number also aromas and spices, may be noticed:

1. Anise, Gr. ἄνηθον, which means rather dill; an aromatic herb mentioned by Christ (Mat 23:23). SEE ANISE.

2. Barley, the frequent rendering of the Hebrew seorah', שְׂעֹרָה, and of the Greek κριθή, as in Rev 6:6; Joh 6:9; Joh 6:13. SEE BARLEY.

3. Bean, Heb. po, פּוֹל, as in 2Sa 17:28; Eze 4:9. SEE BEAN.

4. Caper-berry, Heb. abiyonah', אֲבַיּוֹנָה, desire (Ecc 12:5). SEE CAPER-PLANT.

5. Cinnamon is the rendering of the Hebrew kinnamon', קַנָּמוֹן(Exo 30:23), and of the Greek κινάμωμον (Rev 18:13). SEE CINNAMON.

6. Coriander represents the Hebrew gad, גִּד, in most ancient versions, as the Sept. and Vulg., in Exo 16:31; Num 11:7; but the Chaldee and Samaritan vary. SEE CORIANDER.

7. Cucumber translates the Hebrew kisshu, קַשֻּׁא(Num 11:5); and wild cucumbers appear to be meant in 2Ki 4:39 bypakkuoth', פִּקֻעוֹת, where our version has wild gourds. SEE CUCUMBER; SEE GOURD.

8. Cummin stands for the Hebrew kammon, כִּמּן(Isa 28:25; Isa 28:27); and in the New Test. for the Greek κύμινον, which is simply an adoption of the Hebrew. SEE CUMMIN.

9. Doves' dung our version gives for charey yonim, חֲרֵי יוֹנַים, which is probably some kind of vegetable food, perhaps kali, though the rendering given is the literal translation (2Ki 6:25). SEE DOVES DUNG.

10. Fitches is given by the A. V. in Isa 28:25; Isa 28:27 for the Hebrew ketsach, קֶצִח, which, according to the Sept., Vulg., and rabbins, is a kind of fennel flower, as black cummin. In Eze 4:9 the word kusse'meth, כֻּסֶמֶת, is rendered fitchles, but it seems to mean properly snelt. SEE FITCHES; SEE RYE.

11. Garlic is the Hebrew שׁוּם, shuim (Num 11:5). SEE GARLIC.

12. Gourd. SEE CUCUMBER; SEE GOURD.

13. Grape is the rendering of several Hebrew words; some of them distinguishing particular kinds or qualities:

(a) beiishtm. בְּאֻשַׁים(Isa 5:2; Isa 5:4), wild grapes, i.e. bad grapes. Aquila has σαπρίαι, Symm. ἀτελῆ.

(b) Bo'ser, בֹּסֶר(Isa 18:5; Jer 31:24; Jer 31:30; Eze 18:2), sour or unripe grapes; Sept. ὄμφαξ.

(c) Chartsdn, חִרְצִן, sour grapes, kernels (Num 6:4), and of the Greek σταφυλή, bunch of grapes (Mat 7:16; Luk 6:44; Rev 14:18). SEE GRAPE.

14. Leek (in Num 11:5) renders חָצַיר, chatsir', which elsewhere is translated grass, i.e. greens. SEE GRASS; SEE LEEKS.

15. Lentil renders Heb. adash', עָדָשׁ(Gen 25:34; 2Sa 17:28; 2Sa 23:11; Eze 4:9). SEE LENTIL.

16. Mallows is for the Heb. malluach, מִלּוּחִ, properly sea purslain (Job 30:4). SEE MALLOWS.

17. Mandrake is the Heb. dudaim, דּוּדָאַים, love-apples (Gen 30:14 : Son 7:13). SEE MANDRAKE.

18. Manna, Heb. man, מָן, a sweet resin distilling from the leaves of tamarisk trees, of several species, especially the tamarix Gallica mannifera, from punctures made by an insect, the coccus manniparus. SEE MANNA.

19. Melon is found in Num 11:5 as the rendering of the Hebrew abattichim', אֲבִטַּיחַים. SEE MELON.

20. Millet (in Eze 4:9) represents the Hebrew dochan, דֹחָן; it is the holchuis dochna (Linn.). SEE MILLET.

21. Mint (in Mat 23:23; Luk 11:42) is the Greek ἡδύοσμον, i.e. sweet-scented; the mentha virides of Linn. SEE MINT.

22. Mustard (in Mat 13:31; Mat 17:20; Mar 4:31; Luk 13:19; Luk 17:6) is the Greek σίναπι; the sinapis orientalis. SEE MUSTARD.

23. Olive universally is given in the A.V. where the Hebrew za'yith, זִיַת, is used. In 1Ki 6:23 the word olive-tree renders the Heb. ets-shemen,

עֵצ שֶמֶן, lit. the tree of fatness. The same expression is rendered oiltree (Isaiah 4:19) and pine (Neh 8:15). SEE OLIVE.

24. Onion is in Heb. be'tsel, בֶּצֶל, as Num 11:5. SEE ONION.

25. Parched-corn is the Heb. kali, קִלַיor קָלַיא; it is wheat or barley roasted in the ear and then rubbed out; perhaps occasionally some kind of pulse (1Sa 17:17). SEE PARCHED-CORN.

26. Pistachio-nuts, in Heb. botnim', בָּטְנַם(Gen 43:11), a kind of nut of oblong shape, and taking this name from beten, בֶּטֶן, the belly, in allusion to their form. SEE NUTS.

27. Pomegranate renders the Heb. rimmon, רַמּוֹן, in many passages. SEE POMEGRANATE.

28. Purslain is the Heb. challamuth', חִלָּמוּת, according to the Syriac. Our version has egg (Job 6:6), “white of an egg,” which is certainly wrong. See Gesen. Thesaur. s.v., and SEE PURSLAIN.

29. Raisins, bunches of (1Sa 25:18; 1Sa 30:12; 2Sa 16:1; 1Ch 12:40), translates the Heb. tsimmtik, צַמּוּק. SEE RAISINS.

30. Rye (in Exo 9:32; Isa 28:25) translates the Heb. kussemeth, כֻּסֶמֶת, which means a smooth grain, spelt. See No. 10, above, and SEE RYE.

31. Vine, Heb. sorek, שׂרֶק, or sorekdh, שׂרֶקָה, is a peculiar kind of grapevine. Thus, choice vine (Gen 49:11); choicest vine (Isa 5:2); noble vine (Jer 2:21. SEE VINE.

32. Wheat in general is the Heb. chittah, חַטָּה, of which the plural in Chaldee is chintim', חַנְטַים, as Ezr 6:9; Ezr 7:22; and in the New Test. is σῖτος, a general name for grain, which is also rendered “corn” (Mar 4:28; Act 7:12).

II. Among flowering plants we notice the following:

1. Lily is the Heb. shushan', שׁוֹשִׁן (1Ki 7:19), and shoshan, שׁוֹשִׁן (Son 2:16; Son 4:5; Son 5:13; Son 6:2-3; Son 7:3; 1Ki 7:22; 1Ki 7:26). The word means a musical instrument shaped like a lily, as Psa 60:1; Psa 69:1. Also Heb. shoshannah, שׁוֹשִׁנָּה, but only in the first sense, as 2Ch 4:5; Son 2:1-2; Hos 14:6. SEE LILY; SEE MUSICAL INSTRUMENTS.

2. Myrtle (in Neh 8:15; Isa 41:19; Zec 1:8; Zec 1:10-11) represents the Heb. hadds, הֲדִס. SEE MYRTLE.

3. Rose, Heb. chabatstseleth, חֲבִצֶּלֶת, is properly the meadow saffron (colchicum autumale, Linn.) (Son 2:1; Isa 35:1). SEE ROSE.

4. Saffron, Heb. karknm, כִּרְכֹּם; Sept. κρόκος (Son 4:14), may refer to both kinds of saffron, the common and the Indian. SEE SAFFRON.

5. Sedge, Heb. אָחוּ, csm, rendered meadow in Gen 41:2; Gen 41:18, flag in Job 8:11, is an Egyptian word, applied to all kinds of grassy growth in marshes. SEE REED.

6. Tare is the Greek ζιζάνιον, properly darnel (Mat 13:25 sq.). SEE TARE.

7. Thorn is the translation of many Hebrew words, for the meanings of which SEE THORN.

III. Of medicinal plants we name the following:

1. Balm, “balm of Gilead,” Heb. tsori', צַרַי, opobalsamum (Gen 43:11; Gen 37:25; Jer 8:22; Jer 46:11; Jer 51:8; Eze 27:17). SEE BALM.

2. Camphire, Heb. kopher, כֹּפֶר, rendered pitch (Gen 6:14); in Son 1:14; Son 4:13, refers to the el-henna of the Arabs, a shrub with fragrant white flowers. SEE CAMPHIRE; SEE PITCH.

3. Hyssop, Heb. ezob, אֵזוֹב, and Greek ὕσωπος. SEE HYSSOP.

4. Myrrh, Heb. lot, לֹט, a fragrant resinous gum from the leaves of a shrub, the cistus ladanifera. Sept. and Vulg. stacte, myrrh (Gen 37:25; Gen 43:11). Also Heb. mor, מֹרor מוֹר, a bitter aromatic resin distilling in tears from a tree, the balsamodendron myrrha. SEE MYRRH.

5. Rue, Greek πήγανον, the ruta graveolens of Linn. SEE RUE. See, for the plants of Palestine in general, SEE BOTANY.

## Plantavitius, John, De La Pause, Or Plantavitius Pausanus[[@Headword:Plantavitius, John, De La Pause, Or Plantavitius Pausanus]]

             was born 1576 of a noble Protestant family in the diocese of Nismes, studied theology and Oriental literature, and became pastor at Beziers, where he embraced Roman Catholicism, 1604. He was made bishop of Lodbve in 1625, retired from his ecclesiastical functions in 1648, on account of advanced age and great infirmities, and died in 1651, at the Palace Margon. Few literati, not Hebrews by birth, have devoted themselves more earnestly to, and labored more successfully in, the department of Hebrew literature than Plantavitius, and his works will continue to be a monument to his learning and industry as long as the sacred language of the O.T. continues to be studied. They are as follows: Thesaurus synonymicus lebrceo-Chaldceo Rabbinicus (Lodovae, 1643, fol.); very valuable to the student of the Hebrew Scriptures on account of its treatment of Hebrew synonyms: — Florilegium Biblicum Hebraico- Latinum (ibid. 1645): — and Florilegium Rabbiznicum, complectens  praecipuas vet. Rabbinorum sententias, vers. Lat. et scholiis illustratas cum Bibliotheca Rabbinica (ibid. 1645). See Wolf, Bibliotheca Hebraea, 1, 5, etc.; Steinschneider, Catalogus Libr. Ilebr. in Bibliotheca Bodleiana, col. 2107; Geiger, in Zeitschrift der deutschen morgenländischen Gesellschuft, 17, 330 (Leips. 1863).

## Plantier, Claude Henri[[@Headword:Plantier, Claude Henri]]

             one of the most prominent members of the French episcopate, was born of humble parentage at Ceyzerieux, in France, in 1813. In 1837 he was made a priest, and soon afterwards he was appointed professor of Hebrew at the theological school of Lyons. In 1,855 he was elected bishop of Nismes, and died May 25, 1875. He was one of the fiercest opponents of Louis Napoleon. See Literarischer Handweiser, 1875, p. 252. (B. P.)

## Plantin, Christophe[[@Headword:Plantin, Christophe]]

             a celebrated printer, was born in 1514 at Mont-Louis, in the French province of Touraine, of poor parents. He went to Paris in his youth, and worked there some time in a bookbinder's shop; but afterwards went to Caen, in Normandy, where he learned the art of printing. After working in several of the printing-offices of France, and especially at Lyons, he returned to Paris; but the religious disturbances which commenced about that time induced him to remove to Flanders, and he is known to have been a master-printer at Antwerp in 1555. Besides his printing establishment at Antwerp, he had one at Paris and another at Leyden. The beauty as well as the correctness of the works which issued from his presses extended his reputation rapidly, and he soon acquired a considerable fortune. He employed as correctors of the press several men distinguished for their learning, and Plantin's house was resorted to by learned men from all countries. He died July 1, 1589. The work which has given most celebrity to Plantin's printing establishment at Antwerp is the edition which he printed of the great Polyglot Bible, which had previously been printed at Alcala, in Spain, under the direction of cardinal Ximenes. Plantin was engaged to perform the work by Philip II of Spain, who sent Arius Montanus to superintend it, and he was employed four years (1568 to 1572) in this occupation. SEE ARIUS MONTANUS.

Guillaume Lebe was sent for from Paris to engrave the punches and superintend the casting of the type. The work, in addition to the contents of the Alcala Polyglot, gave a Chaldaic paraphrase and a Syriac version of the New Testament in  Hebrew and Syriac characters. The proofs of the Antwerp Polyglot were all revised by Raphelengius, and the work was published in eight large folio volumes (1568-1572). Plantin was not so learned as the Aldi of Venice or the Estiennes of Paris, but his Latin prefaces to several of the works which he printed seem sufficiently to establish that he had acquired a considerable scholarship.

## Plantsch, Martin, D.D[[@Headword:Plantsch, Martin, D.D]]

             a German theologian, was born in 1460 at Dornstetten, in Würtemberg. He studied at the newly founded university at Tübingen, where in 1483 he was made magister, in 1484 professor of philosophy, and in 1494 doctor and professor of theology, at the same time preaching in the church of St. George. In 1523 he was present at the Zurich colloquium, and died July 18, 1533. In connection with Dr. Hartsesser, he founded the famous scholarship of St. George and St. Martin at Tübingen. He was also the author of Tractatus defitgis maleficis, which he wrote in 1506, on the occasion of the burning of a certain witch at Tübingen. See Jocher, Gelehrten-Lex. s.v. (B. P.)

## Plassmann, Heinrich Ernst. D.D[[@Headword:Plassmann, Heinrich Ernst. D.D]]

             a German Roman Catholic divine, was born in 1817 at Paderborn, where he also afterwards labored as professor of theology. He then went to Rome, where he was appointed rector of the German National Church. He was also honored with the degree of “Magister Sanitae Theologiae” by the Dominican college St. Thomae de Urbe. He died at Tivoli. Italy, July 23, 1865. He wrote Die Schule des heil. Thomas (Soest, 1857), a great but unfinished work. See Literarischer HItndweiser fur das katholische Deutschland, 1865, p. 27 sq.; Zuchhold, Bibliotheca Theologica, 2, 1000. (B. P.)

## Plaster, Masons[[@Headword:Plaster, Masons]]

             (גַּיר, gir, so called from its efervescence, lime; Sept. κονία; Daniel 5, 5; “chalk,” Isa 27:9; also שַׂיד, sid, from its boiling, lime, Deu 27:2; Deu 27:4; “lime,” Isa 28:12; Amo 2:1; as a verb, טוּחִ, tua-ch, to smear, Lev 14:42-43; Lev 14:48; elsewhere “daub,” etc.). The mode of making plaster cement has been described elsewhere. SEE MORTAR. Plaster is mentioned on three occasions in Scripture:

1. Where, when a house was infected with “leprosy” (Lev 14:42; Lev 14:48), the priest was ordered to take away the portion of infected wall and replaster it (Michaelis, Laws of Moses, § 211, 3, 297-305, ed. Smith). SEE HOUSE; SEE LEPROSY.

2. The words of the law were ordered to be engraved on Mount Ebal on stones which had been previously coated with plaster (Deu 27:2; Deu 27:4; Jos 8:32), the pillars being covered with plaster, and the law written on this (see Thomson, Land and Book, 2, 204 sq.). Michaelis, however (vol. 1, bk. 3), supposes that the words were cut in stone and plaster afterwards put upon it, that when the plaster should fall off the words might still be legible. Of this, however, no evidence appears. The process here mentioned was probably of a similar kind to that adopted in Egypt for receiving bass-reliefs. The wall was first made smooth, and its  interstices, if necessary, filled up with plaster. When the figures had been drawn, and the stone adjacent cut away so as to leave them in relief, a coat of lime whitewash was laid on, and followed by one of varnish after the painting of the figures was complete. In the case of the natural rock the process was nearly the same. The ground was covered with a thick layer of fine plaster, consisting of lime and gypsum, carefully smoothed and polished. Upon this a coat of lime whitewash was laid, and on it the colors were painted, and set by means of glue or wax. The whitewash appears in most instances to have been made of shell-limestone not much burned, which of itself is tenacious enough without glue or other binding material (Long, quoting from Belzoni, Eg. Ant. 2, 49, 50). At Behistun, in Persia, the surface of the inscribed rock-tablet was covered with a varnish to preserve it from weather; but it seems likely that in the case of the Ebal tablets the inscription was cut while the plaster was still moist (Lavard, Nineveh, 2, 188; Vaux, Nin. cand Persep. p. 172). SEE STONE.

3. It was probably a similar coating of cement on which the fatal letters were traced by the mystic hand “on the plaster of the wall” of Belshazzar's palace at Babylon (Dan 5:5). We here obtain an incidental confirmation of the Biblical narrative. For while at Nineveh the walls are paneled with alabaster slabs, at Babylon, where no such material is found, the builders were content to cover their tiles or bricks with enamel or stucco, fitly termed plaster, fit for receiving ornamental designs (Layard, Nin. and Bab. p. 529; Died. 2, 8). SEE BRICKS.

## Plaster, Medicinal[[@Headword:Plaster, Medicinal]]

             (מָרִח, marach, to rub, hence to anoint with a healing salve or similar substance, Isa 38:21). SEE MEDICINE.

## Plastic Nature[[@Headword:Plastic Nature]]

             an absurd doctrine, which some have thus described: “It is an incorporeal created substance, endued with a vegetative life, but not with sensation or thought; penetrating the whole created universe, being co-extended with it; and, under God, moving matter, so as to produce the phenomena which cannot be solved by mechanical laws: active for ends unknown to itself, not being expressly conscious of its actions, and yet having an obscure idea of the action to be entered upon.” To this it has been answered that, as the idea itself is most obscure, and, indeed, inconsistent, so the foundation of it is evidently weak. It is intended by this to avoid the inconvenience of  subjecting God to the trouble of some changes in the created world, and the meanness of others. But it appears that, even upon this hypothesis, he would still be the author of them; besides, to Omnipotence nothing is troublesome, nor those things mean, when considered as part of a system, which alone might appear to be so. See Doddridge, Lectures, lect. 37; Cudworth, Intellectual System, p. 149,172; More, Imm7ortality of the Soul, lib. 3, c. 12; Ray, Wisdom- of God, p. 51, 52; Lord Monboddo, Ancient Metaphysics; Young, Essay on the Powers and Mechanism of Nature; Cocker, Theism; Tulloch, English Prot. Theol. 2, 269, 273, 397.

## Plat[[@Headword:Plat]]

             (חֶלְקָה, chelkah., 2Ki 9:26, a piece, or portion of ground, as elsewhere rendered).

## Plate[[@Headword:Plate]]

             (לוּחִ, Mach, 1Ki 7:36, a board [or “table”], as elsewhere rendered; פִּח, pach, a thin lamina, Exo 39:3; Num 16:38; צַיוֹ, tsits, a burnished plate of metal, Exo 28:36; Exo 39:30; Lev 8:9; סֶרֶן, seren, an axle, 1Ki 7:30).

## Platel, Jacques[[@Headword:Platel, Jacques]]

             a French theologian, was born at Bersee, a village of Artois, in the year 1608. He joined the Jesuits, and taught philosophy and theology at Douai. He was regarded as a man of some learning, and his writings were received favorably. He died Jan. 7, 1681, at Douai. His works are, Synopsis curses theologici (Douai, 1654, fol.; 6th ed. 1706): — Auctoritas contra physicam prae determinatioionem (ibid. 1669-1673, 2 vols. 12mo).

## Platina, Battista Bartolommeo de Sacchi[[@Headword:Platina, Battista Bartolommeo de Sacchi]]

             a very learned Italian, is noted as the author of a History of the Popes. He was born in 1421 at Piadena, a village between Cremona and Mantua. He first embraced a military life, which he followed for a time, but afterwards devoted himself to literature. He went to Rome under Calixtus III, who was made pope in 1455; where, getting himself introduced to cardinal Bessarion, he obtained some small benefices of pope Pius II, who succeeded Calixtus in 1458, and afterwards was appointed apostolical abbreviator. When Paul II succeeded Pius in 1464, Platina's affairs took a  very unfavorable turn. In the first place, Paul was much indisposed towards him, on account of his connections with his predecessor Pius; but this might possibly have been borne if Paul, in the next place, had not removed all the abbreviators from their employments by abolishing their places, notwithstanding they had purchased them with great sums of money. Upon this Platina complained to the pope, and most humbly besought him to order their cause to be judged by the auditors of the Rota. The pope was offended at the liberty, and gave him a very haughty repulse: “Is it thus,” said he, looking at him sternly-”is it thus that you summon us before your judges, as if you knew not that all laws are centered in our breast? Such is our decree: they shall all go hence, whithersoever they please: I am pope, and have a right to ratify or cancel the acts of others at pleasure.” These unhappy men, thus divested of their employments, used their utmost endeavors for some days to obtain audience of the pope, but were repulsed with contempt.

Upon this Platina wrote to him in the following terms: “If you had a right to dispossess us, without permitting our cause to be heard, of the employments we had lawfully purchased, we, on the other side, ought to be permitted to complain of the injustice we suffer, and the ignominy with which we are branded. As you have repulsed us so contumeliously, we will go to all the courts of princes, and entreat them to call a council, whose principal business shall be to oblige you to show cause why you have divested us of all our lawful possessions.” Nothing can better illustrate the temper and character of Platina than this letter, which was, however, considered as an act of rebellion, and caused him to be imprisoned, and to endure great hardships. At the end of four months he had his liberty, with orders not to leave Rome, and continued in quiet for some time; but afterwards, being suspected of a plot, he was again imprisoned, and, with many others, put to the rack. The plot being found imaginary, the charge was turned to heresy, which also came to nothing, and Platina was set at liberty some time after. The pope then flattered him with a prospect of preferment, and thus kept him in Rome; but, dying of apoplexy, left him to shift for himself as he could. This whole conflict is related by Platina himself in his Lives of the Popes, under the pontificate of Paul II. Sixtus IV succeeded Paul in 1467, and appointed Platina keeper of the Vatican Library, which was established by this pope. Platina here found himself in his own element, and lived very happily in that station till 1481, when he was snatched away by the plague. He bequeathed to Pomponius Laetus the house which he built on the Mons Quirinalis, with the laurel grove, out of which the poetical crowns were taken. He was the author of  several works, the most considerable of which is De Vitis ac Gestis Romanorum Pontificum, or history of the popes from St. Peter to Sixtus IV, to whom he dedicated it. The Protestants have approved it, and ranked the author among the witnesses to truth. Some Roman Catholic writers charge him with want of sincerity and care; yet Panvinius did not scruple to publish this history, with notes of his own, and added to it the Lives of the popes from Sixtus IV to Pius IV. It was first printed at Venice in 1479 (fol.), and reprinted once or twice before 1500, since which time all the editions of it are said to have been castrated. His Lives of the Popes is written with elegance of style, and discovers powers of research and discrimination which were then rare. He writes with freedom of the popes. Some passages are omitted in late editions. In the edition of 1574, the passage in the life of St. Anacletus, “Uxorem habuit in Bithynia,” is for the first time changed into “Uxorem nion habens.” Platina wrote also a History of Mantua, in Latin, which was first published by Lambecius, with notes, at Vienna (1675, 4to). The titles of some of his other works are. De Naturis rerum: — Epistole ad diversos: — De honesta voluptate et valetudine: — De falso et vero bono: — Contra amores: — De vera nobilitate: — De optimo cive: — Panegyricus in Bessarionem: — Oratio ad Paulum II: — Depace Italice componenda et bello Turcico indicenado: — De flosculis linguce Latinae: — A Treatise on the Means of preserving Health, and the Science of the Kitchen (Bologna, 1498, 8vo), which provoked the following epigram by Salnnazarius:

Ingenia et mores, vitas, obitusque notasse

Polmificum, argntte lex fuit historiae.

Tu tameni hic lautae tractas pulmenta culinae,

Hoc Platina, est ipsos pascere pontifices.

See Schröckh, Kirchengesch. vol. 32; Niceron, Memoires, vol. 3; Tiraboschi, Storia della letter. Ital. s.v.; General Biog. Dict. s.v.

## Plato[[@Headword:Plato]]

             one of the most eminent of the Greek philosophers. He was by far the most illustrious of the pupils of Socrates, completely eclipsing all his fellow students, so that St. Augustine justly remarks, “Inter discipulos Socrates, non quidem immerito, excellentissima gloria claruit, qui omnes caeteros obscuraret, Plato” (De Civ. Dei, 8, 4). He was the earliest of the systematic  scholars, or founders of permanent schools, in which the doctrines of the original master, with more or less of development and change, continued to be expounded through successive generations. His fame and influence on antiquity transcended the renown and authority of any other teacher, and may have suggested, in connection with the character of his doctrine and the mode of its exposition, the declaration of Labeo, that he was to be accounted a god rather than a man. “Hunc Platonern Labeo inter semideos commemorandum putavit, sicut Herculem, sicut Romulum; semideos autem heroibus anteponit, sed utrosque inter numina collocat” (Augustine, ibid. 2. 14). His influence was increased, rather than diminished, during the long and ardent struggle between rising Christianity and expiring Paganism-both combatants receiving his impulse, claiming his alliance, and submitting to his philosophical ascendency. Though the oblivion of the Greek language and the dogmatic character of mediaeval speculation turned intellectual activity into widely divergent channels, yet the revival of letters was attended by the resurrection of Plato; and the Medicean Academy of Florence under the direction of Marsilius Ficinus (q.v.), renewed the prominence of his name and of his philosophy. Since that period, the beginning of the 16th century, Plato has enjoyed an augmented authority in the domain of metaphysical inquiry; has animated successive schools of brilliant reputation and of extensive rule; and has been the late progenitor of the most famous systems which have given to modern Germany its marvelous predominance in transcendental metaphysics.

I. Life and Times. — The notices of Plato's life which have come down to us are few and scanty and for the most part unauthenticated. Legend early fastened upon his name, and incrusted it over with myths as striking and as unreal as any employed by himself for the exemplification of his tenets. He transformed the rugged honesty of his teacher, Socrates: he was himself transfigurated by the wild fantasy of his own followers, and was translated in equal degree with Bully Bottom, though in dissimilar mode. But, if little is known of the real circumstances and incidents of the life of the philosopher, there is abundant information in regard to the troubled and motley times in which he lived. The ancient authorities for the life of Plato which have been transmitted to us are few, late, and untrustworthy. His biography by his pupil, companion, and successor, Xenocrates, was early lost. Of the numerous writers contemporaneous with him, or living in the next centuries, who treated his life, professedly or incidentally, scarcely any available memorials survive. Our fullest authorities are Diogenes Laertius,  Apuleius, Olympiodorus, in the life prefixed to most editions of the Opera Platonis, and an anonymous biographer. These writers, Diogenes Laertius especially, may have had trustworthy materials at command, but they have commingled, or rather inundated them, with the legendary growth which sprang up after Plato's death-a growth which should not be entirely neglected, as it exhibits the manner in which Plato was regarded by his admiring disciples, arising out of his own imaginative expositions, and anticipating the fantastic reveries of the Neo-Platonic Thaumaturgists.

Plato was born a full Athenian citizen, of Athenian parents, but, apparently, not within the limits of Attica. His birthplace seems to have been the island of AEgina, where his father owned a cleruchy, or colonial estate. There are dissonances in regard to the year of his birth, but it fell within the first half of the Decennial War, or earlier portion of the Peloponnesian War. Grote assigns his nativity to May, B.C. 427, just before the surrender of Plataea; Clinton to May, B.C. 429, four or five months before the death of Pericles; and Diogenes Laertius to B.C. 428, the year in which Anaxagoras died. Taking Grote's date for convenience, as this is no place for the investigation of such chronological problems, the philosopher's birth was synchronous with the first exhibitions of the comedian Aristophanes, whom, throughout life he so greatly admired, and whose works he kept habitually under his pillow. Both the parents of Plato were of noble blood; a circumstance which affected equally his political inclinations and his speculative views. His father was Ariston, the son of Aristocles, and traced his descent from Codrus and the god Poseidon. His mother's name was Perictione. She was descended from a collateral branch of the family of Solon the Lawgiver; was nearly related to Critias the chief of the Thirty Tyrants, and was the sister of Charmides, who was at the same time one of the ten governors of the Piraeus. The genealogical table is given by Ueberweg. Legend, which is traced back to Speusippus, the nephew of Plato, ascribed the paternity of Plato to the god Apollo; and, in the form in which the story is told by Olympiodorus, closely imitates the record in regard to the nativity of Christ. A similar origin was assigned to Servius Tullius, to Pythagoras, to Alexander the Great, to Scipio Africanus, to Apollonius of Tvanma, to the seventh ancestor of Genghiz-Kahn, to Buddha, and to many other notable personages. The story of Hercules is well known, and furnished occasion for the apt sarcasm of Tertullian: “Herculem de fabula facis Christum” (Adv. Marc. 4, 2). It was an old- world tale, often repeated in many ages and in many lands. As it was traced  back to Speusippus, the translation of Plato into a supernatural being must have commenced immediately after his death. The transcendentalism of his doctrine may have suggested the fiction of his original divinity. The latter was recognized in the inscription on the tomb erected to his memory by the Athenians:

Soon after his birth he was carried to Mount Hymettus by his father and mother, that they might perform on his account the due sacrifices to the enchorial deities Pan, the Nymphs, and the Nomian Apollo. As the infant lay sleeping on the flowers, the bees settled upon his lips, and filled his mouth with honey and the honeycomb, that Homer's verse might be accomplished, says Olympiodorus:

Τοῦ καὶ ἀπὸ γλώσσης μέλιτος γλυκίων ῥέεν ἀνδή (II. 2, 249). According to Greek usage, the child was called Aristocles, after his paternal grandfather. The name of Plato was imposed on him by Ariston of Argos, his instructor in gymnastics, on account of the breadth of his shoulders or of his forehead, or in consequence of the compass and fluency of his speech. He excelled so far in athletic sports as to gain the reputation of having contended in the Isthmian and other games. He began his education at an early age by studying grammar under Dionysius, and continued it by prosecuting the wide circle of knowledge then called music under Draco, a distinguished pupil of the more distinguished Damon. At some period of his youth he also gained an acquaintance with the philosophy of Heraclitus, under the guidance of Cratylus, after whom he has named one of his Dialogues. As a boy, he is said to have been quick in apprehension, eager, diligent, grave, and modest. His first ambition, as with most young men of lively genius, seems to have been for literary renown. He wrote lyrics, dithyrambs, epigrams, and tragedies; and is even said to have composed a tetralogy for competition in the Dionysiac festival. In the estimation of antiquity he was universally accomplished, and his writings attest a wide range of acquirement. After he entered into intimate relations with Socrates, he burned up his juvenile poems; but throughout his career he was attended by the poetic afflatus. The acquaintance with Socrates seems to have begun about his twentieth year (B.C. 407), and was probably incited by the same causes which induced other wealthy, elegant, and ambitious Athenians to frequent the company of the ceaseless disputant—the desire of skill in debate, and dexterity in public harangues. Plato, or the author of the Seventh Epistle attributed to Plato, acknowledges that in youth “he was animated, like other young men, to  devote himself, as soon as he was his own master, to the affairs of the commonwealth.” Other attractions arose, and the association with Socrates became closer and closer with the passing years, till his venerable master was removed from him by the fatal cup of hemlock, after eight years of communion.

The twentieth year of Plato, according to Grote's chronology, coincides with the return of Alcibiades to Athens, the commission of Lysander as commander of the Peloponnesian fleet, and the appointment of Cyrus to the satrapy of Asia two years later came the decisive overthrow of the Athenians at Egospotami—the siege — the starvation — the surrender — the dismantling and the humiliation of Athens. During these disastrous and sorrowing years the age of Plato would keep him employed, during the season of military operations, in the fleet, the infantry, or, more probably from his social station, in the cavalry. He is said to have participated in three engagements at Tanagra, at Delium, and at Corinth. These exploits are wild imaginations, springing from the acknowledgment of Plato's service in the field, which an active, healthy youth could not have avoided, in such days of agony, without incurring the degradation of λειποταξία. Plato might have been present at Corinth, but Delium was fought when he was only three years old; Tanagra, when he was only one, or, if the principal action of that name be regarded, thirty years before his birth. There is no reason to doubt Plato's military service, but the scenes of that service are wholly conjectural. His intimate connection with Chabrias, in whose defense he once spoke, perhaps arose from old camaraderie.

The subjugation of Athens and the usurpation of the Thirty opened to Plato the public career which appeared barred against him during the reckless rule of the Demus. Critias, the leader of the Thirty, a man of splendid and various talent, of high culture, of daring energy, and of unscrupulous ambition, was a cousin; Charmides, one of the Ten at Piraeus, who fell in the battle with Thrasybulus, was an uncle. The gates of the political stadium were thrown wide open to him and the prospect of rapid advancement invited his eager activity. Accepting the Seventh Epistle as genuine, we have his own declaration that he promptly seized the opportunity afforded. His relatives, his friends, his party, so long excluded from office, were at length in power; and he entered as an aspirant along with those to whom he was united by blood, by traditional association, by hereditary interest, and by personal proclivities. He was a born aristocrat. These things should be remembered in the appreciation of Plato's political  reveries, in the estimation of his censures of Pericles and the democracy, and even in the interpretation of his sarcasms on the rhetoricians and sophists. He was himself an exclusive, an oligarch, and he hated popular liberty even more than he hated a tyrant. His political prospects were, however, soon overclouded. The recent democracy had, doubtless, been lawless, savage, oppressive, and indiscreet; but his kinsmen, Critias, Charmides, and their colleagues, were more lawless, sanguinary, rapacious, and brutal. It is safe to reject the blind partisanship alike of Grote and of Mitford. Whether under the rule of the mob or under the rule of the few, the internal condition of Athens had become desperate. Our histories of Greece, with all their details of license and exaction, reveal but little of the consuming fever by which Athens and her sister states slowly perished. What outraged Plato more than anything else was the indignity and treacherous injustice shown towards his master, Socrates, himself affiliated with the dominant party. Socrates was ordered to arrest an innocent man, and to conduct him to punishment, in order that he might be involved in the crimes and odium of the chiefs.

We are reminded of the nefarious counsels given by the historian and administrator Guicciardini for the repression of the prostrate and humiliated Florence. Socrates refused, and his life was endangered. At the same time his garrulous mouth was stopped, and his instructions in the streets and highways prohibited. Plato gave up the delusive visions of reform which he subsequently ascribed to his youth, and withdrew himself from political concerns. Critias was killed, the Thirty driven out, the usurpation overthrown, and a complete subversion of the recent polity was effected. Plato again sought an entrance into public life. He was dragged in this direction by a strong desire, as he confesses. His inclinations were decidedly political. He complains of the violence and vengeance which attended the political disturbances, but admits that much moderation was shown by the restored democracy. Still the party adverse to him acquired full ascendency, and he found himself excluded from influence. His final repulse from Athenian politics was due to the malicious indictment of Socrates, and his death under sentence of the criminal court. The peril and the condemnation of his teacher drew Plato closer to him. He attended and advised the sage in his trial. He offered to pay the fine that might be imposed upon him; and, if parted by sickness from his last serene hours, he fondly treasured up his memory and his aims, and consecrated his own life to the illustration of his virtues, and the perpetuation of the fame of his great guide and friend. Anxious and occupied with other cares as were the years of Plato's intercourse with Socrates, many of the learned  German scholars who have occupied themselves with the Platonic writings have concluded that several of them were composed and published before or soon after the death of his illustrious instructor. It seems more reasonable to refer them all, or nearly all, to a much later period.

The tragic fate of Socrates dispersed the Socratic fraternity and drove Plato from Athens. He naturally feared to be involved in like odium and like danger with Socrates. It must be remembered that the real cause of enmity was mainly political— that Socrates and Plato were not merely adversaries of democratic ascendency, but had been identified with the tyranny of the Thirty. The looseness, too, and unregulated passion of Athenian procedure, civil and criminal, must also be borne in mind. Justice, innocence, and law were no assured protection before an Attic dicastery. This, doubtless, intensified Plato's hereditary opposition to the rule of the majority, and would increase his distrust after the judicial murder of Socrates. He might recall the remark made by Alcibiades at the time of his flight from Sicily, that he would not trust his life to the vote of his own mother, lest she should blunder and deposit a black pebble for a white one. Plato accordingly retired from Athens, and found refuge in the house of Euclid at Megara, a fellow-pupil, and the father of the Megaric school. He was now in his twenty-eighth year. How long he continued at Megara and how far he imbibed the doctrines of Euclid, cannot be ascertained, though Megaric tendencies may readily be recognized in his own teachings. After leaving Megara, Plato entered upon a round of distant voyages; but their extent, their order, and whether continuous or interspersed with visits to his native city, must remain undetermined. In the course of his travels he visited Cyrene, where he studied geometry under Theodorus; and thence proceeded to Egypt, where he admired the ancient monuments, and held intercourse with the priests. Some reports alleged that he extended his journeys to Palestine, Syria, Babylonia, and even to Persia.

When he was about forty years of age he visited Tarentum where he became acquainted with the Pythagoreans, Archytas, Timaeus, Echecrates, etc. — and Syracuse, where his intimacy with Dion was formed. He is said to have been admitted at this time to the society of the elder Dionysius, and to have offended the tyrant, who sent him away in charge of Pollis, the Spartan, to be disposed of as a prisoner of war. The commission was executed, and Plato was sold as a slave in AEgina, but soon ransomed by Anniceris, who refused reimbursement. The story is questionable in all its parts.  Immediately after this supposed adventure Plato returned to Athens, and revived in a novel and more systematic form the career of Socrates, opening a school of philosophy in the grove of the hero Academus, which adjoined a small estate of his own, either inherited or purchased, lying a mile north of Athens, on the road to Eleusis. Here he remained for nearly forty years, in the exercise of his didactic vocation, with the exception of two absences in Sicily, each of considerable length. To this interval between the death of Socrates and the establishment of the Academy has been attributed the composition of many of the Platonic Dialogules. This has been done by German critics, who have been enabled by keen intuition to discover what was in the mind of Plato, though wholly unrevealed by himself. The object of their production in these years is not easily discernible. The leisure for their preparation would scarcely be afforded during the fatigues of his long journeys; nor is it likely that one so averse to the literary promulgation of his views would engage in such labors while occupied in storing his mind with multifarious knowledge, in examining the dogmas of other philosophers, and in maturing his own views. In the absence of all positive information, a decision is as absurd as it would be impossible. But the conclusion of Grote is most plausible— that the Chartae Platonicae are all subsequent to Plato's entrance upon his career as a teacher.

The history of the Academy under the rule and instruction of its founder is unknown. That it was thoroughly successful is evident from the high and wide reputation of its teacher, from the distinguished names of its pupils, from the duration of their academical course, and from its flourishing condition at his death. Among the more notable of the earlier academicians were Aristotle, who attended the instructions of the great teacher for twenty years; Speusippus, the nephew of Plato, and his immediate successor; Xenocrates, who succeeded Speusippus in the direction of the school; Eudoxus of Cnidus, the illustrious astronomer; the orators Demosthenes, Hyperides, and Lycurgus; the Syracusan Dion, and his comrade and murderer, Callippus. May we add “Timon of Athens” to the list, on the strength of the statement of Olympiodorus, that “with Plato alone did the misanthrope associate.” Men and strong-minded women are said to have flocked to his lectures, as he renounced the pungent and mortifying irony of Socrates, abstained from disputations in the markets and workshops, and refrained from hunting up young men to persecute them with logomachies. He differed from the Pythagoreans in the  abstinence from oaths, secrecy, and dogmatism; he differed from the Sophists, or those to whom the name in a later day attached, in requiring no fee from his hearers, though he accepted presents at times of large amounts.

Honor, renown, and influence increased with advancing years. He was consulted, like that strange philosopher, Bentham, in recent times, by communities anxious to improve their organizations or jurisprudence. The Macedonian king Perdiccas sought his advice, and received Philip into his confidence upon his recommendation. The younger Dionysius twice tempted him to Syracuse, though from these visits he derived little advantage for himself, no improvement of condition for the Sicilians, and only discredit for philosophy. These two expeditions to Sicily constitute notable episodes in the life of Plato, and are reported and exculpated at length in the Seventh Epistle. On the accession of Dionysius the younger, who entertained some philosophical aspirations, and was still in the freshness of youth, his uncle Dion persuaded Plato to accept an invitation to Syracuse, in the hope that his influence over a youthful mind might promote a renovation of good order and prosperity, by inducing the abandonment of the savage policy and cruel practices of the preceding tyranny. Plato yielded with hesitation and reluctance, as he afterwards declared, and sailed for Syracuse B.C. 367, twenty years after his first supposed visit. He was cordially welcomed, hospitably entertained, and for some time handsomely treated. But no conversion was effected. He found the young cub the whelp of the old beast. Dion was banished, and Plato discovered himself to be virtually a captive under surveillance. He was anxious to return to Athens, but the means of escape were unattainable. Dionysius made promises, and entreaties which were commands, and Plato prolonged his stay till the season of navigation in the ensuing year. Notwithstanding this unhappy experience, he was again (B.C. 361) persuaded to visit the tyrant of Syracuse, for the purpose of reconciling Dionysius to Dion, and securing the restoration of the latter to his country. The attempt failed utterly. Plato's life was imperiled, and he was enabled to return home only through the intervention of Archytas of Tarentum. On his return he met Dion at Olympia, and seems to have sanctioned his military expedition against Dionysius, though refusing any direct participation in the enterprise, on account of the technical hospitality received from the tyrant. Dion's bold adventure was successful. Dionysius was deposed and driven into exile. Dion acquired the control of Syracuse, declined into tyrannical procedures himself, was assassinated by his comrade Callippus,  who was murdered in turn, and in the conflict of anarchy Dionrsius was restored.

The intercourse of Plato with Dionysius, and even with Dion, was open to grave suspicion; and his visits to Sicily, with their calamitous issues, occasioned bitter reproach. The Seventh Epistle, addressed to the friends of Dion, is an elaborate exposition of the motives by which he professed to have been guided, and an anxious apology for his conduct. The disorder of the explanations; the subtle casuistry of the reasoning; the earnest palliation of his actions; the inconsequences and incongruities of his statements; the ruggedness and inequality of the expression; the absence of art, alike in the structure and in the details of the letter-are very divergent from the graces of Platonic composition, but are in perfect consonance with the situation of Plato, and with the painful solicitudes of a man compelled to justify what he was ashamed of, and, after the disaster of the mortifying events, to put the best possible interpretations upon unpleasant and damaging memories which could not be suppressed. The real facts may have been these: Plato, with the sanguine hope of a poet, the confidence of a philosopher, and the ambition of a reformer, believed that he could re-establish peace, good order, and happiness in Syracuse by his presence; but Dionysius and his subjects were equally intractable; and the Syracusans were so unfitted for civic and social tranquility, by selfish and sensual luxury, chronic discord and general demoralization, as to be restless under any government, and refractory under any laws. The dissolution was universal throughout the Hellenic world, though unrecognized; the total decay of the constitution was mistaken for an accidental, transitory, and curable disease. It was a time, in some respects, like the present: when the distemperature of society was universally experienced; when theories of all kinds new constitutions on novel principles; socialistic, communistic, and other dreams-were in vogue, and sometimes put into practice, with only an aggravation of misery. This unhappy condition of society explains not merely Plato's failures in Sicily, but his disgust at Athenian politics, and the visionary, extravagant, and often immoral devices of his own political speculations.

The remainder of Plato's life, after his final return from Sicily, was devoted to his school. It was passed in great ease and honor, notwithstanding the troubles, domestic and foreign, in which Athens was involved, and the succession of wars which harassed, impoverished, and depopulated Greece. He died B.C. 347, in the year in which Olynthus was taken by Philip of Macedon, and, according to Seneca, on the same day of the same month in  which he had been born (“Platoni diligentiie suae beneficio contigisse, quod natali suo decessit, et annum unum atque octogesimum implevit, sine ulla deductione,” Epist. 6, 6 [58], § 31). He adds that hence the Magi, then at Athens, sacrificed to him, as being of a nature more than human (“amplioris fuisse sortis quam humanae rati”)— thus furnishing another evidence of his mythical divinity.

From this account of the life of Plato it will be seen that he had large and unsatisfactory acquaintance with the social ailments and political conditions of his time; that he held intimate intercourse with the most distinguished personages of the period; that he was brought into close connection with Socrates and the Socratic family, with the Heraclitean, Megaric, Pythagorean, and other schools; that his education was large and liberal; his studies, observation, and travels varied and extensive; his talents versatile and lofty; that he united the genius of the poet the aptitudes of the rhetorician, the skill of the dialectician, the reason of the philosopher, with the diligence of a scholar, the training of a man of the world, and the propensities of a statesman. He was thus full-armed, and prepared to convert to his own use all former knowledge and speculation. How he employed his gifts and the materials at his command will be manifested by the consideration of his literary and philosophical career.

II. Writings. — The literary remains which pass under the name of Plato are among the most extensive monuments of the classic age of Athens, notwithstanding the disfavor with which he regarded writing as a mode of instruction, and his repeatedly expressed preference for oral communication in the treatment of philosophical problems (Phaedo, p. 276; Grote, Plato, vol. 1, ch. 6 p. 221-232). It would be pressing too far the remarkable declaration contained in the Seventh Epistle: “I have never myself written anything upon these subjects; there neither is, nor shall there ever be, a treatise of Plato”-it would be pressing this declaration too far to conclude from it that Plato had written nothing up to that late period of his life. It would be pressing it still further, and more unwarrantably, to receive it as evidence that he never wrote anything at all. The genuineness of the epistle is not above suspicion, and has often been denied. Moreover, Plato adds: “The opinions called by the name of Plato are those of Socrates, in his days of youthful vigor and glory.” These opinions might have been published by writing, as well as by oral delivery, and still have been disclaimed; and there is a bold fiction, or Platonic myth, in ascribing them to Socrates at any period of his life; but it enabled Plato to disconnect  himself from all personal responsibility for the doctrines set forth by him. It is certain that Plato discountenanced the written promulgation of philosophy, and that his writings were not designed for general circulation, or for the acquisition of literary or other fame, but as summaries for his school, and for the attestation of his views. This is confirmed by the story of Hermodorus selling the Platonic treatises in Sicily, and by the proverb founded thereon: λόγοισιν ῾Ερμόδωρος ἐμπορεύεται. Yet, in despite of this aversion, which rested on grounds of personal ease and security, as well as on the exclusiveness of sect and other philosophic reasons, the Opera Plitonis constitute a very copious collection. They consist of thirty- six works, in fifty-six books, counting the thirteen epistles as one book. To these are appended, in many editions of Plato, seven treatises generally recognized to be spurious. Of the thirty-six works habitually ascribed to Plato, only two have wholly escaped challenge on the score of authenticity.

It is very important for the student of philosophy that the genuine treatises of Plato should be clearly separated from those that are doubtful or illegitimate. It is equally important that none should be repudiated from fanciful conjecture. The task of criticism seemed to have been adequately executed by the great scholars of the Museum at Alexandria, and the results which they reached were not seriously questioned till the close of the last century. Since that period a succession of acute and too ingenious philologians in Germany, commencing with Tennemann and Schleiermacher, have undertaken to determine the legitimacy, the order, and the approximate dates of the several Platonic treatises, in accordance with their own notion of his latent meaning; and have rejected such of the Dialogues as failed to harmonize in form, finish, or sentiment with their preconceived views of the Platonic scheme. These criticisms, arrangements, and rejections do not accord with each other: there are continual dissonances among these organizers and repudiators. If they are followed, everything becomes a quaking bog beneath the feet of the inquirer. It is safer and more satisfactory to acquiesce in the conclusions of the ancients, who had means of judging at their command denied to us, and to receive as Plato's what has been received as Plato's under their authority. To this conclusion Mr. Grote comes after a diligent and minute examination of the Platonic canon, and of all that has been alleged on the part of the opponents. He shows that, the accepted canon rests upon the scheme of Thrasyllus, formed about the reign of Tiberius; that the canon of Thrasyllus rests upon the classification of Aristophanes of Byzantium, and  the arrangements of the Alexandrian Library; that the Alexandrian critics probably derived their Knowledge, mediately or immediately, from Xenocrates and the early Academy itself; and that the Platonic documents were attested by their careful preservation, transcription, and collation in the Academy itself-the house and manuscripts of Plato having been bequeathed by him to the school. The chain of evidence is as complete as possible for the determination of the authorship of ancient works. The direct positive evidence is valuable and irrefragable, but limited. It is almost entirely confined to references in Aristotle to treatises with which he connects the name of Plato; references to passages in Plato, but without mention of his name; and references which can scarcely be explained otherwise than as references to evident passages in Plato. The Dialogues thus accredited are, first, the Republic, Timseus, and Laws; second, the Phaedon, Banquet, Phsedrus, and Gorgias; third, the Meno. Hippias Minor, and Menexenus; fourth, the Thevetetus, Philebus, and Sophistes; and lastly, the Politicus, Apology, Lysis, Laches, and perhaps the Protagoras, Euthydemus, and Cratylus.

The question of the canon is associated with several other difficult inquiries— the order of production and dates of the several works, their coherence and interdependence, their special aim, and their purpose as parts of a supposed Platonic system. There are no external testimonies or internal criteria by which the dates of production can be fixed. In some of the Dialogues events are mentioned which seem to determine the anterior limit of their composition, but reveal nothing as to later years. Some critics have supposed that the order or approximate dates could be settled by the relative age assigned to Socrates in each. This is very arbitrary and fantastical, and leaves no guidance but bold conjecture. Some critics assume that certain pieces appeared during the lifetime of Socrates, others immediately after his death, others again during the period of Plato's foreign wanderings, and a large portion of the remainder in an indicated succession after the institution of the Academy. Some philological legislators decide that the Phaedrus and such other Dialogues as may suit their fancy were the first fruits of his literary fecundity, in consequence of the joyous juvenility of their utterances, the uncastigated redundancy of imagination, and the poetic richness of expression. But the latest productions of Edmund Burke were the richest, the most ornate, fervid, and poetical.  It is impossible to discover the chronological order of the Platonic treatises. The wide diversity of opinion on the subject, the ingenious arguments employed by discordant scholars to confirm their own theories and to refute those of' others, attest this impossibility. There is as much divergence of view in regard to the sequence of the Platonic Dialogues as in regard to the dramas of Shakespeare. The hopeless uncertainty of all conclusions is assured by the similar characteristics of both authors. The productions of each were subject to continued revision and alteration; the first draft rarely, if ever, represented the ultimate form.

Additions, suppressions, expansions, modifications, were from time to time introduced by both into their works, which were not published in permanent form, or thrown into circulation until after the death of their authors. Hence it is an utterly delusive procedure in either case to undertake to decide the date of production by tone by style, by doctrine, or by historical statement or allusion. The writings of Plato are not bounded by the accidents of time. They bear the impress of his hand, his heart, his soul, not at particular moments of his life, but are the flower and sum of his whole intellectual existence. Except in a few instances, which do not affect the totality of his instructions, there is no ascertainable before and after, but all stand upon the same chronological plane. The attempt to determine the order in which the several works of Plato was produced derives its chief interest from the aid thence expected in tracing the evolution of the Platonic doctrines, and the relation of each treatise to the rest. The inquiry is tempting, but, even if capable of satisfactory solution, would be more fruitless in the case of Plato than of any other philosopher. There is so little in Plato of a dogmatic character, so much of tentative, skeptical, and undefined exploration, that the chief result of such an investigation, if it were practicable, would not be the discovery of the process of development and expansion, but only the settlement of the sequence of published doubts.

The question of the connection of the Platonic writings early engaged attention. It seems to have been raised in the years immediately following Plato's death. The great critic Aristophanes of Byzantium, librarian of the Museum at Alexandria, put forth an arrangement of the more notable tractates of Plato in a system of trilogies, the members of each trilogy being determined by community of subject or correspondence of form and treatment. The Platonic exposition is, for the most part, so thoroughly dramatic that it might naturally suggest an arrangement analogous to that observed in theatrical compositions. But the adaptation of the mould to the  Platonic writings is altogether arbitrary, and proved to be inadequate in the hands of its inventors. The Leges and Epinomnis were divorced from the Republic; the Crito and Phaedo were placed in a different class from the Euthyphron and the Apology. Only fifteen of the treatises were trilogized; the rest were ungrouped, and followed in single file. Grote thinks the arrangement may have been earlier than Aristophanes. The imperfections of the scheme are manifold, and provoked other distributions. By some critics his works were arranged in three classes:

1. The Direct, or dramatic;

2. The Indirect, or narrative;

3. The Mixed.

This disposition is awkward, insufficient, and indistinct. Only two, or at most three of the works of Plato are really narrative. All the rest are dialogues, and therefore dramatic; but these are composed of dialogues blended in varying proportions with narrative. Under the reign of the first emperors of Rome the Platonic remains were redistributed by Thrasyllus, to whom were due two distinct schemes. Imitating the example of Aristophanes, and guided by the same dramatic analogy, he disposed the whole recognized works of Plato in nine tetralogies, or groups of four each. The first tetralogy, in which a real community of subject and an orderly development are manifest, was formed of the Euthyphron, Apology, Crito, and Phaedo— which still lead the procession of the Corpus Platonicum in nearly all editions of Plato's works. But the tetralogies of Thrasyllus had no more chronological truth, and rarely more logical coherence, than the trilogies of the Alexandrian school. They do not seem to have satisfied himself, for he proposed another and totally diverse classification of the Platonic memorials, founded upon their form and aim rather than on their subject or supposed succession. In this plan Thrasyllus distinguished the Platonic treatises into I. Inquisitory; II. Expository. The Inquisitory productions were divided into, A. Gymnastic; B. Agonistic. The Gymnastic were subdivided into, 1. Obstetrical; 2. Peirastic, or Tentative; and the Agonistic into, 1. Confirmatory, or Monstratory; and 2. Refutatory. The Expository treatises were separated into, C. Theoretical, and D. Practical. Each of these contained two classes: the Theoretical—1. Physical; 2. Logical; and the Practical—1. Ethical, and 2. Political. The two schemes are exhibited by Grote in tabular form (Plato, vol. 1, ch. 4:p. 161, 162).

The ancients thus renounced the effort to reduce into a connected series the writings of Plato, either by the evidence of the order of their production, or by hypothetical indications of their logical and philosophical interdependence. Such disappointment did not cool the ardor or repress the audacity of the German philologians. Schleiermacher bluntly assumed that the various productions of Plato constituted preconceived and well-ordered parts of a systematic doctrine, contemplated in its integrity from the beginning of his career. Starting from this point, he undertook to detect by internal signs the periods of production, the relation of the parts to each other, the purpose of each treatise, and the constitution of the whole philosophy. Whatever did not accord with this scheme was set aside as a disconnected or incidental labor, or was rejected as a fraudulent pretence. Schleiermacher's views raised up a host of opponents, but a host of imitators of his procedure also. It is not appropriate to examine here the theory of Schleiermacher, or the theories of his antagonists; or to point out what has been admitted and what rejected by each of the acute disputants. The theses of Schleiermacher, Ast, Socher, C. K. Hermann, Stallbaum. Steinhart, Sisemihl, Munk, and Ueberweg are carefully stated, weighed, and judged in Grote's laborious and tedious work. The discussion is noticed here because it involves the decision of two very important points in the appreciation of the doctrine of Plato: Was there any unity of design in the literary productions of this philosopher? Is there any unity of execution, any methodical scheme of philosophy in them? In other words, did Plato contemplate from the commencement of his career the elaboration of that scheme which may be deduced from his works?

Does each separate work bear, from the intention of its author, a definite relation, and render a definite service to any complete doctrine? Are the works of Plato to be considered parts of a system? or as, in the main, occasional and fragmentary presentations of disconnected parts of philosophical inquiry? These questions probe the whole significance of Plato's career and of the Platonic doctrine, and we assent substantially to the conclusions of Grote. The idea of a preconceived plan had been rejected by Ast, Socher, Hermann, Stallbaum, and others, before it was impugned by Grote. A system of philosophy is always a production of slow and gradual growth, requiring not merely long meditation and frequent re- examination, but favorable circumstances, so that it is rarely completed by its originator, except in method and broken outline. The philosophy of Comte is one of the few instances of complete organization by the author himself; the philosophy of Leibnitz an instance of the much commoner  result of only fragmentary indication. The assumption of Schleiermacher is at variance with nearly all experience. Certain fundamental views in regard to principle or method, usually to both, for they are almost indissolubly connected, present themselves to the quick apprehension and creative imagination of the young philosopher. These long struggle to shape themselves into definite form. They are at first vague, though luminous; active, though indeterminate; indistinct in outline, though of penetrating radiance. As separate questions arise, they are discussed under the impulse and by the guidance of the new light: and each successive discussion renders this new force more distinct, more prominent, and more controlling. With the process of such expansion, new modifications and new applications are introduced, and it is only when an opportunity is afforded, after the performance of this course, for revising the chain of progression, that a philosopher is enabled to present his doctrine in harmonious integrity. Was this opportunity afforded to Plato, outside of the sphere of his acroamatic expositions? It may well be doubted, if not roundly denied. In his published works we find fragmentary revelations only, accompanied by incongruities and positive inconsistencies, which would surely have been absent from speculations complete in the mind of the philosopher, and not merely in various stages of development.

If there was no unity of purpose in the several productions, if they were never contemplated in their conception as parts of a general and concordant system, there could scarcely be any definite unity in their execution. The whole is composed of all its parts. The meditated whole may, indeed, be discerned “by the mind's eye” where several of the parts have been lost or never supplied, as any circle may be completed from a single arc, or from the broken segments of the same circumference. But that this may be done it is essential that all the members finished or preserved shall have the same curvature, shall have been described by the same radius revolving round the same center. This cannot be said, and cannot be supposed without violent presumptions, of the Platonic treatises. All that we know, and all that we can positively discern, is adverse to such an hypothesis. The style of Plato is singularly various: its variety is one of the most salient indications of the wealth, freedom, and activity of his genius. The structure of the several dialogues is so ingeniously diversified as to render them incapable of classification, and to make them, like the plays of Shakespeare, each a distinct species in itself. Plato's mode of procedure is as elastic as his style. The Socratic method of disputation may  be usually retained, but its spirit is curiously changed in different applications, and its prominence is varied. The points of view, the central stations, are constantly shifted in passing from one dialogue to another, and, as a necessary result, the aspects presented are changed-the tendencies are dissimilar and the doctrines are uncoalescing. But more than this: very few of the treatises of Plato are constructive or dogmatical. Nearly all of them are simply negative or inquisitorial. The latter do not seek to maintain any dependence on the former.

They are separated by the whole diameter of the intellectual sphere. It is only in a few of his works—presumably the late and still crude products of his old age, the second fruitage that never ripens-that Plato enounces principles which are neither inductions nor deductions, and propounds dogmas which are rather germs of undeveloped speculation than the partial representation of the conclusions of a system already completed and formulated. However greatly he may have travestied and sublimated the character of his teacher and philosophical protagonist, his procedure was in the main and throughout honestly and earnestly Socratic, and his aim was Socratic also. His object was not the establishment of a doctrine, but the stimulation of candid investigation, in order to free his hearers from the stagnation of thought and the obsession of vulgar or treacherous errors. He was not a doctrinaire, but an inquirer; or, rather, he taught the need and practice of investigation, not a body of conclusions. Undoubtedly there is an intellectual unity, vague, unformed, and in great measure unconscious, in the constitution of every man, there is a mental identity, through innumerable and often wide changes of opinion, in the entire career of every thinker, and this unity and this identity, intuitively recognized by the pupil or student, will suggest purpose where no purpose was present, and furnish the elements of an imaginary system which never revealed itself to its parent. To this cause may be largely assigned the strange and divergent developments of the Platonic philosophy in the several schools which sheltered their reveries under the prestige of his great name. It would lead us too far from our proper subject to pursue further this line of reflection. We return, therefore, to the text that there was no conscious scheme, no unity of execution, in the writings of Plato, and approve of the spirit in which they have been regarded by Grote, who says, “I shall not affect to handle them as contributions to one positive doctrinal system, nor as occupying an intentional place in the gradual unfolding of one preconceived scheme, nor as successive manifestations of change, knowable and determinable, in the views of the author. For us they exist as distinct imaginary conversations, composed by  the same author at unknown times and under unknown specialties of circumstance” (Plato, vol. 1, ch. 6, p. 279).

The mode in which these questions may be decided regulates the interpretation to be given to the Platonic philosophy, both in the original conception of its author and in its subsequent developments. It explains the origin, the cause, and the filiation of the later divergences, and their wide separation from each other. It determines our appreciation of the nature and extent of Plato's services to his own and future times, fixes his position in the history of philosophy and in the development of human intellect. It affects our estimate of his relation to his disciples, to his country, and to his times, and, indeed, penetrates and colors every part of the criticism which may be hazarded on his personal and speculative career.

III. Relations to his Times. — For the just and adequate conception of Plato it is indispensable to ascertain his actual position in the Hellenic world, and his attitude towards Attic thought, the thought both of the general public and of the cultivated intelligences in that period of mental activity which followed the death of Pericles. To do this it is necessary to consider the remarkable mission of Socrates; for, however Plato may have transmuted and glorified his master, he unquestionably continued his labors in a higher sphere, and both spoke in his name and contemplated the same public results. The extreme democracy of Athens, which was only the fullest and most pronounced exhibition of the general Hellenic tendency, threw all power-political, social, and, we may almost say, religious-into the hands of the multitude.

The populace became more willful, arrogant, and reckless after the demoralization produced by the Peloponnesian War and the plague. But the intractable Demus, described in burning lineaments by Aristophanes, is always under the guidance or at the mercy of demagogues, flatterers, and timeserving politicians. The sense of power produced in the masses the feeling of right, for with mere numbers “might is right;” and the execrable maxim, “Stet pro ratione voluntas,” is the motto of an ochlocracy even more than it is of an autocrat. The mob cannot be led by considerations of abstract morality; it may be wheedled by persuasion, by adroit catchwords, by dexterous appeals to its whims, passions, and immediate interests. At Athens it had lost all reverence for the cardinal principles of right; it had been greatly corrupted by the incidents and consequences of the war; it was habitually misguided for selfish purposes by its dissolute leaders; gentleness, mercy, justice, prudence, were all discredited; and everything was sacrificed to momentary caprice, to insane  suspicion, and to blind fury (Plato, De Rep. 8:10-13; Xenoph. De Rep. Ath. Oratores Attici, passim). In these respects the Athenians were merely the highest exemplification of the contemporaneous spirit of the Greeks.

The leaders, who debauched the people, could hope to gain or to retain their ascendency only by encouraging the debauched sentiments by which they throve. Under these circumstances professed teachers visited the Greek cities and thronged to Athens, undertaking to communicate for pay the corroding arts by which the populace might be swayed, and office, power, honor, and emolument acquired. By the union of these bad influences truth lost all respect; virtue all authority; the sense of right was destroyed; every ancient rule, custom, or institution was deprived of its sanction; every venerable principle was brought into contempt; morality was supplanted by passion or apparent expediency; nothing stable was suffered to remain; words became jugglers' tools, reason was degraded to chicanery, casuistry, and sonorous plausibility; and specious rhetoric or ambiguous commonplaces took the place of wisdom. No hope could be entertained for the renewed health of society, for the welfare of the community, for the restoration of order in the state, till this vicious circle of delusions had been broken and suppressed. But the delusions, and the pernicious practices which attended them, were fortified by the conceit of knowledge and of practical sagacity; and this conceit could not be overcome without exposing the ignorance which it concealed, and compelling the vain tribe of blind leaders of the blind to confess their ignorance with shame and remorse. The most effectual mode of reaching this result might well seem to be the examination of the nature, import, and ambiguities of words, habitually and loosely used without reference to their special significance or insignificance; the investigation of the shadowy and unsettled notions attached to current phrases and accepted aphorisms; the discovery of the characteristics and relations of propositions, both in particular employments and in their general constitution; and the detection of the conditions under which valid conclusions might be drawn.

Lessons of this character could not be effectually communicated to persons confident in their own knowledge and perspicacity, and contemning all who were of a different communion, otherwise than by propounding a series of interrogations growing not out of each other, but out of the answers to each question, and thus leading the respondents into a labyrinth of perplexities, absurdities, inconsistencies, and impotent confusion. No escape would then be left from the recognition of previous ignorance and error. The better natures would be stimulated to further inquiry, and to  persistent efforts to attain a knowledge of momentous truths, or, at least, to abstain from the preconization of manifest uncertainties, unmeaning verbiage, or interested misrepresentations, as unquestionable truth. Now this procedure was the Socratic elenchus, and it was mainly conducted by means of the Socratic sorites-a most fallacious form of reasoning, but most piercing in unveiling the hollow pretensions of arrogant sophistry. It was a keen “examination of conscience,” intended to lay bare the habitual sins of ignorance, false knowledge, and fraudulent conceit. It was not designed to teach anything but the knowledge of self, and the accompanying knowledge of ignorance disguised as wisdom. This was the true Nosce teipsum, and the ground on which the Delphic Oracle pronounced Socrates the wisest of men-because he professed to know nothing. It was a contrivance for sweeping away error, as the indispensable preliminary for the discovery of truth. It was not the announcement of truth, but the preparation for its reception. It was the preaching of repentance, which must precede, and might induce. the restoration of individual, social, and political health, morality, and welfare. We see from the testimony (of Plato, Xenophon, and even Aristophanes, to what cruel tortures, to what writhing reluctations, to what bitter reflections, to what irritating mortifications, the catechumenos in this strange school were subjected. Some went away penitent, some sought fuller knowledge, and attached themselves to the master with reverent love and eager desire to learn, some followed him to acquire the secret of his art, that they might apply it to the nefarious practices which he proposed to frustrate. Hence from the Socratic school issued Alcibiades, and Critias, and Charmides, and Xenophon—the mercenary soldier and enemy of his country. But the most of the disciples departed in rage and confusion, to feed upon their husks, to repeat their old practices, and to nurse enmity against the man and the process by which they had been exposed and brought to shame.

The vocation of Socrates was exercised in the dockyards, the workshops, the markets, the streets, and all places of public gathering. He straggled about, seizing upon every chance idler whom he might; and whom he fascinated, or button-holed, so that “he could not choose but hear.” Plato changed the audience and the venue; but he pursued the same dialectical method as his instructor, for the same purposes, with the same distant prospects; but with greater elegance, higher culture, and in a loftier range of thought, illustration, and expression. Like Socrates, he aimed at coercing his hearers into an examination of the meaning of their terms and  the contents of their propositions, single or connected, in order to induce them to put aside the misguiding and corrupting influences of the empty pretence of knowledge, and of sophistical rules of action. When this was achieved, something more might be attempted: till this was done, nothing beneficial could be expected. The teachings of Socrates and Plato might train men in the legitimate employment of language and the instruments of thought, but was not calculated for the establishment of systematic doctrine; and they had direct relation to the positive needs of the Hellenic communities of their time, rather than to the intellectual aspirations of a few cultivated minds. It these views be correct, it is manifest that Plato could neither have contemplated nor executed any rounded scheme of philosophy in the writings that remain to us; and we know that we possess all his important works. The philosophy that may be ascribed to him must therefore be patiently, and in some degree at least conjecturally, developed from the hints that he has given, and from the scattered tenets that he has expressed.

There is another peculiarity which points in the same direction. Artistic considerations, and the desire to reproduce the life of the time and the familiar intercourse of Athenians, may have induced Plato to adopt the form of dialogue in nearly all his compositions. The truer representation both of Socrates and of the Socratic mode of procedure may also have concurred in recommending the dramatic presentation of his inquiries. But the dialogue had another and still higher advantage for him: it enabled him to conceal his opinions, and to dissociate himself from any doctrines calculated to give offence, or that might give offence, to the irritable people of Athens. The fate of Socrates was always before his eyes; and with much more sincerity, as well as art, than Descartes, he evaded responsibility for his opinions lie did not only adopt the form of dialogue, but he made Socrates the principal speaker, illustrating the Socratic method under the mask of Socrates, and putting nearly everything of weight, moment, or originality into his mouth. He never appears in paropria persona. There is nothing to connect him before the Athenian dicasteries with any tenet in his writings. There is a constant avoidance of definite doctrine a frequent censure of written instruction, a continual reference to the obstetrical procedure, and a deliberate renunciation of all responsibility. Everything is thus adverse to systematic unity of any kind in the Copus Platonicum.

IV. Literary and Artistic Merits. — The dramatic form of nearly all the Platonic writings has just been mentioned as one of the instrumentalities by which the philosopher shrouded his personality, and withdrew himself from the malice of his fellow-citizens; but it constitutes one of the distinguishing excellences of his composition. Whatever construction may be put upon Plato's philosophic career, whatever value may be assigned to his speculations, whatever censures of his doctrines may be hazarded, his varied literary merits and graces have always won the most enthusiastic admiration. In a beautiful epigram on his great comic contemporary attributed to him, Plato says that the Graces found in the soul of Aristophanes a temple which should never decay. The comedies of Aristophanes were Plato's constant companions. He caught from them many delicate turns of expression and attitudes of thought; and he offered in his own Protean mind an equally imperishable temple for the habitation of the Graces.

Plato probably owes much more of his immortality to the beauties of his compositions than he does to his philosophic splendor and profundity; and perhaps it was chiefly through the fascination of his manner that his doctrines secured the attention necessary for their appreciation and acceptance. The literary attractions of the Platonic writings furnish their first and most easily recognized claim to permanent renown, and can scarcely be regarded as accidental or undesigned characteristics. Plato's earliest efforts were in the direction of poetry. He is believed to have produced attempts of high pretension in the popular forms of poetic art. No literary apprenticeship equals poetical composition. When he first associated himself with Socrates he was full of dreams of political distinction, and he may have expected to derive from the intercourse the same aids for a political career which were derived by other illustrious pupils of the school. When he renounced the temptations of a political career, he converted to philosophic purposes all the knowledge of literary art and all the faculties of effective expression which he had acquired by his previous discipline. The result was a style unrivalled for variety, fertility, vivacity, ease, flexibility, and almost every form of literary excellence. The great difficulty of expression to say simple things simply, and ordinary things with propriety (difficile est communia dicere)— was never surmounted by any writer with such felicity as by Plato. None has approached him in the natural facility with which he changes the mood of expression with the changed mood of feeling, or with the requirements of the changing subject. He turns “from grave to gay, from lively to severe,” with inimitable self-possession; rising without effort to the highest  sublimities of imagination, descending without a fall to the playfulness of unchecked humor and poising himself in the middle air without hazard and without uneasy fluttering of his pinions.

The exuberance of the Greek vocabulary can be estimated only by comparing Aristophanes with Platonot that they exhaust its wealth. but that they have an ampler mastery of its treasures than any other writers of the tongue. In this comparison Plato will not appear inferior to Aristophanes in the extent of his possessions, in the happiness of their employment, or in the force of their combinations. Words are, however, only the currency of thought and feeling. The preeminent merit of Plato is equally manifest in the plasticity of his phraseology; the appropriate turns of expression—the homeliness at times, at times the rare magnificence of his diction; the close adaptation of the utterance to the sentiment, so as to furnish a perfect cast of whatever is intended to be conveyed, no matter how convoluted and intricate. To these qualities must be added the balance and harmony of all the instrumentalities of communication, and-that which most delighted an Attic ear-the rhythm and melody which are almost as imperceptible to moderns as “the music of the spheres” to those who know not “divine philosophy.”

These remarkable excellences are only aids for the fuller exhibition of higher characteristics of art. The drama was the favorite recreation of the Athenian people; their whole life was dramatic; their time was spent in the open air, “hearing or telling some new thing;” their political discussions were dramatic; their forensic controversies were thoroughly theatrical; their social gatherings and their street colloquies were all dramatic-and the dialogue was in consequence the natural representation of their daily existence, as well as of the customary procedure of Socrates. ‘The Dialogues of Plato, at once artful and artistic, seemed wholly devoid of art, from their correspondence with the familiar usages of the people, and thus they won regard and ready acceptance, which might have been sturdily refused to a more demonstrative form of communication. Then, too, the dialogue enabled the author to turn and twist a question into every imaginable attitude and shape, and Plato reveled in the performance of such legerdemain. It furnished an opportunity of examining a thesis or a doubt on every possible side; of bringing forward and answering, modifying, appreciating, or evading, every conceivable objection; and of thus applying the Socratic elenchus in the most startling manner and with the best effect. It also enabled Plato to keep ever in the foreground his beloved teacher,  who was elevated by his presentation, though dressed up so as to be incapable of recognition.

This prominence of Socrates points to another charm of the Platonic writings. We have little reason to believe that the Socrates of Plato was the man whom Xenophon described, whom Aristophanes ridiculed, whom the Athenians laughed at, whom Anytus and Melitus indicted, and who drank the hemlock in the public dungeon. The character presented was thoroughly unreal and wholly idealized; but it was a perfectly natural and consistent creation-as much so as Hamlet, Prospero, or Falstaff. It was a living portrait of one who had never appeared in that fashion in life. The same remarks may be extended to the other personages introduced into the magic mirror of Plate. The dramatic imagination is continually displayed by him with a power and a sagacity which might have been envied by Sophocles, by Aristophanes, or by Moliere. These lifelike personages, moreover, are not employed by him as vain puppets, or as pageantry to excite surprise or to decorate the scene. They have a sufficient sratio essecendi, and help forward all the graver purposes of the philosopher. How much more effective are the illustration and the pungency of the reasoning when they are the spontaneous outpouring of the thoughts and feelings of personages like ourselves and our acquaintances! Mr. Grote has shown the aim and the service of the endless questionings and inconclusive argumentation of Plato; and he has noted their partial correspondence with the unappreciated method of the schoolmen. Both procedures appear tedious, over-subtle, and absurd to modern apprehensions; yet they had their use, and might be revived with advantage. But the Platonic art renders the further service of bringing “home to men's business and bosoms” the grave perplexities which are discussed in so many forms and clothed in such chameleon hues; and also of making men take a lively interest in debates, which might otherwise be repelled as abstract refinements, devoid of practical interest and significance. The total neglect into which the great schoolmen have fallen, when contrasted with the unfading fame of Plato, may prove how much of his influence in every age has been due to his literary skill and the marvelous subtlety and perfection of his dialogue.

If we frankly and admiringly confess the variety and splendor of the Platonic style, we must not close our eyes to its occasional defects. The copiousness of his expression and the joy of indulging his genius certainly encouraged loquacity and a needless languor of movement. The richness of his imagination, lavished upon reveries, also led to turgidity and  inappropriate gorgeousness of rhetoric. These defects were noticed by the ancient critics, and can scarcely be overlooked by the sober modern student (Dionys. Halicarn. De Vi Demosth. p. 956; Longin. De Sublim. c. 32. 29). There is the brilliancy, but there is also the extravagance of the Miltonic outbursts of fancy, and, as the language far outstrips the thought, it becomes obscure, like a cloud before the sun, whose darkness is deepened by the fringe of radiance on its borders.

It is not merely from this cause that Plato frequently lapses into obscurities and awkwardness. He is sometimes more concerned about his expression than about his thought. He dealt in reflections still vague to himself, and in mysteries not clear to his own mind. There was constant demand for the services of a Delian diver. The subjects which he handled were not only deep, but unfathomed by him; not only dark, but undefined. Their imperfect apprehension by himself was reflected by the indistinctness of his utterances. There was also a misguiding star by which he was often led astray and tempted into pathless intricacies. The imagination of Plato was the commanding faculty of his intellect, and he followed its beams too far. He was a poet by congenital propensity. Aristotle has said that the philosopher is a devotee of fable (φιλόμυθος ὁ φιλοσόφος πώς ἐστιν, Metaph. 1, 2, p. 982). Plato furnished the example and confirmed the dictum. He insisted upon the employment of philosophical fiction as the best means of popular education; and proposed to substitute it for the great poets-Homer, Pindar, and the Tragediansm— whom he condemned and excluded from his commonwealth. He was constantly indulging his poetic appetencies, inventing fables for the illustration of his positions, and converting his fables into philosophical verities. Were the Platonic Ideas at first anything more than fantastic dreams— “tenues sine corpore vitas?” This tendency, which grew with years, eventuated in mysticism; and mysticism is at best a luminous cloud, unsubstantial, impalpable, inapprehensible, however bright it may be.

V. Philosophy. — From what has already been observed, it will be evident that we could not ascribe to Plato a definite, distinct, coherent, and complete body of doctrine. But philosophy, in its original application, and peculiarly in the Socratic school, imported the love and pursuit of truth and wisdom, without assuming their actual attainment. In the philosophy of every sect, the method of inquiry and the germs or fundamental principles constitute its distinctive characteristics and excellences, and determine its ulterior developments, whether wrought out by the founder of the school  or by his successors. Thus, though we may deny to Plato the full creation of a philosophic system, we must admit that he laid the corner-stone and some of the foundations of a system; that he opened out new paths of inquiry and broadened old ones, that he stimulated investigation by characteristic modes, and communicated a potent impulse in a particular direction, and that he furnished new and pregnant germs of thought to be cherished into ample growth and production by those who should come after him. These germs are scattered through his writings without reciprocal connection; but they may be discovered, harmonized, and combined. Though their meaning may appear diverse to different minds, their combinations be variously established, and their developments be strangely divergent, yet a general accordance in the constitution of all the expositions will maintain the family likeness, and attest the presence of a distinctive and fruitful thought undisclosed body of thought in the original founder of the sect. It is this body of thought, indicated, but unequally and imperfectly revealed, in the Platonic treatises-extracted from them, and coordinated by a succession of acolytes, who professed to find it in the authentic texts-which constitutes the philosophy of Plato. Partly in consequence of the length of this notice, partly in consequence of the impossibility of referring the connected scheme in its connected form to Plato, it will be presented in brief outline under the head of SEE PLATONIC PHILOSOPHY.

VI. Services and Influence. — A few remarks may be added here on the character and tendency of the Platonic teachings, as no appropriate place will be found for them in the proposed examination of the Platonic doctrine. The aim of Plato was to bring his people to a knowledge of their intellectual sins, and to a confession of ignorance and guilt in their pretensions and practices, in order that a foundation for truth might be discovered, and the rules of correct action and upright conduct might be established and observed. His main object was to confute intellectual chicanery, to dispel delusion, and to lead men to an eager desire for justice, righteousness, and wisdom. For his greater pupil, Aristotle, was reserved the task of building on the ground which he cleared from wreck and ruin and poisonous weeds. But the vast and magnificent structures of the Stagirite are the best proof of the valuable service which Plato rendered. The domination of sophistry was ended by the career of Socrates and the institution of Plato's Academy. In various modes, earnest men addressed themselves to the search for truth, and ceased to wander after “sounding  brass and tinkling cymbals.” Healthy thought, eager purpose, and honest resolution were reawakened throughout the realm of Hellenic intellect, and, though devious paths were pursued, and dissimilar resting-places accepted as the goal, all prosecuted their investigations with a single eye to truth, and not as the means of fraudulently gaining personal advantage. As the Knights of the Round Table separated in the quest of the Holy Grail, which only one achieved, so the philosophers of Greece, after Socrates and Plato, traveled by different routes to reach the same end, though Aristotle alone accomplished the task which all contemplated the pursuit of the summum bonum, or supreme good, became after Plato the special object of all philosophy (Cicero, De Fin. Bon. et Mal.). Divergent were the tracks of the inquirers, and dissimilar the forms of good which were contemplated, but with all the schools virtue and happiness, which was its promised fruit, were the aim. The utter rottenness of the communities of Greece, the irreparable disintegration of Hellenic society, prevented the new spirit from infusing health into the diseased political fabric; but the unexampled integrity of Lycurgus, and the exalted morality of Demosthenes in his Orations, both alleged pupils of Plato, may be taken as evidence of the wholesome reaction produced. To the lofty and pure sentiments of Plato, even more than to the beauty of his style, may be applied the observation of Quintilian: “Ut mihi non hominis ingenio sed quodam Delphico videatur oraculo instructus” (Or. Inst. 10. 1, 81).

The philosophy and the habitual sentiments of Greece were purified and elevated by the teachings of Plato, and the world never wholly lost the vantage-ground which had thus been gained. There is indeed nothing more remarkable in the history of Greek intellect than the purity of sentiment, the spirituality of aspiration, the adoration of virtue and holiness and justice and right, the fervid enthusiasm for a virtuous life, irrespective of consequences, and the intuitive apprehension of the highest precepts of morality, which shine through all the writings of Plato. They are blended, occasionally, it is true, with coarse views contracted from the habitual practice of the pagan world around. Some of these views are too disgusting to be commemorated here. Others are aberrations unworthy of Plato. When he advocates the community of goods and the community of women, and the paternal abnegation of children, in the governing class of his ideal commonwealth, we see how far fantasy betrayed him into pernicious error (De Rep. 5).

There was no greater service rendered to humanity by Aristotle than his confutation of these dangerous and immoral  extravagances. But when we contemplate the positions of Plato in regard to the perfections of God, to the nature of virtue and holiness; when we consider his declaration that man should assimilate himself to the Deity, that God is the source of good, but not of evil, that the regeneration of the spiritual nature is not to be attained by argumentative reasoning, and cannot be taught as a science or an art; when we regard his assertion of the immortality of the soul, his belief in future retribution, his allegation that the highest truth must be revealed, his delineation of the Son of God (τοῦ θεοῦ ἔγγονος)it is impossible to overlook his vast superiority over all former schemes of morality, and his near approximation to the doctrines of Christianity-some of which he announces almost in the language of the apostles. We know no more terrible and sublime picture than the passage in which he depicts the dead presenting themselves for judgment in the other world, scarred and blotched and branded with the ineradicable marks of their earthly sins (ψυχὴν...διαμεμαστιγωμένην καὶ οὐλῶν μεστὴν ὑπὸ ἐπιορικῶν καὶ ἀδικίας, § ἕκαστῳ ἡ πρᾶξις αὐτοῦ ἐξωμόρξατο εἰς τὴν ψυχήν, κ.τ.λ. Goig. c. 80).

Yet this is but one of many analogous passages. This approximation to revealed truth is among the most insoluble problems bequeathed to us by antiquity. It has often been thought that Plato derived much of his theological and ethical doctrine from the Hebrew prophets, either circuitously or by direct acquisition during his supposed travels in Palestine. But his tenets are not to be found in those prophets in such a form as to be apprehended by a Gentile; nor can they be detected in them except through the illumination of the later revelation. It has been alleged that the spiritual interpretation of these utterances, which gives them their startling significance, is unwarrantably deduced from the Neo-Platonists, who were posterior to the evangelists. But the tenets are in Plato's text, were commented on by Cicero, and affected the speculation of Philo-Judaus, before Christianity had secured definite establishment, or Neo-Platonism was distinctly constituted. It has been suggested that these anticipations of the teachings of the Great Master are hesitating and only problematic-dreams thrown out as possibilities, the vague longings of the ecstatic fancy but the mystery remains; how could such dreams and longings arise in the midst of paganism, and of Athenian degradation and corruption? We offer no solution of the enigma, which awaits its (Edipus. We only note the existence of the riddle. There are marvels in the life of men and of nations which no plummet in man's hands can fathom, but which justify the conviction that, as the spirit of God brooded over the face of the deep, and  brought order and beauty and life out of chaos, so it incessantly broods over the dark confusion of earthly change, regulating all issues, and preparing the world, in the midst of manifold disorder, for the higher and purer phases of being for which it is designed, and towards which it is blindly striving.

We are not of the number of those who accept without inquiry the tenets of Plato, or approve the whole tendency of his teachings. We are of another school. We recognize however, that his aims are always noble, and that an invigorating morality breathes through nearly all his writings. To him we are indebted for many glorious visions of supernal beauty, which beam upon us like the unattainable stars disclosed through rifts in the clouds which envelop the earth. But the philosophy of Plato is essentially mystical, and consequently unsubstantial; and, though mysticism may inflame, spiritualize, and refine natures already spiritual and refined, it is heady and intoxicating, and apt to justify willful aberrations, and to place every fantastic conviction on the same level with confirmed truth. The Socratic elenchus, with its appropriate instrument, the Socratic sorites, is invaluable in certain rare conjunctures, but it is a dangerous procedure. It reveals the baselessness of error, but it weakens all convictions; and it was a natural consequence of its employment that Platonism so soon passed into the skepticism of the New Academy. The spirit of Plato's philosophy is throughout idealistic, though it is not pure idealism; and idealism, in all its forms, inevitably runs into pantheism, which resolves everything into phenomenal evolutions of divinity, and thus destroys the distinctions of right and wrong, and all moral responsibility. Hence, when the best of the Romans under the later republic and early empire experienced the necessity of corroborating the moral sense, and instituting a rigorous rule of conduct, it was not to the Platonists but to the Stoics that they recurred. Notwithstanding the purity of' Plato's sentiments, his devotion to the abstract and ideal in preference to the actual, and his absolute submission to the tyranny of his rich imagination, tempted him into political and social heresies of the worst type of communism.

It is thus necessary to distinguish between the various tendencies of the Platonic doctrine, and, while admiring with reverent enthusiasm its rare excellences and elevating impulses, we must not overlook the germs of corruption which were also present, and which. like rust on iron or mould on bread, contaminated the wholesome body on which they preyed.

VII. Literature. — The literature of Platonism is endless. A complete collection of the works treating of this subject, directly or indirectly, would equal in extent the Library of Alexandria, and would include the writings of all subsequent philosophers. The professed historians of philosophy necessarily devote a large share of attention to Plato and his speculations; and in the treatment of the subsequent developments of metaphysical inquiry they are constantly compelled to refer to his system, in its original or derivative form, in consequence of the unceasing influence which it has exercised on the highest and most abstract departments of human thought. The special treatises which have been written on the general philosophy of Plato, or on particular Platonic theses, are practically innumerable. Under these circumstances it would be a cumbrous and inappropriate task to undertake to present here a Platonic bibliography. Such a labor would be inevitably incomplete, if fullness were contemplated. A selection of the best or most accessible authorities would be open to many objections, on the score of both omissions and admissions. It would be, moreover, a vain repetition of what has already been done in a sufficient manner by the historians of philosophy. It is consequently more advisable to direct attention to the copious enumeration of illustrative treatises found in the notice of Plato in Ueberweg's History of Philosophy, and to specify here only those recent works which are most useful or most accessible to the English student.

The basis of all intelligent study of the Platonic doctrine must, of course, be the writings of Plato. Of these there are three versions in the English language. Henry Rogers complained, nearly thirty years ago, that there was no translation creditable to English scholarship, the only complete attempt being that of Thomas Taylor, the Platonist, whose sins and imbecilities are severely castigated by him. This translation is, The Works of Plato, viz. his Fifty-five Dialogues zandt Twelve Epistles, translated from the Greek. Nine of the Dialogues by the late Floyer Sydenham and the remainder by Thomas Taylor, with occasional Annotations on the Nine Dialogues translated by Sydenham, and copious Notes by the latter Translator, etc. (Lond. 1804, 5 vols. 4to). At the very time of Rogers's complaint a new and respectable version was on the eve of appearance: The Works of Plato, a New and Literal Version, chiefly from the Text of Stallbaum, by Henry Cary and others (Bohn, Lend. 1848, 6 vols. sm. 8vo). A third and admirable version, recently produced, satisfies the desires and removes the grounds of censure expressed by Rogers: Jowett, The Dialogues of Plato,  translated into English, with Analyses and Introductions (republished N. Y. 1874, 4 vols. 8vo). A new and revised edition of the work has recently appeared.

The other aids deserving of notice in this connection are, Day, Summary and Analysis of the Dialogues of Plato (1870, 8vo); Grote, Plato and the other Companions of Socrates (2nd ed. 1867, 3 vols. 8vo); Lewes, Biographical Hist. of Philosophy; Rogers, Essays, “Plato and Socrates” (in the Edinb. Rev. April, 1848, art. 1); Zeller, Plato and the Older Academy, translated by Alleyne and Goodwin (Lond. 1876,8vo). It may be added that indispensable assistance is still rendered by Cicero's Quaestiones Academicae, etc., by Cudworth's Intellectual System of the Universe, and by Brucker's elaborate exposition of the Platonic tenets in his well-known Historia Critica Philosophiae. (G.F.H.)

## Platon[[@Headword:Platon]]

             a celebrated Russian prelate of modern times, whose family name was Beffschin, was born June 29, 1737. He was the son of a village priest near Moscow, in the university of which capital he received his education, and, besides studying the classical tongues, made considerable proficiency in the sciences. His talents soon caused him to be noticed, and, while yet a student in theology, he was appointed, in 1757, teacher of poetry at the Moscow academy, and in the following year teacher of rhetoric at the seminary of the St. Sergius Lawra, or convent. He shortly afterwards entered the Church, became successively hieromonach, prefect of the seminary, and, in 1762, rector and professor of theology. That same year was marked by an event in his life which greatly contributed to his advancement, for on the visit of Catharine II to the St. Sergius Lawra, after her coronation, he addressed the empress in an eloquent discourse, and on another occasion preached before her. So favorable was the impression he made, that he was forthwith appointed court preacher and preceptor in matters of religion to the grand-duke (afterwards the emperor Paul), for whose instruction he drew up his Orthodox Faith, or Outlines of Christian Theology, which is esteemed one of his best and most useful productions, and has been reproduced in English by Pinkerton (Lond. 1814), by Coray (1857), and by Potissaco (1858). During the four years of his residence at St. Petersburg, Platen frequently preached before the court, and also delivered on various occasions many of the discourses and orations which are among his printed works. After being created member of the synod at  Moscow, by an imperial order, he was made archbishop of Twer in 1770. His attention to the duties of his new office was assiduous and exemplary; for he not only set about improving the course of study pursued in the various seminaries throughout his diocese, but established a number of minor schools for religious instruction, and drew up two separate treatises, one for the use of the teachers, and the other for their pupils. He was also entrusted with the charge of instructing the princess of Würtemberg, Maria Feodorowna, the grand-duke's consort, in the tenets and doctrines of the Graeco-Russian Church. At the beginning of 1775 he received the empress at Twer, and proceeded with her and the grand-duke to Moscow, where he was advanced to that see, with permission to retain the archimandriteship of the Sergius Lawra. With the exception of some intervals occasioned by his being summoned to St. Petersburg, where he preached before the court, it was in that convent that he chiefly resided, until he erected another in his vicinity at his own expense, in 1785, called the Bethania. Two years afterwards he was made metropolitan of the Russian Church, in which capacity he crowned the emperor Alexander, at Moscow, in 1801, delivering on that occasion a discourse that was translated into several modern languages, besides Latin and Greek. He died in his convent of Bethania, Nov. 11-23, 1812. His works, printed at different times, amount in all to twenty volumes, containing, besides various other pieces, 595 sermons, discourses, and orations, many of which are considered masterpieces of style and of eloquence. A selection from them, consisting of the finest passages and thoughts, was published in two volumes in 1805. — English Cyclop. s.v. See Mouravieff, Hist. of the Church of Russia (Oxf. 1842); Otto, Hist. of Russian Literature, p. 327-330; Hagenbach, Hist. of Christian Doctrines, 2, 459, 460; Schlegel, Kirchengesch. des 18ten Jahrh. 1, 59 sq.

## Platonic Philosophy[[@Headword:Platonic Philosophy]]

             or the philosophy of Plato. The term is loosely and ambiguously applied. It is sometimes used to signify the collection of fragmentary views scattered through the writings of Plato: sometimes it is employed to denote the systematic coordination and development of those views by the later academicians; and, most frequently, it is extended to embrace the whole chain of opinion which may be deduced from, or which claims filiation with, the teachings of Plato. These diverse applications of the name are rarely discriminated in ordinary use, and its specific import is left vague and undetermined. This indistinctness cannot be wholly avoided, for it rises out  of the disconnected utterances and unsystematic presentations of Plato himself, together with the concurrence of his successors in the arrangement and exposition of his doctrines. In attempting an outline of the Platonic philosophy, the effort will be made to adhere as closely as practicable to the authentic texts in the writings accredited to Plato, and to borrow as little as may be from the later luminaries of the school.

Numerous devices have been employed for the exhibition of the Platonic doctrine, and none of them are entirely satisfactory. It is necessary for a synoptical exposition that some thread should be discovered or invented for the support and connection of its several members, and that some definite commencement should be assumed to which the thread may be attached. The fixed point of departure has been variously chosen; and the tenets of Plato have been strung variously, and with various degrees of skill, on the thread adopted. The Germans, with ῆeir inner light and their divaricating assumptions, have been peculiarly ingenious, and often peculiarly unhappy, in the performance of their task. They abound in luminous views and in acute suggestions, but they generate such an intricate labyrinth of cross-lights that they dazzle, bewilder, and blind as much as they illuminate. They impose their own arbitrary opinions on Plato, as regards both the import and the coherence of his doctrines. They assert design where no design can be safely asserted. They imagine dependence where all is disconnected; and pretend system where system never existed. Other inquirers, feeling the difficulty and the hazard of the task, have been content, like the translators and many of the editors of Plato, to give an abstract or analysis of the several pieces, with an appreciation of their contents. This leaves the doctrines in their original segregation, and affords little aid in bringing them into one harmonious picture. This process has been, in the main, followed by Grote, whose extensive work appears rather as a collection of preparatory studies, pursued with great diligence and redundant learning, than as a clear and full delineation of Plato and other Companions of Socrates. The danger is equally great of presenting the views of Plato without obvious links of connection, and of organizing them into a compact scheme, which could not have been contemplated by Plato. In avoiding Scylla on the one hand, and Charybdis on the other, we are thrown back upon-the original record, with such assistance as may be derived from illustrative works, and especially from the historians of ancient philosophy. Among these expositors, the one who may still render the best service is Brucker. He is  in many respects antiquated; he has morbid antipathies and scornful condescensions; he is very mechanical, and even wooden in his arrangements; but he is honest earnest, discreet, and free from preoccupations. The very methodism of his procedure is serviceable, when we seek a summary but connected view of the doctrines which Plato taught, or was supposed in ancient times to have taught.

The leading object of Plato's life and philosophical activity was to teach the Greeks the correct use of reason, and to induce them to apply it, with a constant observance of the requisite conditions, to the practical concerns of private and public life. The human mind, alike from its constitution and from the defects of its instrument of communication, is ever exposed to the hazard of plausible delusions, and to the peril of accepting fallacies for irrefragable truth. These pernicious consequences were the daily diet of the Athenian people. Hence arose errors in morals, disregard of virtue, indifference to wrong-doing, unreflecting license of individual passion or caprice, disintegration of society, corruption, and anarchy. How were welfare, virtue, and happiness to be attained in this mass of disorder? What were justice, right, truth? How were they to be detected, appreciated, and appropriated? On truth everything else reposed; but other Greeks besides the Cretans were habitual liars (Gacecia mendux). What is truth? The interrogation of Pilate was the fundamental question propounded by Plato to himself and to his age; and, in propounding it, he trod in the steps of Socrates. There is a truth of' knowing and a truth of being, and they must agree with each other. How are they to be reached and reconciled? If the instruments of knowledge are broken, warped, or otherwise disordered, there can be no true knowledge, and no valid apprehension of the character and relation of the facts with which we have to deal. The purpose of Plato was, in some respects, similar to the purpose of Bacon. Bacon proposed to rectify the processes of reasoning in the investigation of nature, for the attainment of scientific knowledge, and for the practical benefits thence to be derived. Plato sought to do the same thing in a more general manner, for the intellectual and moral improvement of men, of societies, and of states. Coleridge has enlarged upon the correspondences of Plato and Bacon, and has exaggerated them. It was a fine and just instinct which suggested the parallelism. With Plato, as with Bacon, the first step was the exposure and expulsion of confident ignorance and presumptuous error; the refutation of the vast brood of sophisms which swarmed around every principle of speculation and conduct; the determination of the character,  extent, and validity of human knowledge, and the requirements for the legitimate use of reasoning, and for the avoidance of its abuse. Only after this had been done would it be possible to arrive at trustworthy knowledge or safe opinion in regard to the universe of which we are members, and in regard to the relations in which we stand to it and to its parts. The truth of being, as a subject of knowledge, thus demanded and presupposed the truth of knowledge, not in its rounded fullness, but in its formulary of procedure. In the ultimate and unattainable result, the truth of knowledge would accord and be superficially coextensive with the truth of being, as the reflection in a perfect mirror corresponds with the object reflected. Not until such a recognition of the truth of being was gained as the competency of the weak, fallible, finite mind of man might permit, could the conduct of men find safe and authoritative regulation, and the truth of action, or right in all moral contingencies, be discovered. To reason accurately in order to know the essential character of the facts on which action should depend, and by which it must be controlled, and to use right reason and correct knowledge of facts for the determination of right action, may be said to be an abstract statement of the Platonic scheme, which thus embraces the whole duty of man. The intricate casuistry of Plato, and the breathless flights of his daring and playful fancy, withdraw attention from his solemn, earnest, direct, everyday aim. The determination and discipline of the reason, the appreciation of the universe, sensible and intelligible, and the application of these acquisitions to the permanent needs of individual, social, and political existence, constitute the sum of Plato's teachings; but how wonderfully are they diversified and adorned and enriched by his endless variety and poetic imagination!

In strict accordance with this interpretation of Plato's latent meaning, his philosophy is distributed under three heads: I. Dialectical Philosophy; II. Theoretical, Contemplative, or Physical; III. Practical (Cicero, Acald. Quest. 1, 5, § 19). The second and third divisions are subdivided. This distribution is not distinctly proposed in Plato's works, but it is implied in them. It is accredited by Sextus Empiricus to Xenocrates, Plato's second successor in the Academy. The terms employed are earlier than Plato, as are the inquiries also. It must not be forgotten that though Plato was in the main Socratic, he was also a votary of other doctrines-Eclectic, if not Syncretistic, and, in his later writings, largely Pythagorean.

I. Diallecticul Philosophy. — The term “Dialectics” includes in Plato much more than it does in Aristotle (Sophist. p. 253; De Rep. 7, 532-535;  Aristotle, Topic. 1, I. Sophist. Elench. 32; Metaph. 2, 1; 3. 2, Rhet. 1, 2). It is not confined to the art of probable argumentation, but comprehends the whole theory of know-ledge, the characteristics of correct and incorrect reasoning, the conduct of the understanding, and so much of psychology as is concerned with the operations of the mind in the acquisition, estimation, and communication of knowledge. This wide range may be illustrated by lord Bacon's inclusion under Logic of the Artes Inveniendi, Judicandi, Retinendi, et Tradendi (De Augm. Sci. 5, 6).

There is a fundamental enigma which demands solution at the commencement of all inquiry, and which has been designated the problem of certitude. How can we know that we know what we think we know? How does knowledge arise? how is its credibility or validity ascertained? What degree of credibility belongs to it? These questions were never dogmatically answered by Plato, unless it were the last. A positive answer would have been a repudiation of the Socratic profession of ignorance and uncertainty (Aristot. Soph. French. 33). But he labored assiduously in all his treatises to exemplify the conditions of true knowledge, and he contributed efficiently to their determination. Knowledge, in ordinary, according to Plato, is acquired through the senses, but it is not determined by sense: it is determined by the knowing mind. This is an approximation at once to Kant's forms of the understanding, and to Leibnitz's acute reply to the maxim, “Nihil in intellectu quod non prius in sensu,” by the addition of “nisi intellectus ipse.” The mind is its own place. It is lord of itself, and of all the world beside. Sense is an affection of the mind through the intervention of the corporeal sensibilities. Permanent impressions made by the senses are retained by the faculty of memory. The collation of remembrances with sensible experiences constitutes opinion—true opinion when they agree, false opinion when they are discordant (Phileb. p. 34; Thecetet. p. 186). The knowledge of things in time is uncertain, and amounts only to opinion. The human mind may be conceived to be a tablet of wax, ready to receive and to retain any impression. This is, however, merely an illustration (λόγου ἕνεκα). Thought is the communing of the mind with itself. Speech is the sensible utterance of thought. Words are not knowledge, but only the means and vehicle of knowledge (Thecetet. p. 191, 202).

Intelligence, or real knowledge, is the action of the mind in the contemplation of the prime Intelligibles, or incorporeal types of being. It is twofold; the first is the perception of the soul, which beheld its appropriate  intelligibles, before descending into the body; the second. or natural knowledge, is that which the mind receives while enveloped in its carnal integument. The latter, or mundane knowledge, is the restored but broken recollection of what had been known in a pre-existent state, and must be distinguished from the acquisitions of memory, being concerned with things intelligible, as the other is with things sensible (Timaeus, p. 30; Phaedon, p. 74-76; comp. Wordsworth, Ode on Initiations of Immortality, etc.). This doctrine of reminiscence is a peculiarly Platonic fancy, and fascinated the later Platolists to such an extent that Synesius declined a bishopric in the Christian Church rather than renounce the dream. It is implicated, as cause or consequence, with the doctrine of the Platonic ideal, as both are with the dialectic process by which Socrates and Plato strove to dissipate error and to evolve truth from the minds of their hearers. The midwifery of the mind which Socrates professed, and which Plato represented him as professing, necessitated the assumption that truth was present potentially in the mind, and that it only required to be drawn from its latent state by adroit handling. It could not be latent, nor could it be brought forth unless it lay there like a chrysalis, and descended from an anterior condition of being. It was in a super terrestrial and antemundane existence that souls had acquired

“Etherium sensum, alque aura simplicis iglem;”

but before their demission, or return to earth, they had been steeped in oblivion,

“Scilicet immemores supera ut convexa revisant.”

The acquisition of genuine knowledge was thus the restoration of the obliterated memories of supernal realities. Absurd and extravagant as this tenet appears in its Platonic form, it was a dreamy and ineffectual effort to give definite expression to the mysterious process of thought. The doctrine was modified and transformed by St. Augustine so as to deprive it of its wildness and irrationality. He conceived the human mind to be constituted in perfect harmony with the universe. The acquisition of knowledge was the evolution of this harmony, and it was accompanied with instinctive consciousness of the pre-adaptation. Many of the strangest reveries of Plato may be similarly reduced to prosaic probability.

The supernal realities which are the objects of the pure and of the purified intelligence are the first Intelligibles, presented to the contemplation of  unembodied or disembodied spirits. These prime intelligibles are Ideas— eternal images, immaterial archetypes (sine corpore formas) — patterns or conceptions forever present to the Divine Mind, furnishing the models, and, indeed, the essence, of all the temporal creation. The term ideas was older than Plato; but its application to heavenly types, its metaphysical employment, and its substitution for the Pythagorean Numbers, were almost certainly Platonic inventions (Parmenid. p. 135; De Rep. 6, 509). It has justly been remarked by Ueberweg, as it had often been remarked before Ueberweg, that “the Platonic philosophy centers in the theory of ideas.” In the Dialectics, Physics, Ethics, the rays all converge towards this point. But the ideas of Plato are not merely his central doctrine; they are usually conceived to be his distinctive doctrine. As such, they were assailed and refuted by Aristotle (Metmaph. 1, 6, 9), who, nevertheless, substituted a more rationalistic equivalent for them in Forms. As such, they were received and expanded by the New Platonists. As such, they have given life and name to all associated schemes of philosophy, included under the broad name of Idealism. As such, they furnished the battleground for the long, impassioned, and bitter controversy of the Realists and Nominalists. SEE KEALISAI and SEE NOMINALISM.

According to Plato following the Eleatic school and Heraclitus, all sensible or concrete existence is perishable, fleeting, and imperfect; but this imperfection involves the existence of the perfect, the changeless, and the immortal (Aristot. Metaph. 1, 6; Alex. Aphrod. Asclep. et Anon. Urbin. Schol. ad loc.). If some things are good, there must be an absolute goodness, in which all things good participate, and which they feebly reflect. If things. are beautiful, they are so by the incorporation of the beautiful. If actions are just, beneficent, or holy, there must be an eternal justice, beneficence, and holiness, whence they derive their character (Phoedrus, p. 246-256; Hipp. Moj. p. 294, 295; Conviv. p. 210-212; Phaedo, p. 100-102). The passing things of sense acquire their essential character from the indwelling of these immutable existences, however these may be warped and deformed by being reduced to temporal conditions. As it is with abstract qualities, so it is with individual things. A dog, a horse, a man, are what they are (τὸ τί ἐστι) from the possession of the essential nature of those animals-caninity, equinity, humanity. Each differs from other members of its class, or is individualized, by union with matter, and consequent deflection from the perfect conception of the breed. Each, therefore, is an inadequate and, consequently, untrue representation of the  true and perfect being of its kind, and approaches such perfection just in proportion as it approximates to the true, perfect, and eternal image. These intelligible and uncreated perfections are the ideas, present from the beginning, or before all beginning, in the contemplation of the Divinity, after which all things are made that were made. They are not merely the models of created things, but their essence. In the progress towards truth, all phenomenal being, all concrete existence, all temporal presentation, all earthly images, all sensible apprehensions, must be left behind, and, by an ascending process, the purified intelligence must pierce the veil and phantasmal appearances of time, and look upon the absolute, everlasting, unchanging, and divine ideas of things. These alone are true and real: all that is actual, sensible, or derived from sense is phenomenal, evanescent, and delusive. The doctrine of ideas will reappear, for, as Bricker notes, neither the metaphysics and theology of Plato, nor his physical and ethical philosophy, can preserve any consistency without them. Ideas form the first order of intelligibles, and are apprehended by the pure reason with the aid of the scientific understanding (νοήσει μετὰ λόγου περιληπτὸν). The second order consists of species which are united with matter and cannot be separated from it-the inseparable species of the schoolmen. These are detected by the understanding with the concurrence of tie intuitive faculty. Things sensible are, in like manner, primary and secondary, and are apprehended only conjecturally through irrational perception (δόξῃ μετ᾿ αἰσθήσεως ἄλογου δοξαστόν). Intelligibles belong to the intelligible and eternal universe (τὸ νοητόν, τὸ ὄντως ὄν). Sensibles are the shadows of the intelligible, and appertain to the visible, phenomenal, and shifting world (τὸ ὁρατόν, τὸ αἰσθητόν, τὸ ὄντως οὐδέποτε ὄν, τὸ γιγνόμενον). Kinowledge attaches only to the former: from the latter nothing better than opinion can spring (Timaeus, p. 28; De Rep. 6, 20, p. 509).

In contemplation, the mind regards truth and falsehood: in matters concerned with action, it judges of right and wrong. The moral or practical judgment proceeds from an ingenital sense of beauty and goodness, and decides, in particular instances, by comparison with the indwelling types of excellence. Truth, beauty, and goodness are thus nearly identified, and are exhibited as different aspects of the same perfect ideas. Beauty is conformity to the idea, and the idea is perfectly good and true.

In dialectical procedure, the first thing to be determined is the essential nature of the object under consideration. The essence is established by definition, division, and resolution. The accidents are separated by  induction and ratiocination, or deduction from first principles. In detecting the essence we reduce the many to the one; in inferring consequences, we trace the one in the many. The Platonic scheme is presented in the Republic (7). It is noticeable that hypotheses are admitted by Plato among the processes for discovering truth. The abstract theory thus sanctions the large use of imagination which presides over its whole development. It may be advantageous to compare the dialectics of Plato with the severe logic of Aristotle, and with the elaborate devices proposed in the second book of Bacon's Organon. Words are no criteria of the character of things. They are loosely imposed, in consonance with popular impressions, and do not agree with realities. Yet words and language are of grave importance, and require to be used with propriety and precision, to avoid indistinctness and ambiguity, and consequent delusion or deception. The art of effectual speech springs from a just knowledge of the intellectual powers and emotions, of the dispositions of men, and of the different forms of expression. The perfect orator is one who has these endowments, knows the arts of persuasion, and can apply them to his purposes (Phaedrus, p. 259). The value which Plato attached to the graces of composition is attested by the skill and beauty of his own compositions. He has also strongly declared it (ibid. p. 258). Hence when we find him ridiculing and denouncing rhetoric in the Gorgias, and comparing it to unwholesome cookery, we must accept the explanation of Quintilian that the Gorgias was eristic, and designed only for the refutation of the Sophists and sophistical teachers of rhetoric (Inst. Or. 2, 15). The dialectics of Plato thus embraced everything connected with the discovery, determination, and communication of truth, in its subjective aspect. But it will be remembered there was, in addition to the truth of' knowing, the truth of being also; and this forms the second part of the Platonic philosophy.

II. Theoretical, Contemplative, or Physical Philosophy. — This grand division of Platonic speculation is distributed into three branches: Theology, Physics Proper, and Mathematics, which is a sort of appendix to the other two. It will be observed that the term Physics is employed in a very wide and unrestricted sense, to include not merely nature, but everything extrinsic to the intellectual operations and the ethical conduct of man. It is contradistinguished from dialectics by embracing the real constitution of things, while the latter is confined to their mental apprehension and exposition. It is contrasted with ethics, as it is concerned with essential being, while the latter deals only with human action. The  division is made in the Phaedo (41, p. 103; comp. De Rep. 2, 19, p. 381). It is further to be observed that the Platonic doctrines are rarely conveyed in explicit propositions, but must be gathered from fragmentary statements, from incidental expressions, front poetic fancies, and from the general tenor of discussion. In the Phaedo, Plato explains the utter abnegation of physical inquiries by Socrates. In the opening of the Timaeus, he announces the impossibility of giving anything more than a plausible account (εἰκότες λόγοι) of things becoming, and not permanent (rid. Ariston. ap. Stob. 80, § 7). Recognizing, then, the difficulties and the uncertainties due to the character of the procedure and the presumed complexion of the subject, we continue to note the peculiarities of the Platonic philosophy.

1. Theology. — “In the beginning the world was without form.” The universal chaos was reduced to order by the Supreme and Intelligent Cause, who framed the creation in accordance with the perfect and eternal patterns ever present to the divine mind. It is the best of all generated existences, the best of all possible worlds, because it was fashioned by the Highest Goodness and Wisdom working after the absolutely perfect models, or ideas (Timaeus, p. 28). It was not made, however, out of nothing, but out of eternally existing matter. Being formed out of matter, it is not free from grave blemishes and defects, which are due to the inherent stubbornness and ineradicable perversity of matter. God and formless matter are thus the two concurring but antagonistic causes of the universe. By matter is understood something very different from the palpable substance or body which is habitually contemplated under that name- something totally different also from anything that we can conceive. It is that remnant or substratum of body which subsists after every cognizable property of body has been removed (Timaeus, p. 51; comp. Porph. Sentent. 20; Plotin. Ennead. 2, 4; Berkeley, Siris, § 317). By ascribing to God the creation of the Cosmos out of unformed matter, Plato avoids the heresy of pantheism. Still he indulges in fantasies which readily lead to it. From the nature of matter as co-eternal with the Divine Intelligence, and from its reluctation in yielding to the creative energy, originate the necessary existence and the inevitable presence of evil in all created things (Theaetet. p. 176). The antagonism of matter suggested the presence of subtle aptitudes and occult qualities. We are thus brought within the range of hypotheses similar to those which underlie the recent theories of Darwin, Spencer, and Huxley.  Matter was the relatively passive ingredient in the process of creation. The active power was the Supreme Intelligence, or Highest Good, whom it is almost impossible to apprehend, and impossible to declare (Timaeus, p. 29).

He is the efficient cause of all things the fountain of all pure, spiritual, perfect, and self-supporting existences; the founder and ultimate fabricator of everything. He is incorporeal reason, self-existent, eternally the same, without beginning, without end, having no affinity with things of sense, and apprehensible only by the pure intellect. He is all wise, all-seeing, all- foreseeing, all-mighty, except so far as restricted by the intractability of matter. He has absolute freedom of will, is supremely good, and, being good, is void of envy and malevolence. Hence everything made by him is good, so far as the repugnance of matter will permit. He framed the world in all possible excellence after the eternal image in his own mind. This uncreated and unbeginning idea of the universe (λόγος or λογισμὸς τοῦ θεοῦ) has been regarded as a third coeternal principle. This exemplar included the patterns or ideas of all created things; everything in the sensible universe being fashioned according to its corresponding type in the intelligible universe, or world of ideas. The doctrine seems to have been deduced from Pythagoras, but was applied by Plato in his own manner; and never more beautifully nor more characteristically than in his celebrated fancy of a cave where all that men saw or heard consisted of shadows and echoes (De Rep. 7 p. 514-519). The imperfect things of earth were thus the obscure, fleeting images of the perfect forms of the divine contemplation. It is uncertain whether Plato attributed to these ideas a substantive existence of their own, separate from and independent of the divine mind, or supposed them to be simply the immanent, changeless thoughts of the Godhead. Yet, though God is distinctly and habitually acknowledged as the father and creator of all things, all things were not directly framed and regulated by the Supreme Divinity. For the government of the sensible universe he created a subordinate deity, and placed it in the material creation (Timaeus, p. 34). This guiding spirit, or Demiurgus, was a mixture of the ideal and of the material, of the one and of the many, that, being intermediate, it might communicate with both. This was the Animan Mundi, which assumed such prominence in the theological and physical speculations of the Stoics. It maintained the regular operations of the laws of temporal change, and by its plastic energy molded into appropriate forms all the multitudinous manifestations of transitory being (τὸ γιγνόμενον) (Cratylus, p. 53).  The soul of the universe was not the sole created divinity. Divine spirits were apportioned to the earth, sun, moon, and stars, to govern their developments and to preside over their motions (De Legg. p. 899). Hosts of still inferior deities were assigned to other appropriate functions. Thus, with a fine and half-suppressed irony, provision was made for the national gods, and for the 30,000 unnamed divinities attested by Hesiod. To these deities, each in his due place in the vast hierarchy, was ascribed the duty of forming men, animals of lower order, plants, etc., and of watching over them. In the subordinate ranks of the celestial army were a countless multitude of sprites, who were cousin-German to the sylphs, gnomes, fairies, and other tribes of “little people,” and to whom immortality was denied.

2. Physics Proper . — The second branch of contemplative philosophy is occupied with the consideration of the order of nature as the product of the acts of creation. Nothing exists or arises without cause. Hence proceeded the Aristotelian maxim vere scire est scire per causas; for the cause affords the ratio essendi, or explanation of the existence of the object investigated. As the universe, or orderly Cosmos, had a producing cause, it was created in time. It was generated or brought into being, and was therefore subject to sensible perception. It was consequently corporeal, visible, and tangible. It could not be visible except through the presence of fire, nor tangible without the presence of earth. An intermediate bond is needed to link two things together, and the fairest of bonds is a mean proportion. Thus, as fire is to air, so is air to water; and as air is to water, so is water to earth. Here are the four elements, corresponding to the mystical tetrad of the Pythagoreans. They were held together in their several combinations by the attraction of love. The whole theory is largely Pythagorean, and blends itself with the Pythagorean imaginations about the secret virtues of numbers. The universe is an animated whole, composed of perfect parts, and exempt from the infirmities of age and of disease (Timaeus, p. 35). A spherical figure and orbicular motion are given to it and its chief components because a circle is the most perfect of figures, is least liable to injury and obstruction, returns upon itself, and thus promises the greatest duration to the vast living organism in which all things temporal are contained. As the universe had a spherical form and a circular motion conferred upon it, each of the elements had its own appropriate figure. Earth was cubical, fire pyramidal, air octahedral, and water  eicosihedral, or twenty-sided. These were combined in apt proportions, and all things were ordered “by measure, by number, and by weight.”

The details of the cosmogony must be omitted. It may be added that the earth and the seven moving lights of heaven were arranged in concentric spheres, at harmonic intervals, around a mighty spindle resting on the knees of Necessity; and that their revolutions propagated along the great axis “the music of the spheres” to the earth, which was the fixed and middle orb (De Rep. 10 p. 617). The earth was occupied by animals and other things created by the subordinate demiurgic, to whom was also entrusted the creation of man. But man, as the noblest of animals, was not left wholly to their handiwork. Immortal souls, numerous as the stars, were supplied by the Supreme Intelligence, to be provided with terrestrial bodies. These souls were neither emanations nor spirations, but true creations. They were to guide and govern the material vessels in which they should be confined, as the superior spirits guided and governed the worlds which they controlled. The matter with which they were united exposed them to contamination, to failure, and to sin. From the struggle ‘“within the union” results moral evil, or disobedience to the laws of ideal perfection, which are in conformity with the purposes of God. In their earthly condition, human souls were subjected to the general laws of the universe, but were endowed with an undefined freedom of will through their heavenly constitution. Happiness resulted from obedience to the impulses of the better nature, and to the order and economy of the intelligible world.

It would take too much space, and prove too tedious, to enter into the physiology propounded by Plato; and nothing could be gained from the presentation of his views but the exhibition of Platonic fantasy. We pass to the third part, or appendix, which was intended to serve at once as a discipline and as an instrument.

3. Mathematics. — The importance attached by Plato to mathematical science is familiar to every student, and is illustrated by the inscription supposed to have been placed over the entrance to the Academy:

The commendations bestowed by him on this branch of learning (De Rep. 7 p. 522) may be compared with the similar eulogies of Roger Bacon (Opus Mtljas, pt. 4) in an age of somewhat analogous speculative development, and of Francis Bacon (De Aug. Sci. 3, 6; Essays, 1). They may also be contrasted with the views presented in the diatribe of Sir William Hamilton.  Under the head of mathematics were included, in accordance with the Pythagorean practice, and with the general conception of antiquity, arithmetic, geometry, astronomy, and music.

III. Practical Philosophy. — Plato's practical philosophy was in many respects consentaneous with his physics or theory of nature. It would not be correct to say that it was founded upon it, for this would be inconsistent with the position that there was no orderly, consecutive, or concatenated development of the Platonic doctrine in the mind of its author. There is close correspondence in parts between Plato's physical and practical philosophy, but in others much separation and independence. The agreement must therefore be ascribed to the consonance of the developments of the same mind in different directions, rather than to intentional coherence between successive applications of doctrine. The practical philosophy of Plato falls under two heads, Ethics and Politics.

1. Ethics. — Moral questions occupy the largest part of the Platonic writings; but they are treated in the Socratic manner, by question and answer, and are thus proposed in diffuse and disconnected fragments. Plato's aims, his leading tenets, and his modes of explication are derived from Socrates; but his discussions, so far as may be conjectured, are conducted in a much broader spirit and loftier strain. He includes also within the domain of ethics much that would now be referred to theology.

As in the physics everything is traced back to the First Intelligence, the Divine Creator, so in the ethics everything is referred ultimately to the perfect and beneficent character of God. The good is the summit of all conceivable things. God is absolute goodness. The supreme good of man (summum bontum) is the knowledge and imitation of God, and approximation thereby to the divine nature. “Be ye therefore perfect, even as your Father is perfect.” Everything is good and beautiful so far as it proceeds from God, retains the impress of its divine original, and possesses the characteristics of the pure archetypal ideas of moral perfection. “Every good gift and every perfect gift is from above, and cometh down from the Father of lights, in whom is no variableness, neither shadow of turning.” Ordinary blessings or advantages in popular estimation, such as health, strength, high birth, riches, renown, honors, are good only in conjunction with virtue; otherwise they are evil (Protag. p. 351-353). The honorable (the right) alone is good (Alcibiad. 1, 116). This is continually and strenuously asserted in opposition to the general practice and current  sentiment among the contemporaneous Greeks. Virtue is lovely in itself, and to be loved irrespective of its rewards. Being of heavenly origin, the best reproduction of the divine ideas, and approximating to the divine nature, it is itself divine. Being divine, it is not an art that can be taught, but must be divinely communicated (Euthydem. p. 282). Goodness can be acquired only by the influx and in working of the Good.

The object of all knowledge, and it should be the object of all effort, is assimilation to the highest good that is, to God. This assimilation consists in the habit and practice of wisdom, fortitude, temperance, justice, and holiness (Thecetet. p. 176; De Legg. 4 716). The first stage of this approximation is εὐδαιμονία, usually translated happiness, but which implies good dispositions, and a conscience tranquil, innocent, and void of offence towards God and towards man (Gorg. p. 470; Symnos. p. 188). The Critias breaks off unfinished just at the opening of a full discussion of the conditions of a happy life. The word is also used for the future beatitude which it anticipates. The requirements for such bliss correspond, as nearly as a pagan dream can agree with revelation, to the Scripture rule “to love justly, to love mercy, and to walk humbly with God.”

As has been observed, the body was regarded as a prison, because composed of malignant matter. Hence humanity was miserable by congenital constitution. The progress towards virtue and holiness was to be achieved by the subjugation of' material antagonisms, by the renunciation of worldly aims and temptations, and by the purgation of mind and heart from sensual appetites and corporeal satisfactions (De Rep. 7 p. 515). There is here a pronounced tendency in the direction of Oriental asceticism. There is much also that inclines towards the pessimism of Schopenhauer, but it is wrought out to a very different issue. These tendencies readily explain the growth of the Neo-Platonic reveries which may always be detected in the egg in the writings of Plato himself. How far such results may be due to the difficulty of framing abstract conceptions at the commencement of ethical inquiry, and to the attendant difficulty of clothing such conceptions in precise terms before a philosophical language had been invented, it would be hazardous to say. Plato may have simply designed, in a blind, heathen, tentative way, to prescribe “the purification of the flesh,” and “the overcoming of the world,” and “the righteousness which is of God.”  The morality of Plato was much higher in aim and sentiment than it was possible to be in its expression, yet in many single precepts it uses nearly the language of revealed truth. It habitually insists upon the charms of virtue and “the beauty of holiness;” and in the delineation of the several virtues, which he represents as indissolubly connected (Charmides, p. 161), and at times as united in one, he maintains an uncompromising elevation of view. His illustrations, indeed, are often tainted with the prevalent vices of his age and country. Thus, in treating of the passions, he is led by his rich and mythical fancy into hypothetical explanations, which have been very easily abused, and which are repulsive in their original proposition. We refer to his comments on friendship and love. Friendship, or attraction, is ascribed even to the particles of matter; and the like proclivities are bestowed upon primordial souls. Like is attracted to like, and hence arises friendship. Souls of similar nature are drawn towards each other by the instinct of resemblance resulting from preadaptation. The attraction proceeding from conformity in their pure state exercises its due influence only between spirits retaining in some measure their primordial purity. Hence true friendship can exist only between the good (Lysis. p. 214).

Love is a species of friendship, or friendship in its highest intensity. It is of three orders: sensual, animal, or bestial; honorable, having regard to psychical virtues; and mixed, which unites the characteristics of both (Sympos. p. 201). Love, in its two forms of heavenly and earthly, “half beast, half deity,” appears in Plato in many ambiguous and Protean shapes, rising from the coarsest pagan sensualism to the purest aspirations for the beautiful and the good. But the dialogue in which its nature is chiefly discussed is so tantalizing, shifting, and bewildering-it is woven with threads of such changing and returning hues-that it furnishes treacherous foundation for any dogmatic conclusions.

2. Political Philosophy. — The two most extensive and elaborate of Plato's treatises are devoted to political questions. Of these, the Republic is the most complete and characteristic triumph of his genius. The Laws is in a rough and unfinished state, and has often been excluded from his works. In narrating the life of Plato, his predilections for political life, his early and unsuccessful intervention in Athenian affairs, his political expeditions to Sicily, and his consultation in matters of state by princes and states, were duly commemorated. The contemplative habits of his mind, his eager fancy, his tone, his temperament, his associations, his hereditary tastes, his party proclivities, all unfitted him for success in actual politics;  and from every effort to engage in them he retired discomfited and disappointed. The more congenial domain of speculation was still open to him. He might organize a state, regulate its citizens, and determine their duties, in the vast realm of fancy, with none to make him afraid of either failure or obstruction. lie might look forward to the ultimate adoption of his projects or his principles in some happier time, when philosophers had become rulers, or when rulers had become philosophers, and when later generations, instructed by his lessons, might give reality to his dreams (De Leg. 5. 739). In strange modes, and in unrecognized forms, his visions have been partially accomplished.

The Republic and the Laws differ greatly in tone and dogma, as well as in execution, but they are intimately connected. They are diverse and consecutive presentations of the same general design. The Republic is the ideal state, the Laws the concrete state. The Republic is the dream of a Utopian constitution, the Laws the proposition of a frame of government adapted to the weaknesses and recalcitration of an Hellenic people. Everything in the one is suited to an impossible condition of things; everything in the other is reduced to the proportions and capacities of actual human society. In the one the state is conformed to the abstract idea of justice, as it was conceived by Plato; in the other, justice is put into action, weighted down with human prejudices and passions, and conformed to the nature of the Greeks. These distinctions must be regarded in order to prevent exaggeration of Plato's offences against morality and good-sense. We sympathize with the strong censure of the Republic expressed by Mitchell in his Aristophanes, but we see that what is most repugnant may be only an ingenious imagination to symbolize pure abstract doctrine. It is not surprising that much perplexity should exist in regard to the Republic. Its double title produces confusion. Its inscription, or superscription, is, Of Politics, or concerning the Just. The second epigraph may have been formally the addition of Thrasyllus, but it is sanctioned by the text itself (De Rep. 2. p. 368; comp. 4:p. 434). Many critics of great name, and especially the ancients, have held it to be a theoretical constitution of the state. Others, of not inferior reputation, among the moderns, have considered it as simply an investigation into the nature of justice, illustrated by the state, because the state exhibits the characteristics of justice in a completer form and on a larger scale than the individual could do. Stallbaum, in his Prolegomena, arrays the arguments adduced in favor of either opinion, and concludes that Plato's design was  to portray the image of a perfect and happy life, by prescribing the offices of man in his public and private relations (p. 18, 19).

We are not disposed to deny this conclusion, which substantially reconciles the previous contradictions; but we think there is something more than this. The ideal, the absolute, the perfect, was always present to the mind of Plato: the whole tenor of his philosophy precluded him from resting in the actual. But his personal and philosophical career urged him also to regard with most earnestness the amelioration of the moral and political condition of his countrymen, and the improvement of their political through the rectification of their moral state. To a Greek the state was everything, the individual being merely a fragment or constituent atom of the state. The life of the citizen was absorbed in the state; the life of the state was reflected in the life of the citizen-was, indeed, imposed on him. According to Greek ideas, the just man could not develop his virtues except in a just state; and the just state could not subsist except through just citizens-just either by native constitution or by compulsion, or by both. Education and discipline would be demanded to produce just rulers and just subjects. The investigation of the nature of justice would accordingly require the determination of the form and conditions of a justly organized community (Jowett, Plato, 4, 5); the delineation of the just state would be blended with that of the just man—and the conclusions resulting from the whole inquiry would furnish an earthly image of the Greek City of God (γῆς γε οὐδαμοῦ οιμαι αὐτὴν ειναι, De Rep. 9:p. 592). Indistinct and fragmentary as is Plato's doctrine, it would have been left much more formless and unsatisfactory without the fancies and dreams and political precepts contained in the Statesman, Republic, and Laws. They furnish the unjointed outlines of the complete design for whose construction all the rest was intended.

According to Plato's notion, justice or righteousness is the object and essence of healthy political organization, and he consequently inquires in the Republic into its nature, and the best mode of its realization in the state. Of course he cannot free himself from Hellenic preoccupations. Of course his reactionary tendencies and his oligarchical proclivities produced a constant recoil from the democratic license of his Athenian contemporaries towards the spirit of antique usage and the imitation of Spartan institutions. Even in his wildest vagaries there appears a disposition to employ supposed traditionary practices. He insists upon the strict subordination of ranks; he even petrifies his classes of citizens into castes. He does not  rigorously conjoin every one to his class, but accords advancement to those of eminent ability— la currtiere olverte aux talens. He restricts the government to the few (καλοκαγαθοί); the masses he converts almost into serfs— “hewers of wood and drawers of water,” etc. There are two great classes of freemen, the guardians of the state and the craftsmen (De Rep. 3, p. 414, 415). The guardians are themselves divided into two orders, the rulers and the auxiliaries. The rulers are selected, by successive examinations till their thirtieth year, from the body of guardians who are diligently trained and educated from their birth. The training and the selection have some agreement with the Chinese practices, with English competitive examinations, and still more with the regulation of the Ottoman Janizaries. There is also a considerable degree of correspondence between the Platonic organization and Comte's constitution of the Positive Society.

The body of the guardians or auxiliaries is employed as the military force to repress internal disorders and to repel external danger. The rulers are the supervisors of the community, and are to govern it with a view to the greatest happiness of all (De Rep. 4 p. 240). The auxiliaries are to live and to conduct themselves so as to cherish and protect the whole commonwealth. “None of them should have any property beyond what is absolutely necessary; neither should they have a private house, with bars and bolts, closed against any one who has a mind to enter; their provisions should be only such as are required by trained warriors, who are men of temperance and courage; their agreement is to receive from the citizens a fixed rate of pay, enough to meet the expenses of the year and no more, and they will have common meals and live together, like soldiers in a camp.... They alone of all the citizens may not touch or handle silver or gold, or be under the same roof with them, or wear them, or drink from them. And this will be their salvation and the salvation of the state” (Rep. Jowett's translation, 2, 242). There is here the union of Spartan institutions and Pythagorean organization with the theoretical devices of Plato. There is also an anticipation of the standing armies of modern states.

With the details of the education of the superior class, and with the appreciation of different branches of instruction, we cannot occupy ourselves further than to mention that it is in this connection he censures the poets, and excludes Homer and the Tragedians from the ideal state as blasphemers against the gods. We pass over the criticism of the various forms of government, important as this criticism is for political philosophy  in general, and for the estimation of Plato's doctrine and its relation to Hellenic systems. We cannot, however, omit all notice of the measures by which he endeavors to maintain the unselfish devotion of the dominant order. He leaves the laboring masses almost entirely out of sight. They are to be protected in their persons, rights, and industry; and they are to be guided in the proper course. Further than this there is little concern for them. They work in their way for the state, as their superiors live and work also for the state, which is everything to the legislator. There was reason in the interruption of Adimantus that “the citizens were made miserable,” if the temporal comfort of the citizen, and not the theoretical elevation of that hypothetical unit, the state, is taken into consideration.

To guard against jealousies, rivalries, discords, which might endanger or ruin the public welfare and the political constitution, the equality of the sexes, the community of women and the community of property are prescribed, and this community is still insisted on in the Laws. Plato seems to have held with the Persian impostor, Mezdah, in the reign of Khosru Kobad, that feuds, quarrels, and animosities arise mainly from the possession of wealth and women in several. The delusions of modern socialism and radicalism are anticipated. The shadowy character of Plato's proposed arrangements is some palliation for their entertainment. They are evidently devised as modes of discipline and preparation, or as means for the prevention of disorder. They are acknowledged to be unsuited to men as men now are, and may be taken as the prefiguration of what men might be under other conditions, in a blessed state in which there should be neither gold nor silver, nor marrying nor giving in marriage.

For the close correspondence in aim between the dreams of Plato and the revelations of Scripture, and between the devices of Plato and the projects of modern Communists and Socialists, we have no satisfactory explanation. The cultivated intelligence, the active imagination, the varied experience, the general immorality, and the painful disquietude of the Greeks in the 4th century before Christ may account for much, but it will not interpret all. We leave the enigma as one of the mysterious problems presented by the career of humanity. There is surely no more marvelous approximation to revealed truth than in the exposition of the Supreme Good, and of its child or offspring, which is described (De Rep. 6, p. 506) in terms that recall the delineation of wisdom in the Book of Wisdom.  “Vapor est enimn virtutis Dei, et emanatio quaedam est claritatis Dei sincera; et ideo nihil inquinatumn in earn incurrit.

“Candor est enim Incis meternse, et speculum sine macula Dei majestatis et imago bonitatis illius.

“Est enim hec speciosior sole et super omnem dispositionem stellarum, luci comparata invenitur prior.”

Do not such sublime anticipations consort well with the conclusion of the Republic, which increases our wonder but at the same time justifies our reverential comparisons!

“And thus, Glaucon, the tale has been saved and has not perished, sand may be our salvation if we are obedient to the word spoken; and we shall pass safely over the water of Forgetfulness, and our soul will not be defiled. Wherefore my counsel is that we hold fast to the heavenly way, land follow after justice and virtue always, considering that the soul is immortal, and able to endure every sort of good and every sort of evil. Thus shall we live dear to one another and to the gods, both while remaining here and when, like conquerors in the games who go round to gather gifts, we receive our reward. And it shall be well with us both in this life and in the pilgrimage of a thousand years which we have been reciting.”

We have now at some length, yet all too briefly, reviewed the philosophy attributed to Plato and deducible from his writings. We have omitted nearly everything in the way of detail, and have attempted the survey from an elevated vantage-ground, where only the broad lines are apparent, and where the asperities and discords of the landscape disappear. It may now be manifest, we think, how and why Plato has always exercised such fascination on pure natures, and has so largely and so enduringly stimulated the speculation and ennobled the thought of the world.

Literature. — See the observations made and the works specified under the article PLATO. Comp. also Tulloch, Rat. Theol. in England, vols. 1 and 2 (Lond. 1872, 8vo); Lecky, Hist. of Rationetlism, and his European Morals; Nourisson, Pensees Humaines, p. 45 sq.; Stephen, Hist. of Engl. Thought in the 18th Century (Lond. 1876, 2 vols. 8vo); Ackerman, The Christian Element in Plato and the Platonic Philos. (transl. in Clark's Edinburgh Philosophical Library): Stein, Sieben Bücher zur Geschichte d. Platonismus (Leips. 1867); Beapt. Quar. April, 1874, art. 5, “Plato's  Relation to Christianity;” also North Brit. Rev. Nov. 1861, art. 3; Presbyt. Rev. April, 1864, art. 1; Brit. mandor. Ev. Rev. Oct. 1862, art. 8:on “Platonism of the Fathers. (G. F. H.)

## Platonics, New[[@Headword:Platonics, New]]

             SEE NEOPLATONISM.

## Platt, Adams W[[@Headword:Platt, Adams W]]

             a Presbyterian minister, was born in Weston, Conn., Oct. 28, 1790. After receiving an ordinary education, he commenced the study of medicine, when his brother, who was studying for the ministry, died, and he immediately turned his thoughts in that direction. He graduated with the second honor of his class at Union College, Schenectady, N.Y. in 1817, and at Princeton Theological Seminary in 1820; was licensed the same year, and entered upon his duties as a missionary in the then new states of Ohio and Indiana. In January 1824, he accepted a call, and was ordained as pastor of the Presbyterian Church of Rutland, N. Y.; in July, 1829, he became pastor of the Church at West Galway, N.Y.; in 1833 he gave up the Church, and rested for a few months; in 1834 he became stated supply for the Church in West Fayette, N. Y. until 1836, when he became pastor of the Presbyterian Church in Hector. N. Y., where he continued to labor till, in 1848, his health becoming quite impaired, he ceased his pastoral labors. In 1856 he removed to Clinton, Iowa, and assisted in the organization of the Church there, and supplied the pulpit for one year. He died May 2, 1859. Mr. Platt was a humble, laborious, and self-denying minister-a man of marked prudence of character. See Wilson, Presb. Hist. Almanac, 1860, p. 121. (J.L.S.)

## Platt, James Mcclure, D.D[[@Headword:Platt, James Mcclure, D.D]]

             a Presbyterian minister, was born at Athens, Pennsylvania, December 31, 1826. He graduated from the University of the City of New York in 1847, and from Princeton Theological Seminary in 1853; became pastor at Lawesville, Ohio, the same year; at Leetsdale, Pennsylvania, in 1867; and at Bath, N.Y., in 1869, where he died, April 14, 1884. See Necrol. Reanort of Princeton Theol. Sem. 1885, page 47.

## Platte-Montagne, Nicolas D[[@Headword:Platte-Montagne, Nicolas D]]

             a French painter and engraver, son of a celebrated Belgian portrait-painter, was born at Paris about 1631. He was a pupil of Philippe de Champagne, Charles le Brun, and of his uncle, Jean Morin. He painted the Mary, which was presented in 1666 to the church of Notre Dame at Paris; a St. Benedict, a St. Scholastica (1676), and a ceiling for the church of the Benedictines du Saint-Sacrament of the Rue Cassette; and The Holy Ghost alighting upon the Apostles, for the church of Saint-Sullice (1676). He also worked for the Tuileries in 1683 and 1684. He exhibited two paintings at the salon of 1673; five historical paintings and three portraits at the salon  of 1699 -the first that took place in the galleries of the Louvre. He engraved from 1651 to 1694, in a fashion but little differing from that of Morin, seventeen different subjects, and eleven portraits after Porbus, Janet, Philippe de Champagne, B. de Champagne, and after his own paintings. He was received a member of the Academy April 21, 1779; appointed supplementary professor July 1, 1679, and regular professor Dec. 20, 1681. He signed his works Montague, Montaigne, De Platte- Montaigne, N. D. P. Montaigne, N. de la Platte-Montaigne, N. van Platten Berc, vulgo De Platte-Montaigne, and N. de Platte-Montagne. He died Dec. 25, 1706. — Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Géneralé, 40, 453.

## Platter[[@Headword:Platter]]

             (παροψίς, properly a side-dish, consisting of dainties set on as a condiment, or sauce). Our Lord, in reproving the Pharisees, said, “Woe unto you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! for ye make clean the outside of the cup and of the platter, but within they are full of extortion and excess” (Mat 23:25). “Howbeit in vain do they worship me, teaching for doctrines the commandments of men. For laying aside the commandment of God, ye hold the tradition of men, as the washing of pots and cups; and many other such like things ye do. And he said unto them, Full well ye reject the commandment of God, that ye may keep your own tradition” (Mar 7:7-9). The Talmud contains many directions on the use of these utensils, which Jews are strictly required to observe. SEE DISH.

## Play[[@Headword:Play]]

             (צָחִק, tsachak, Exo 32:6). This word, in addition to the sense of joking or sporting (Gen 19:14), may also be understood of amusements, accompanied with music and singing, in which sense it may be understood in Jdg 16:25. Though we have no particular mention in the Old Testament of such matters, we may reasonably suppose that some of the games practiced by the ancient Egyptians were likewise known to the Hebrews; these appear, from the monuments, to have been mock combats, races, gymnastic exercises, singing, dancing and games of chance (Wilkinson, Anc. Egyptians, 1, 189 sq.). In the declining period of Jewish history the athletic games of the Greeks were introduced and there were gymnasia, or schools of exercise in Jerusalem, where they practiced  wrestling, racing, quoits, etc. (1 Maccabees 5, 16; 1 Maccabees 2 Mance. 4:13-15). For the Grecian games of strength and skill so often alluded to by Paul, SEE GAMES. SEE SPORT.

## Playfair, James, D.D[[@Headword:Playfair, James, D.D]]

             a Scotch divine of some note, was born about 1740, and was educated at the University of St. Andrew's. He then became minister of Liff and Benvie livings, which he held until his son succeeded him in the work of the ministry, to soon exchange, however, these fields of labor for the, scientific work in which he became so greatly celebrated. Dr. James Playfair was also principal of the United College of St. Salvador and St. Leonard, in the University of St. Andrew's. He died in 1819. He published A System of Chronology, and other works. See London Gentleman's Magazine, 1819, pt. 2, p. 179.

## Playfair, John[[@Headword:Playfair, John]]

             an eminent scientist, was born, in 1749, at Dundee; was educated at St. Andrew's; resigned a living, and became mathematical professor at Edinburgh, where he died July 20,1819. Playfair was celebrated as a geologist, and a strenuous defender of the Huttonian system. Among his works are, Elements of Geometry: — Outlines of Philosophy: — Illustrations of the Huttonian Theory: — and A System of Geography.

## Playfere, John[[@Headword:Playfere, John]]

             SEE PLAIFERE.

## Plays, Religious[[@Headword:Plays, Religious]]

             SEE MYSTERIES.

## Pleasure[[@Headword:Pleasure]]

             is the delight which arises in the mind from the contemplation or enjoyment of something agreeable, and is synonymous in expression with happiness (q.v.).

## Pledge[[@Headword:Pledge]]

             (usually some form of חָבִל, chabda, to bind as by a chattel mortgage; occasionally forms of עָבִט, abdt, to exchange, and עָרִב, ardb, to give  security; Talmud, מַשְׁכּוֹן), in a legal sense, an assurance given as security by a debtor to his creditor, which is alluded to in the Mosaic books in several instances. Thus

1. The creditor was not permitted to go to the house of his debtor to take his pledge, but must receive it before the door (Deu 24:10 sq.). The reason of this requirement and its merciful object are obvious.

2. The articles which were forbidden to be taken in pledge were,

(a) the raiment or outer garment (Exo 22:26 sq.; Deu 24:10 sq., but see below), because this served the poor also as a covering by night for the bed;

(b) the hand mill (q.v.; Exo 24:6. Comp. Mishna, Baba Mez. 9, 13). But notwithstanding these merciful provisions of the law, hard- hearted creditors were found among the Israelites who oppressed their debtors by taking pledges (Pro 20:16; Pro 27:13; Eze 18:12; Eze 33:15; Hab 2:6; comp. Job 22:6; Job 24:3). See Delitzsch, ad loc., and especially Michaelis, Aos. Recht, 3, 61 sq. The custom of giving pledges prevailed extensively in the ages succeeding the exile, from the fact that by the decisions of the scribes all Jews were prohibited from making any payments on the Sabbath; hence he who would make a purchase on that day left some pledge with the seller (see Mishna, Shab. 23, 1), as his outer garment, to be redeemed by payment the next day. The taking of pledges is still further restricted by the Talmud (Baba Mez. 9, 13). A pledging of land, mortgaging, appears first in the Talmud (Mishna, Shebiith, 10, 6). However, the legal transfer of land under the Mosaic economy was properly but a pledging; for it could at any time be redeemed, and in the year of Jubilee it returned without repayment to the original owner. Pawning of personal property for debt, however, was a very ancient custom (Gen 38:17 sq.). Personal guarantees of faith. pledges, or hostages, are mentioned (2Ki 14:14, בְּנֵי תִּעִרֻרוֹת). The general abhorrence of the usurer, and of his taking pledges, among the Arabs of the present day, is often mentioned by travelers. Mohammed entirely forbids all lending on interest, and the Mosaic precepts (comp. Exo 22:25-27) are generally so understood in the East. Yet nothing is more common there than exorbitant usury, and the taking of pledges (Thomson, Land and Book, 1, 499 sq.). SEE LOAN.

PLEDGE is something given in hand as a security for the fulfillment of a contract or the performance of a promise. When a man of veracity pledges his word, his affirmation becomes an assurance that he will fulfill what he has promised. But as the word of every man is not equally valid in matters of importance, it becomes necessary that a valuable article of some kind should be deposited as a bond for fulfillment on his part. In the Protestant Episcopal Church Catechism a sacrament is defined as “;an outward and visible sign of an inward and spiritual grace given unto us; ordained by Christ himself, as a Ineans whereby we receive the same, and a pledge to  assure us thereof;” in which the pledge is the token that we receive the grace.

## Plegmund[[@Headword:Plegmund]]

             a noted prelate of the early English Church, flourished near the close of the 9th century. He was the friend and fellow-student of Alfred, and was in 890 elevated to the archbishopric of Canterbury. We know next to nothing about his personal history, but we are aware of the influence he exerted on ecclesiastical affairs through Alfred. See Churton, Early English Church, p. 210, 221; Wright, Biogr. Brit. (see Index).

## Pleiadas[[@Headword:Pleiadas]]

             is the rendering in the A.V. of כַּימָה, kimah, in Job 9:9; Job 38:31; but in Amo 5:8 out A. V. has “the seven stars,” although the Geneva version translates the word “Pleiades” as in the other cases. In Job the Sept. has Πλειάς, the order of the Hebrew words having been altered, SEE ORION, while in Amos there is no trace of the original, and it is difficult to imagine what the translators had before them. The Vulgate in each passage has a different rendering: Ilyades in Job 9:9; Pleiades in Job 38:31; and Arcturus in Amo 5:8. Of the other versions, the Peshito-Syriac and Chaldee merely adopt the Hebrew word; Aquila in Job 38, Symmachls in Job 38 and Amos, and Theodotion in Amos, give “Pleiades,” while with remarkable inconsistency Aquila in Amos has “Arcturus.” The Jewish commentators are no less at variance. Rabbi David Kimchi in his lexicon says: “Rabbi Jonah wrote that it was a collection of stars called in Arabic Al-Thuraiya. And the wise rabbi Abraham Aben-Ezra, of blessed memory, wrote that the ancients said Kimah is seven stars, and they are at the end of the constellation Aries, and those which are seen are six. And he wrote that what was right in his eyes was that it was a single star, and that a great one, which is called the left eye of Taurus; and Kesil is a great star, the heart of the constellation Scorpio.” On Job 38:31, Kimchi continues: “Our rabbins of blessed memory have said (Rerachoth, 58, 2) Kimah hath great cold and bindeth up the fruits and Kesil hath great heat and ripeneth the fruits: therefore He said, ‘or loosen the bands of Kesil;' for it openeth the fruits and bringeth them forth.” In addition to the evidence of rabbi Jonah, who identifies the Hebrew Kimnah with the Arabic el-Thuraiya, we have the testimony of rabbi Isaac Israel, quoted by Hyde in his notes on the Tables of Ulugh Beigh (p. 31-33, ed. 1665), to the same effect. That el-  Thuraiya and the Pleiades are the same is proved by the words of AbenRagel (quoted by Hyde, p. 33): “Al-Thuraiya is the mansion of the moon, in the sign Taurus, and it is called the celestial hen with her chickens.” With this Hyde compares the Fr. Pulsiniere, and Eng. Hen and Chickens, which are old names for the same stars; and Niebuhr (Descr. de l'Arabie, p. 101) gives as the result of his inquiry of the Jew at Sana, “Kinmeh, Pleiades, quon appelle aussi en Allemagne la poule qui glousse.” The “Ancients.” whom Aben-Ezra quotes (on Job 38:31), evidently understood by the seven small stars at the end of the constellation Aries the Pleiades, which are indeed in the left shoulder of the Bull, but so near the Ram's tail that their position might properly be defined with reference to it. With the statement that “those which are seen are six” may be compared the words of Didymus on Homer, τῶν δὲ Πλειάδων οὐσῶν ἑπτά, πάνυ ἀμαυρὸς ὁ ἕβδομος ἀστήρ, and of Ovid (Fast. 4:170):

“Qeua septem dici, sex tamen esse solent.”

The opinion of Aben-Ezra himself has frequently been misrepresented. He held that Kimâh was a single large star, Aldebaran, the brightest of the Hyades, while Kesil [A. V. “Orion”] was Antares, the heart of Scorpio. “When these rise in the east,” he continues, “the effects which are recorded appear.” He describes them as opposite each other, and the difference in right ascension between Aldebaran and Antares is as nearly as possible twelve hours. The belief of Eben-Ezra had probably the same origin as the rendering of the Vulg. Ilyades. One other point is deserving of notice. The rabbins, as quoted by Kimchi, attribute to Kimâh great cold and the property of checking vegetation, while Kesil works the contrary effects. But the words of rabbi Isaac Israel on Job 38:31 (quoted by Hyde, p. 72), are just the reverse. He says, “The stars have operations in the ripening of the fruits, and such is the operation of Kimâh. And some of them retard and delay the fruits from ripening, and this is the operation of Kesil. The interpretation is, ‘Wilt thou bind the fruits which the constellation Kimâh ripeneth and openeth; or wilt thou open the fruits which the constellation Kesil contracteth and bindeth up?” On the whole then, though it is impossible to arrive at any certain conclusion, it appears that our translators were perfectly justified in rendering Kimâh by “Pleiades.” The “seven stars” in Amos clearly denoted the same cluster in the language of the 17th century, for Cotgrave in his French Dictionary gives “Pleiade, f., one of the seven stars.” Hyde maintained that the Pleiades were again mentioned in Scripture by the name Succoth Benoth.  The discussion of this question must be reserved to the article on that name.

The etymology of Kimâh is referred to the Arabic Kumeh, “a heap,” as being a heap or cluster of stars. The full Arabic name given by Gesenius is ‘the knot of the Pleiades;” and, in accordance with this, most modern commentators render Job 38:31, “Is it thou that bindest the knots of the Pleiades, or loosenest the bands of Orion?” Simon (Lex. Hebr.) quotes the Greenland name for this cluster of stars, “Killukturset, i.e. stellas colligtasts,” as an instance of the existence of the same idea in a widely different language. The rendering “sweet influences” of the A. V. is a relic of the lingering belief in the power which the stars exerted over human destiny. The marginal note on the word “Pleiades” in the Geneva Version is, “Which starres arise when the sunne is in Taurus, which is the spring tyme, and bring flowers,” thus agreeing with the explanation of R. Isaac Israel quoted above.

The word is used as the name of the cluster of stars in the neck of the constellation Taurus, of which seven are the principal. Six or seven may be usually seen if the eye is directed towards it; but if the eye be turned carelessly aside while the attention is fixed on the group, many more may be seen. Telescopes show a number of large stars there crowded together into a small space. The name Pleiades is probably derived from the Greek word Pleios, i.e. full, so that it merely denotes a condensed assemblage of stars. The Romans called the Pleiades vergiliae, because they arose in the spring, in the first part of May, and set early in November. See Hyde on Ulugh Beigh's Tabb. p. 32; Niebuhr, Arab. p. 114; Ideler, Ursprung und Bedeutung der Sternnamen, p. 146. SEE ASTRONOMY; SEE CONSTELLATION.

## Plenarty[[@Headword:Plenarty]]

             (opposed to a vacancy) denotes in ecclesiastical language that an office or parish is filled.

## Plenary Indulgence[[@Headword:Plenary Indulgence]]

             SEE INDULGENCE.

## Plenary Inspiration[[@Headword:Plenary Inspiration]]

             SEE DEISTS; SEE INSPIRATION.

## Plerma[[@Headword:Plerma]]

             (πλήρωμα, fulness) is the Gnostic term for that fullness of pure and radiant light and perfection in which the Divine Being was supposed to dwell, and whom they named Bythus. SEE GNOSTICISM.

## Plesken, Meinnhard[[@Headword:Plesken, Meinnhard]]

             a Lutheran theologian of Germany, was born at Bremen, June 8, 1696. He studied at Wittenberg. In 1720 he was called as subrector to the cathedral school of his birthplace, in 1725 as pastor to Stade, in 1733 he was member of consistory, in 1743 general superintendent, and in 1748 doctor of theology. Plesken died May 30, 1757, leaving, Judas Iscariotes Sacrae Eucharistiae Convirus (Bremen, 1716): — De Columnis Aeneis Jachil et Boans (1719): — De Benjamino Parvo (1720): — De Homine, in Caijus Naso est Spiritus (eod.): — De Quibusdam pro Existentia Dei Arguimentis Sollicitatis (1725). See Doring, Die gelehrten Theologen Deutschlands, s.v.; Furst, Bibl. Jud. 3:107. (B.P.)

## Plessing, Friedrich Victor-Lebrecht[[@Headword:Plessing, Friedrich Victor-Lebrecht]]

             a German philosopher, was born at Belleben, near Magdeburg, Dec. 20, 1752. He was the son of John Frederick Plessing, who was counselor of the consistory at Werningerode, and wrote an Essai sur l'Origine du Paganisme (Leips. 1757-1758, 2 vols. 8vo), and a Histoire des Tombeaux (Werningerode, 1786, 8vo); he died in 1793. Young Plessing attended the theological courses at different universities, and finally devoted himself to philosophy at Konigsberg, under Kant's direction. From 1788 he was a professor of that science at Duisburg. He died Feb. 8, 1806. He left, Von der Nothwendigkeit des Uebels und der Schmerzen bei fuhlenden Geschspfen (Dessau, 1783, 8vo): — Osiris und Socrates (Berl. 1783, 8vo): — Historische Untersuchusgen über die Theologie und Philosophie der dltesfen Volker bis auf Aristoteles Zeiten (Elbingen, 1785, 8vo): — Memonium, oder Versuch zur Enthüllung der Geheimnisse des Alterthum (Leips. 1787, 2 vols. 8vo): — Versuche zur Aufklärung der Philosophie des a'ltesten Alterthum (ibid. 1788-1790, 5 vols. 8vo). — Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Géneralé, 40, 465.

## Plessing, Johann Friedrich[[@Headword:Plessing, Johann Friedrich]]

             a Lutheran theologian of Germany,. was born at Conitz, Prussia, October 28, 1720. He studied at Jena and Leipsic, was in 1746 preacher at Cothen, in 1764 at Wernigerode, and died December 31, 1793. He wrote, Versuch vom Ursprung der Abgotterei (Leipsic, 1757-58, 2 volumes): — Die Auferstehungs-Geschichte Jesu Christi (1785; 2d ed. 1788): — Harmonische Geschichte der Aurferstehung Jesu Christi (Wernugerode, 1789): — Ueber Golgotha und Christi Grab (Halle, eod.). See Doring,  Die gelehrten Theologen Deutschlands, s.v.; Winer, Handbuch der theol. Lit. 1:560, 561. (B.P.)

## Plessis, Joseph Octave[[@Headword:Plessis, Joseph Octave]]

             a somewhat noted Roman Catholic prelate, was born at Montreal, Canada, March 3, 1772, of very humble parentage. He decided to give himself to the service of the Church, and after completing his theological studies was ordained priest, March 11, 1786; was employed as professor of humanity at the College of St. Raphael, also as secretary to the bishop of Quebec, and curate of the capital; Sept. 6, 1797, he was made coadjutor to bishop Denault; April 26, 1800, he was appointed bishop of Canatte, in Palestine, with the succession to the seat at Quebec, of which he became incumbent Jan. 17, 1806. He founded the college at Nicolet, as well as primary schools at Quebec. He was called by the crown to the legislative council in 1818, and proved himself a loyal and patriotic senator. In 1796 he pronounced an oration at Quebec on the occasion of the naval battle of Aboukir. He died at Quebec Dec. 4, 1825. See Ferland, Biog. Notice of J. O. Plessis (Queb. 1864, 8vo).

## Plessis-Mornay[[@Headword:Plessis-Mornay]]

             SEE DUPLESSIS.

## Plessner, Solomon[[@Headword:Plessner, Solomon]]

             a Jewvish rabbi of Germany, was born at Breslau, April 19, 1797. He received a thorough rabbinic education, was in 1822 instructor of religion at Festenberg, Silesia, in 1830 instructor at the teacher's seminary in Berlin, and died at Posen, August 25, 1883, where he had acted as rabbi for nearly forty vears. He is the author of, Die apocryphischen Bucher des Alten Testaments in Hebraische ubersetzt, etc. (Breslau, 1833): — Materialien fur tiefere Einblicke in das Alte Testament und die rabbinischen Schriften (Berlin, 1836), also with the title Belehrungen u. Erbauungaen (ibid. eod.): — Die kostbare Perle oder das Gebet (1837-38): — Judisch- Mosaischer Religionsunterricht (1838-39): — Religiose Vortrage (1840): — Festreden (1841). See Furst, Bibl. Jud. 3:107. (B.P.)

## Pletho or Gemistus, Georgius[[@Headword:Pletho or Gemistus, Georgius]]

             a distinguished philosopher, theologian, publicist, historian, geographer, and scholar of the 15th century, is one of the most prominent of the Greeks who contributed to the revival of Greek studies in Western Europe, and the restorer of the Platonic philosophy.

Life. — The dates of the birth and death of Pletho have not been ascertained. He is supposed to have died before the capture of Constantinople by the Turks, and not many years after the Council of Florence. He is vaguely reported to have been nearly a hundred years of age at the period of his demise. If this were true, he must have first seen the light about the middle of the 14th century. His birthplace was probably Constantinople, but much of his life was spent in Peloponnesus, and was passed in official employment. He received the name of Pletho, and perhaps of Gemistus, from the extent multiplicity, and fullness of his erudition, which he displayed in numerous works on a great variety of subjects. “He was admired,” says a writer near his time, “by not Greece alone, but by nearly the whole world, for his various and manifold knowledge of things divine and human, so that by the universal consent of both Greeks and Latins, he approached most closely to Plato, the prince of philosophers, and to Aristotle.” Yet this great name is one which posterity has willingly let die. He wrote on philosophy, theology, history, geography, oratory, music, etc. He composed orations, occasional essays, polemical tracts, letters, etc., and made collections, in the fashion of declining centuries, from Diodorus, Appian, and Plutarch; from Xenophon and. Dionysius Halicarnassensis, from Aristotle and Theophrastus. He was engaged in numerous controversies, with George Gennadius, who became patriarch of Constantinople after the Ottoman conquest; with Theodore of Gaza, and with George of Trebizond.

The number of his works might encourage the belief that a century of years had been accorded to their author; but this longevity is discredited by the incidents of his life. If he died, almost a centenarian, in 1452, as some reporters allege, he must have been about seventy when he held the first public employment recorded as held by him; and he must have been verging on ninety when last commemorated as an imperial officer in the Peloponnesus. The years of  macobians are so readily exaggerated by themselves, and by their more juvenile contemporaries, that no great weight need be attached to the allegation that he was born in 1355. His name of Pletho has been stated to have been bestowed on him in consequence of his learning but it may have been designed as an approximate reproduction of the name of Plato to whose memory and speculations he devoted himself with unrestrained enthusiasm. The surname may, indeed, have been assumed by himself, for it furnished frequent occasions of sarcasm and ridicule to the numerous adversaries whom he provoked. He occupied a high place at court, in the close of the reign of the emperor Manuel II Palheologus (Brucker says Michael, but the last emperor of that name had died almost a century and a half before. Dr. Plate, in Smith's Dict. of Gr. and Rom. Mythol., etc., gives 1426 as the date of this official function, but Manuel died in 1425). Gemistus “the Philosopher,” as he was already called, was one of the notables at the conference in Constantinople which recommended conciliation with the Latin Church (Michael Attaliotes, Hist. Polit. c. 4). He attended the emperor John V, as a senator and deputy of the Greek Church, to the Council of Florence in 1439 (Ducas. Hist. Byzant. c. 31). Among his companions were Bessarion, his pupil; Isidore of Russia; George the Scholarius, his future antagonist; and Argyropulus. Pletho distinguished himself by the active part which he took in the conferences, and by his violent opposition to the union of the churches. He yielded ultimately, however, and was one of the signatories of the formulary of compromise. This sacrifice of religious opinion embittered the feelings of his countrymen to him.

He did not accompany the emperor on his return to Constantinople. During his stay in Florence he formed an intimacy with Cosmo the Magnificent, and by the fascination of his lectures converted the great Florentine to the Platonism which Gemistus had espoused with the utmost fervor-though it was rather the mystical excesses of the later Neo- Platonists than the genuine doctrine of Plato which he had adopted. Marsilius Ficinus states, in his Dedication of Plotinus, that it was at Pletho's suggestion that Cosmo di Medici instituted the Platonic Academy at Florence, of which Ficinus became the first director. He certainly succeeded in rendering Platonism the rage in Italy, supported as he was by the countenance of his illustrious disciple, cardinal Bessarion, and by the favor of the Medicean house. Most of his labors henceforth were devoted to the illustration and dissemination of the Platonic doctrine. This endeavor, and the success which attended it, provoked the hostility of the Aristotelians, whose opinions had been for centuries in almost  unchallenged possession of the domain of philosophy, and involved him in virulent controversy with their leaders. Nor was the hostility mitigated by the suspicion that Pletho desired to supplant not merely Peripateticism, but Christianity also, by his revived Platonism. He was charged by George of Trebizond with being not less dangerous to the faith than Mohammed himself.

The suspicion was in some sort justified by the language of Plethq and corroborated subsequently by the tenor of the Commentaries of Ficinus. The quarrels thus excited were further exacerbated by the revolutionary doctrines of Pletho's treatise On Laws, written after the example of Plato, and far transcending the socialistic reveries of the Platonic Republic. The work seems not to have been published, or even completed. It is said to have been burned after his death by the directions of his ancient antagonist, George Scholarius, or Gennadius. Fragments of the work only remain. The imitation of Plato might have tempted him to the composition of the work, have determined its form, and suggested its doctrines. Any such temptation would have been encouraged by the meditated socialistic experiment of Plotinus. But the wretched condition of his countrymen, their destitution, their hopeless oppression by taxes which they could not pay-especially in Peloponnesus, ravaged as it had been for centuries by Sclavonians and Saracens and Franks, and ground into the dust by the Latin barons introduced by the Fourth Crusade-are alleged as the inducements to this wild device of social reorganization. There is every reason to believe that Pletho was as sincere as he was earnest in this dream of political renovation; which was neither more nor less insane in the 15th century than have been the numberless analogous schemes which have deluded the 19th. The project seems to have occupied his declining age. The years of Pletho were as full as was his assumed name.

Writings. — The treatises, abstracts, essays, polemics, letters, and other productions of Pletho were both numerous and varied. They still remain, for the most part, in manuscript, nor has there been any complete enumeration, or sufficient investigation of those that survive. The wish has several times been expressed for their collection, recension, and publication; but the wish is still ungratified, notwithstanding the acknowledgment of the various and valuable services that might be expected from its satisfaction. The editors of the Bonn edition of the Byzantine historians, who proceed so languidly with the continuation of the labors auspiciously and energetically commenced by Niebuhr, may contemplate, or may be induced to contemplate, an edition at some future  time of the Opera omnia quoe supersunt of Georgius Gemistus Pletho. The variety of these works has already been indicated. Of those which have been given to the press, the most important, as reported in Smith's Dictionary of Mythology, etc., are:

1. De Gestis Graecorum post pugnam ad Malntineamn, extracted from Diodorus and Plutarch: —

2. De Fato,

3. De Virtutibus:

4. De Platonice atque Aristotelicae Philosophice Differentia: —

5. Oracula Magica Zoroastris. Since this list was prepared, some of the smaller tracts of Pletho, previously unedited, have been published, and M. Alexandre has brought out at Paris,

6. De Legibus, Franmenta.

Philosophy. — There is no distinctive system of philosophy to be ascribed to Pletho. He was a revivalist and restorer only, except in the department of politics; and even here he was a legitimate disciple of Plato. He asserted the exclusive doctrine of Plato against Aristotle and the Aristotelians, and also against the experiment of the Neo-Platonists to conciliate the principles of Aristotle with those of Plato. He did not, however, avoid the transcendental excesses of the Alexandrian school, or refrain from following the example of the later members of that school, in blending Oriental fantasies with the speculations of the First Academy. Still his restitution of Platonism exercised a great and beneficial influence on the intellect of the 15th century, by presenting a new object of regard, by quickening intelligence through the conflict of opinions and through the controversies excited, and by liberating inquiry from the solitary predominance of the one great teacher, whose views had been converted into a tyrannical authority, distorted and cramped in their application, and deflected into the perilous systems of the Alexandrists and Averroists. The institution of tile Florentine Academy was one of the most potent agencies in the emancipation of modern thought; and its establishment may fairly be credited to the labors and to the impulse of Pletho. What is truly distinctive of his philosophical career is his political project for the reformation and amelioration of the Peloponnesus. Though some of its outlines were derived from antiquity, and the route was in some sort indicated by Plato  and Plotinus, yet it possesses originality of its own, and was immediately induced by all active desire of' ministering to present needs, and of supplying practical remedies, even if they were impracticable, to the actual miseries of the society around him.

The plan proposed by Pletho was a sweeping agrarianism, resembling in some respects the system of Lycurgus and that of Cleomenes II in the same region of Laconia; resembling in others the socialism of Plato, but resembling still more the extreme projects of land reform which have recently been proposed in England, Ireland, France, and other countries. The evils which he proposed to redress by a complete alteration of the fabric of society were the insecurity of person and property; the squalor occasioned by ravages and multitudinous taxes, ill-imposed and unfairly levied; the uncertain and defective administration of justice; and the varied and degraded currency in circulation. Like Plato, he proposed to divide the people into three classes, but the classes were different from those of Plato: they were to be the agriculturists, the capitalists, and the guardians. The farmers or agriculturists were intended to include the greater part of the industrial body; the capitalists were to embrace the owners of all the appliances for the assistance of labor, and apparently the lessors of the land; the guardians, or defenders, comprehended all who were engaged in the protection of the society and its members, or in the maintenance of right and order: princes, magistrates, lawyers, doctors, and soldiers-priests also, probably. There was to be no private property in land; it was to belong exclusively to the state, and to be leased out, from time to time, to landlords or capitalists. A right of temporary occupancy was all that was admitted. Of the produce of the soil, one third was to be paid to the government for the maintenance of the guardians, and for other public burdens; one third went to the landlords or capitalists; and one third was to be the remuneration of the actual cultivators. Pletho, like the French Economistes, thought that all wealth was the production of land, and that all impositions should be charged upon it. The guardians, whether princes or soldiers or magistrates, were a class entirely apart from the rest of the community. They paid no taxes, but protected the people from external violence and internal disorders, and were supported by the government from the proceeds of the public third. The soldiers were quartered on the farmers to consume the government thirds, so far as required for their support: “fruges consumere nati.” No money-taxes were imposed: the funds required for the public service were to be derived exclusively from  the export and sale of the surplus which remained out of the government's share of the produce. Such is a brief abstract of Pletho's plethoric state. The plan was never completed; the book was burned; its author died; and tie Turks conquered the Morea before the experiment could be tried.

Literature. — Gass, Gemadii et Plethonis Scripta quaedam edita et inedita (Breslau, 1844); Pellissier, Plethon, Traite des Lois, ou Recueil des Fragmens. en Pastie inedits de cet Ouvrage, par C. Alexandre (Paris, 1851); Leo Allatius, De Georgiis diatriba (ibid. 1651); Boivin, Querelle des Philosophes du XV me Siecle; Hody, De Graecis Illustribus, etc. (Lond. 1742); Bayle, Dict. Hist. et Critique; Brucker, Hist. C(rit. Phil. per. 3, Psalms 1, lib. 1, c. 2, § 1; c. 3, § 4, 5; Tiraboschi, Storia della Letteratura Italiana; Ginguden, Hist. de la Litterature Italienne; Smith, Dict. Anc. Mythol. and Biog.; Hallam, Hist. of the Lit. of Europe, ch. 2, § 2, p. 13, 14; Finlay, Hist. of the Byzantine Empire, bk. 4, ch. 2, § 5, vol. 2, p. 608; id. Hist. of Med. Greece, etc., ch. 9:§ 2, p. 282; Ueberweg, Hist. of Philosophy, § 109. (G. F. H.)

## Pletz, Joseph[[@Headword:Pletz, Joseph]]

             doctor of theology, imperial chaplain, and abbot of the monastery of the Holy Virgin of Pagrany, Hungary; imperial counselor, consistorial counselor, deacon-emeritus of the metropolitan chapter of St. Stephen at Vienna; director of the theological studies in the Austrian empire, referent of the same assistant of the imperial commission of studies, director and president of the theological faculty; and, in 1835, ex-rector magnificus of tie University of Vienna, member of the high schools of Vienna, Pesth, and Padua, etc., was born at Vienna Jan. 3, 1788; attended the lessons of the gymnasium of St. Anna; studied philosophy and theology at the University of Vienna; received orders Aug. 30, 1812, and was appointed adjunct at the university, prefect of the studies, and librarian in the episcopal seminary. During the years 1814 and 1815 he taught dogmatics at the High School of Vienna. In 1816 he was appointed chaplain of the court, and first director of the studies at the institute for the education of secular priests, then recently founded by Francis 1. In 1823 he was called upon to teach dogmatics at the University of Vienna, and Feb. 15. 1827, he became canon of the metropolitan chapter of St. Stephen. He received successively the functions and dignities mentioned above, and discharged the duties thereof with active zeal, commendable prudence, with disinterestedness and conscientiousness, for the good of the State and the Church. A fit of  apoplexy put an end to his restless activity, in 1841. Pletz was a worthy, unblemished priest, a learned theologian, a zealous protector of true science, and at the same time a father to the poor, a consoler of the afflicted, a helper in need, and to his friends a true and upright friend. Besides several works of edification and some sermons, which he published in the years 18171833, he wrote a number of essays in Frint's theological journal, and in his own, which he edited from 1828 to 1840 under the title of Neue theoloyische Zeitschrift (Vienna), in twelve annual volumes; the thirteenth, commenced by Pletz, was completed by his friend, Prof. Seebach.

## Plicata[[@Headword:Plicata]]

             the “folded” chasuble worn on Good Friday by the deacon and subdeacon, or by a priest, folded on the shoulder, when acting as a deacon. It is a relic of ancient usage, anterior to the use of the dalmatic and tunic, when they wore the trabea rolled up in front to leave their hands free and unencumbered, and is also a peculiarity belonging to times of penance.

## Pliny The Younger, Or Caius Caec. P. Secundus[[@Headword:Pliny The Younger, Or Caius Caec. P. Secundus]]

             the nephew and adopted son of the elder Pliny, was born at Como in A.D. 61 or 62; was a pupil of Quintilian; and pleaded successfully as an advocate in his nineteenth year. He was successively tribune of the people, prefect of the treasury, consul, proconsul in Pontus and Bithynia, and augur; and died, universally esteemed, in 115. The name of Pliny the Younger has, from the days of Tertullian, been mentioned with peculiar interest by Christian writers on account of the testimony which he bore concerning the Christians of his day in Bithynia. They form the subject of a rather long letter (10, 97) to Trajan, written about forty years after the death of St. Paul, and followed by a short answer from Trajan. With all his advantages of education, Pliny was superstitious and credulous. Though a kindhearted man even to slaves (8:1,16, 19), he was intolerant and cruel to the Christians; and, according to his own account, he put to death the Christians of Bithynia who would not abjure their religion, though he considered it only an innocent superstition. The materials for Pliny's life may be collected from his Epistles, from which a brief notice has been drawn up by Cellarius, and one more elaborate by Masson; there is also a very complete Life of Pliny, with abundant references to his letters, prefixed to E. Thierfeld's German translation of the “Epistles and  Panegyric” (Munich, 1828). But the reader is referred to the Epistles themselves for the most gratifying notice of Pliny the Younger, every epistle being, as Melmoth observes, “a kind of historical sketch, wherein we have a view of him in some striking attitude either of active or contemplative life.” Pliny's Epistles have been translated into English by Lord Orrery and Mr. Melmoth. The best edition of Pliny's Epistles is that of Cortius and Longolius (Amst. 1734, 4to). Of the editions of the Epistles and Panegyric together may be recommended those of Christopher Cellarius (Leips. 1693,12mo); Hearne, with Life by Masson prefixed (Oxfortd, 1703, 8vo); Gierig (Leips. 1806, 2 vols. 8vo), and Gesuetan and Schaefer (ibid. 1805). Of his writings, the letter addressed to the emperor Trajan in the year 107 is considered one of the most important documents remaining of early Christian history, and we therefore transcribe here some portion of it. After mentioning the difficulty of his own situation, and his perplexity in what manner to proceed against men charged with no other crime than the name of Christian, the writer proceeds as follows:

“Others were named by an informer, who at first confessed themselves Christians, and afterwards denied it; the rest said they had been Christians, but had left them some three years ago, some longer, and one or more above twenty years. They all worshipped your image and the statues of the gods; these also reviled Christ. They affirmed that the whole of their fault or error lay in this— that they were wont to meet together on a stated day before it was light, and sing among themselves alternately a hymn— to Christ, as to God, and bind themselves by an oath, not to the commission of any wickedness, but not to be guilty of theft, or robbery, or adultery, never to falsify their word, nor to deny a pledge committed to them when called upon to return it. When these things we performed, it was their custom to separate, and then to come together again to a meal, which they ate in common without any disorder; but this they had forborne since the publication of my edict, by which, according to your commands, I prohibited assemblies. After receiving this account, I judged it the more necessary to examine, and that by torture, two maidservants, which were called ministers; but I have discovered nothing besides a bad and excessive superstition. Suspending, therefore, all judicial proceedings, 1 have recourse to you for advice, for it has appeared to me matter highly deserving consideration, especially upon account of the great number of persons who are in danger of suffering, for many of all ages and every rank, of both sexes likewise, are accused, and will be accused. Nor has the  contagion of this superstition seized cities only, but the lesser towns also, and the open country; nevertheless, it seems to me that it may be restrained and corrected. It is certain that the temples which were almost forsaken begun to be more frequented; and the sacred solemnities, after a long intermission, are revived. Victims likewise are everywhere bought up, whereas for a time there were few purchasers. Whence it is easy to imagine what numbers of men might be reclaimed if pardon were granted to those who repent.” So few and uncertain are the records left to guide our inquiries through the obscure period which immediately followed the conclusion of the labors of the apostles, that the above testimony to the numbers and virtues of our forefathers in faith becomes indeed invaluable. See Milman, Hist. of Christianity; Liddon, Divinity of Christ; Mosheim, Commentary of Christian History; Schaff, Hist. of the Christian Church, 1, 164 sq.; Smith, Dict. of Class. Biog. s.v.; Bähr, Gesch. der romischen Literatur; Hagenbach, Kirchengesch. der ersten drei Jahrh. ch. 8; Alzog, Kirchengesch. 1, 112, 136; Riddle, Christian Atiquities, p. 176 sq.; Bender, Derjuingere Plinius (Tub. 1873); Cudworth, Intellectual Universe; Jules Janin, Pline lejeune et Quintilien (1838); Church, Pliny's Letters (Lond. 1872).

## Plisson, Marie-Prudence[[@Headword:Plisson, Marie-Prudence]]

             a French female mathematician, celebrated in her time by her eccentricities, was born at Chartres Nov. 27, 1727. Her father was a magistrate. Her taste for learned pursuits kept her aloof from the world, and induced her to prefer single-blessedness to matrimonial bliss. Her quaint disposition soon engaged her in disputes with which her sex evidently ought to have nothing to do. She first made herself known by several pieces in prose and in verse, published by the newspapers of the time. In 1764 the question was agitated whether a child born ten months and ten days after the dissolution of the matrimonial tie was legitimate? Mlle. Plisson boldly intervened in this momentous debate, and attacked with no little vivacity the opinion of Lebos, Bertin, Antoine Petit, etc.: many were the epigrams darted at the female philosopher. There was a time when she took to observe with passionate curiosity the nature of the cat, and comparing notes with all the naturalists who had written anything about it. She undertook to write the physiology of this interesting animal. “What animal,” she says, in one of her pamphlets, “is more common, more at hand to be examined by educated people, than the cat?” Her library was remarkable in every respect. She died Dec. 17, 1788. Mile. Plisson left, Odes sur la Vie champetre (1750):  — Projet pour soulager les Pauvres de la Campagne (Chartres, 1758): — Recherches sur la Du-ee de la Grossesse (Amsterdam, 1765): — —La Promenade de Province, Nouvelle, avec les Voyages d'Oronasis dans ‘Ile de Bienveillance et dans la Planete de Mercure (Paris, 1783, 12mo): — and Maximes morales d'un Philosophe Chretien (Paris, 1783, 16mo). — Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Géneralé, 40, 486.

## Plitt, Gustav Leopold[[@Headword:Plitt, Gustav Leopold]]

             a noted Lutheran theologian of Germany, was born March 27, 1836, at Genin, near Lubeck. He studied at Erlangen and Berlin, and commenced his theological career at the former place in 1862. In 1866 he was made professor, and in 1872 doctor of theology. He died September 10, 1880. Plitt, who is best known as the associate editor of the second edition of Herzog's Real-Encyklopadie fur Protestantische Theologie und Kirche, published the following works: De Auctoritate Articulorum Smalcaldicorum Symbolica (Erlangen, 1852): — Festpredigten deus heiligen Bernhard (1860): — Melanchthon's Loci Communes in ihrer Urgestalt (1864): — Einleitung in die Augustana (1867-68, 2 volumes): — Aus Schelling's Leben in Briefen (1869-70, 3 volumes): — Die Albrechtsleute oder die Evangelische Gemeinschaft (1877): — Die Apologie der Augustana (1873): — Grundriss der Symbolik fur Vorlesungen (1875): — Iodokus Truffetter von Eisenach, der Lehrer Luther's (1876): — Gabriel Biel als Prediger (1879): — Dr. Martin Luther's Leben und Wirken (edited after Plitt's death by Petersen, Leipsic, 1883). See Plitt-Herzog, Real-Encyklop. s.v. (B.P.)

## Plitt, Johann Jacob[[@Headword:Plitt, Johann Jacob]]

             a Lutheran theologian of Germany, was born February 27, 1727, at Wetter, Hesse. He studied at Halle, was in 1749 preacher at Cassel, in 1755  professor at Rinteln, in 1762 preacher at Frankfort-on-the-Main, and died April 7, 1773, doctor of theology. He wrote, De Gloria Dei in Promulgatione Legis Sinaiticae (Gottingen, 1755): — De Nexu inter Bonitatem Dei Infinitam et Justitiam ejus Punitivam Arctissimo (1756): — De Vero Conceptu Ceremoniae Religionis (Rinteln, 1759): — Testimonia Quorundam Ecclesiae Patum pro Baptisma Infantum (1760): — De Poenifentia Caini (1761): — Theologische Untersuchungen (1764-71, 3 volumes); besides he published a number of sermons and other ascetical works. See Doring, Die gelehrten Theologen Deutschlands, s.v.; Winer, Handbuch der theol. Lit. 1:451. (B.P.)

## Ploos van Amstel, Cornelius[[@Headword:Ploos van Amstel, Cornelius]]

             a celebrated Dutch amateur engraver and designer, was born at Amsterdam in 1726. He is chiefly distinguished for his imitations of the drawings of old masters, of which he possessed one of the best collections known, amounting to five thousand drawings by celebrated Italian, German, French, Flemish, and Dutch masters, from Giotto to his own time. Born of a good and wealthy family, he had every opportunity for improving his taste and advancing his pursuits. Being acquainted with all the principal collectors of Amsterdam, he commenced making his own valuable collection at a very early age. He had likewise a very valuable collection of prints and etchings, especially of the works of Lucas van Leyden, Albert Durer, Golzius, Cornelius and Jan Visser, N. Berchem, and especially Rembrandt. Ploos van Amstel's own works consist chiefly of imitations of drawings of old masters, in chalk, washed and colored; the colored imitations were accomplished by printing with several plates. In 1765 he published a collection of forty-six such imitations in various styles, after drawings by A. Vandevelde, Rembrandt, Ostade, Gerard Dow, Backhuysen, Metzu, Berchem, A. Bloemaert, Wouvermann, Mieris, Terburg, and others. There are altogether upwards of one hundred imitations of drawings by Ploos van Amstel, and many of these are published in various stages of progress, but very few impressions were taken of any. They are enumerated and described by Weigel in the Kunst- Katalog, and in Nagler's Künsler- Lexikon. A collection of one hundred of Van Amstel's and some additional similar imitations, with a portrait of Van Amstel, was published by C. Josi (London, 1821, royal folio); but only one hundred copies were printed, and at the enormous price of forty guineas per copy. Ploos van Amstel died at Amsterdam Dec. 20, 1798, and on March 3, 1800, his valuable collection, with the exception of the etchings of Rembrandt, was sold at auction, and realized the large sum of 109,406 florins. See Van Eynden en Vander Willigen, Geschiedenis der Vaterlandsche Schildekunst sedert de Helft der XVIII Eeuw. 1816-1842.

## Plotinus[[@Headword:Plotinus]]

             the most prominent and celebrated of the Neo-Platonic philosophers, the most elaborate and authoritative exponent of the school of Alexandria, was the most transcendental of the ancient transcendentalists, and was mainly instrumental in transforming into the Pantheism of Iamblichus and Proclus the doctrine deduced through many successions from Plato.

Life. — The outlines of the career of Plotinus have already been given, and have been accompanied with a brief notice of his opinions, under SEE NEO-PLATOISM.

The esteem in which the sage of Lycopolis was held by his contemporaries is shown by the application to him of the current proverb, “The productions of Egypt are few, but they are great.” His asceticism led him to regard his body, the casket of his soul, with such contempt that he would never suffer his likeness to be taken. His pupil Amelius, however, introduced the painter Carterius to his lectures, who was thus enabled to take a portrait of him from memory, without his knowledge. His philosophical temperament is further illustrated by his dying words, addressed to Eustochius, “I am striving to reunite what is divine in me to the pure divinity which reigns throughout the universe.” When he expired, a dragon rushed from under his bed, and escaped through a hole in the wall. Amelius inquired of the Delphic oracle, not yet entirely dumb, “What has become of him?” and was informed, in a string of loose hexameters, that he dwelt with Minos, Rhadamanthus, Abacus, Pythagoras, and other blessed spirits, in the contemplation of the Deity, to whom he had been conjoined in ecstatic union four times during life. After the biographical notice already given, it only remains to give a somewhat fuller account of his writings, and a more extended and connected exposition of his views.

Writings. — The philosophy of the Neo-Platonic school of Alexandria, founded by Ammonius Saccas, was an exclusive cult, designed to be a secret and privileged possession for the training and elevation of an elect body of theorists and enthusiasts. The seal of reticence having been broken by Herennius, his fellow disciple, Plotinus deemed that there was no longer either obligation or expediency in endeavoring to preserve the secrets of the new speculation, and accordingly promulgated it by oral lectures at Rome, continued for twenty-five years, and by treatises written at various times during this long course of instruction. His exposition was, however, so curt, intricate, and obscure; so full of inapprehensible subtleties and  impalpable distinctions, that he was under the necessity of invoking the aid of his pupils to interpret and to develop his doctrine. He thus employed his veteran disciple, Amelius, to combat the repugnances and to remove the doubts of the neophyte Porphyry. All the earlier writers who have occasion to mention Plotinus speak of his brief, terse, thought-oppressed, oracular style; and the few among the moderns who have had the patience and have taken the pains to wade through his tantalizing compositions must have often re-echoed the ancient censures. The sublimation of the recondite thought is rendered more evanescent by the dryness of the phraseology and the niggardliness of words. The difficulty of the compressed and indistinct utterance is made more difficult by the abundance of the nebulous thought. Yet through all the clouds of utterance and of contemplation gleams continually a more than earthly radiance, which lights up the darkness, and converts the dim, disjointed, spasmodic communications into exquisite revelations of supernal purity and beauty, and into wonderful graces, which are equally without art, in violation of art, and beyond art. The intense flame of passionate love illumines dialectical subtleties and scholastic formulas in the Letters of Eloise and Abelard; and the ethereal splendor of “the heavenly love,” which fills his whole intellectual being, frequently clothes with its own light the technical phrases, the visionary abstractions, and the jagged points of the diction of Plotinus. Knowledge with him is intuition: he sees the divine and the eternal by the influx and the communion of the divine: he is himself in turn apprehended, rather than understood, by an immediate contact between his own rapt spirit and the enkindled intelligence of his readers. He says that in the pure universe of the intelligible there are neither “discourse of reason” nor the voices of speech, but only immediate knowledge by sympathetic community of thought (οὑ δὲ δὴ φωναῖς οιμαι χρῆσθαι νομιστέον, ἐν μὲν τῷ νοητῷ οὔσας καὶ πάμπαν...γιγνώσκοιεν δ᾿ ¨ν καὶ τὰ παῤ ἀλλήλων ἐν συνέσει, Enn. 4, 3:18).

There is something of the same inspiration by contact and association which quickens and assimilates the eager intellect, and enables us to divine and appropriate rather than to understand the mystic communications of Plotinus. He seems himself to have been fully aware of the vagueness and unintelligibility of his compositions. They were bursts of sudden revelation, gushing out in hasty, spontaneous expression. The weakness of his sight, and the feverish impatience of his overteeming mind, prevented him from recasting what he had once committed to parchment. He, therefore, entrusted to Porphyry, a rhetorician trained in the school of Longinus, the onerous task of collecting, revising, and  coordinating his works. Porphyry undertook the office with reverence, and discharged it with affectionate fidelity. Plotinus had already produced and disseminated among his acolytes twenty-one books, when Porphyry came to Rome and attached himself to him: he added twenty-four during the six years that Porphyry attended his instructions, and he sent nine for revision to Porphyry, in his Sicilian retreat, during the last period of his life. It is probable that these books did not embrace all the philosophical lucubrations of the master, but that there were other treatises or essays in various stages of development, which were left behind, or were preserved as notes or memoranda in the hands of the disciples-like the college notes of the lectures of Niebuhr, Sir William Hamilton, and many others, which have been expanded and published to complete or to extend the lessons of the preceptors. Of such materials there are ample evidences in the surviving remains of Plotinus, the greater part of which appears as brief and undeveloped jottings, often as bare hints, while numerous passages have been elaborated with great care, and are expressed with adequate precision, fullness, and accesses of rugged grace. Porphyry collected fifty-four essays of various dimensions, which, in imitation of the Platonic Trilogies and Tetralogies, he arranged in six series of nine each, to which he gave the name of Enneads; being guided in their combination and disposition by the agreement or affinity of their topics, and in their succession by the ascending progress from human observation and experience, through the constituent principles of abstract nature, to ontology and theology. This is not the line of systematic exposition, nor is it, in its execution, the strict order of discovery. The whole body is irregular and confused; incomplete and often incoherent in its members; undeveloped and fragmentary in the exposition of the several parts. There are a few sufficiently thorough discussions: On Beauty (Enn. 1, 6); On Nature and the One (Enn. 3, 8); On Psychical Problems (Enn. 4. 3-5); On the Species of Existence (Enn. 4, 1- 3); and On Unity and Multiformity (Enn. 6, 4-5); to which may be added On the Essential Good (Enn. 6, 7 and 9). That there was a definite system in the mind of Plotinus may be readily admitted, for there is a general congruity of thought pervading the whole collection, and his characteristic principles were entertained from the first. This system might possibly be reproduced in its substantial integrity by a liberal employment of conjecture and logical evolution. Such a system may have been propounded by Plotinus in his oral course-though, from his remains and from the testimony of antiquity, we may safely conclude that even the instructions to the school were marked by the absence of method, consecution, perspicuity,  and proportion. The written expansions of his doctrine appear to have been determined by transitory contingencies-the doubts of his scholars, the cavils of opponents, the apparent urgency of particular questions, as in the papers Against the Gnostics (Enn. 2, 9). Yet even what was written in this disconnected manner was composed at various times, in diverse moods, and left in different degrees of completion.

None of the books can be regarded as a just, rounded, and complete essay. They are, for the most part, a collection of remarks upon discontinuous points, associated with a common subject of inquiry, thus resembling the Pensees, like those of Pascal, which were for a long time a favorite but imperfect form of enunciation with French thinkers. This, however, does not exhaust the impediments to any coherent and satisfactory ordination of the productions of Plotinus. There is no reason to suppose that all his written remains were in a condition to be made available. There is reason to believe that other materials besides those employed by Porphyry, either in his form of synoptical abridgments or of formal tractates, were in the hands of other disciples. In view of all the difficulties of his position, so far as they can now be ascertained and appreciated, there is a concert of opinion among scholars and critics that the procedure of Porphyry was judicious, and that no better plan of arrangement could have been adopted than the aggregation of the fragmentary materials in accordance with the loose bond of coherence supplied by similarity of subject, although this plan utterly disregards the chronological order of their production, and shuffles confusedly together the writings of very distinct periods. Less inconvenience would result from this disorder, if there had been entire constancy and consistency in the development of his speculation; but in his earlier career Plotinus was much influenced by the tenets of Nulmenius; in his maturer life he acquired greater independence of thought, but inclined most closely to the teachings and tendencies of Plato; and in his later years he gave evidence of diminished power of intellect. What could be done to correct or compensate for the confusion of the text was supplied by the Sentences of Porphyry, which gave an abstract of the doctrine, but these have come down to us only in a sadly mangled form.

In the arrangement of Porphyry, SEE NEO-PLATONISM, the logical order is disturbed, and in a great measure inverted. The last two Enneads are the most characteristic, and in some respects the most important for the estimation of the philosophy of Plotinus. The first Ennead is noted by Porphyry as pre-eminently ethical (being occupied with τὰ ἠθικώτερα, or  τὰς ἠθικωτέρας ὑποθέσεις). The recension of Porphyry was not the only promulgation of the lectures of Plotinus. Three other publications have been specified, and other copies of special parts of his philosophy may have been circulated. As soon as he commenced reducing his views to writing, demands for copies were made upon him by his followers, and these exemplars would naturally be multiplied and disseminated to some extent. We know that some of his productions were sent in his lifetime from Rome to Syria, to the rhetorician Longinus. These loose and flying sheets would soon be lost after the more complete body of his doctrine became accessible. This, however, is acknowledged to have existed in two forms-that issued with authority by Porphyry, and another presentation by Eustochius, a pupil who attended the deathbed of his teacher. These two versions are alone recognized by Creuzer, the accepted authority for all matters connected with the text and interpretation of Plotinus. These recensions did not agree either in the distribution of the matter or in all the details of doctrine. The Eustochian edition was still in existence in the Byzantine period, but has since perished, and has left the Porphyrian text as the sole representative of Plotinus. This exemplar is, however, believed by Creuzer to have received additions and alterations from the concurrent copy of the Eustochian rolls.

We would remark, before proceeding to the consideration of the peculiar philosophy of Plotinus, that neither he, nor the sect of which he was the expositor, contemplated the institution of a distinct, original type of speculation. The Neo-Platonists were the continuators of the Platonic Academy-drifted far, it may be, from the ancient shores. Their distinctive purpose was to conciliate Aristotle with Plato, and to harmonize with both the teachings of Pythagoras, and the asceticism which had flowed to Alexandria from Oriental sources. The energies of the teachers of the new and modified doctrine would thus be not equally expended over all parts of any complete system, but concentrated on the subjects of conciliation, the exposition of those leading principles which furnished the means of reconcilement, and their development in accordance with the scheme of agreement. Aspasius, Alexander, and Adrastus were read in the school and commented upon by Plotinus to the last, in company with Severus, Numenius, and other Platonists or Neo-Platonists.

Thus is given a further explanation of both the incompleteness of the Neo-Platonic doctrine in Plotinus, and also of the inevitable difficulty of affording a clear, compact, and methodical exposition of that doctrine.  Philosophy. — The definition of metaphysics by the schoolmen as the branch of knowledge treating of abstract being and its modifications (De Ente, Enztibus et Entium affectibus) is more applicable to the daring reveries of Plotinus than to any other scheme of speculation. For, whether we regard the term as having been originally invented by Theophrastus to designate inquiries outside of physics and subsequent to them, or beyond physics and transcending them, it is almost exclusively in this dim and unbounded region that the reflections and imaginations of Plotinus disport themselves. With the ordinary topics of English-speaking philosophy he scarcely concerns himself. He rises from the earth like the skylark, and rarely pours forth his song till he is lost from sight in the clouds, and commingles his notes with the mysterious voices of the upper air. The account given of his writings would preclude any expectation of a complete or detailed body of doctrine. His work was fragmentary and without order. Death seized the reaper in the midst of his harvest. His instruction must at all times have been broken and unsystematic, because it was merely the supplement and modification of opinions already current. He deals only with those sublimities of speculation-apices coyitabiles— which aid him in harmonizing the teachings of Plato, Aristotle, Parmenides, and Pythagoras, in developing their conclusions into a still higher range of thought, and in applying this development to the purification of the intellect and to the purgation of the heart. It is extremely difficult to breathe in this rarefied atmosphere. The pilgrim of the Alpine Club is oppressed and dizzied by the tenuity of the air on the heights of Mont Blanc or of Ararat; and the brain whirls in those extreme altitudes of speculation, where words become too hard and narrow for their contents, and language is only the symbolism of unutterable thoughts.

Whether, then, we consider the character of the investigations, the form in which they appear, their limitation to the highest and most insoluble problems, their incompleteness, or their discontinuity, it is a task of the greatest difficulty to present a clear, orderly, and coherent view of the philosophy of Plotinus. Within the space at command, all that can be attempted will be a rapid outline of his most distinctive positions, in what appears to be their natural dependence.

Creuzer condenses his summary of the Plotinian doctrine into three theses:

‘1. There is a Supreme One whence all things proceed, which cannot be fitly declared by the thought or name of Essence or Being, yet is the fountain and original of all essences, and therefore of being itself.

‘2. What is One in the ultimate apprehension becomes twofold in Mind (Νοῦς) and through Mind. For Mind, turning towards that Supreme One and regarding it, establishes difference, generates ideas, and produces the commencements of definite thought.

‘3. The Soul (of the world) being turned towards the Mind and regarding it, develops the diversity and multiplicity of things which are discoverable in the sensible universe. The universal aggregate of things sensible cannot, however, be conceived as unity, if the Supreme Mind be excluded, nor can it be thought of as One. Mind cannot form for itself the idea of the absolute One, without the original One and the Good; that is, without the author and father of Mind itself, and of all things; that is, without the Supreme” (Proleg. in Plotin. § 9, p. 24-25, ed. Paris).

These three propositions correspond in a loose and indistinct way with the three principles of the intelligible universe assumed by Plotinus: the Absolute Good, the Supreme Intelligence, and the Soul of the Universe. From these three all other intelligences descend by gradual differentiations. and all sensible things by distinct creation. These three constitute the Neo- Platonic trinity: the Good, which is the father of all, the Mind (Νοῦς) or absolute Reason (Λόγος), and the animating Spirit, or universal soul (Enn. 2, 9:1; 5, 1, 7; 2, 1; 8:12). The second and third of these principles, and all other things in their orderly subordination, which possess active potencies in themselves, derive their power of acting and their rule of action from the contemplation and imitation of the superior essences in which they participate, and which they apprehend by intuition of the Divine, ever indwelling, informing, and inworking (συμπαθὲς δὴ πᾶν τοῦτο τὸ ἕν, Enn. 4, 4, 32; νοῦς συνημμένος τῇ ἁπάσῃ οὐσίᾷ, 6, 4, 14; ἐσμὲν ἕκαστος κόσμος νοητός, 3, 4:3). High and chief over all intelligences, intelligibles, and sensibles is the absolute, eternal, unchanging, self- sustaining One (Enn. 6, 9:3). This is the Absolute Good, and is wholly ineffable, being dimly apprehensible only by the purest and highest efforts of the most depurated intuition (Enn. 2, 9:1; 6:8:8; 9:3, 4; ὑπὲρ ἐπιστήμην δεῖ δραμεῖν). The One and the Good (which are one) is before and above being, and before and above mind, or the intelligence  (ὑπερβεβηκὸς τὴν τοῦ νοῦ φύσιν...τὸ ἐπέκεινα νοῦ, καὶ ἐπέκεινα οὐσίας, Enn2. 5, 1, 8). That the One is above the Νοῦς is a fundamental doctrine with Plotinus, which he professes to deduce from Plato. This One and Good is the Father of all things, the universal God, existing in all, moving through all, and embracing all (ž ν πάντα τὰ ὄντα, Lann. 6, 5, 1; 5, 2, 1).

This doctrine unquestionably presents the appearance of Pantheism, and approximates to it, especially when taken in connection with the Scala Intellibilis Ascensus ad Unum, or progress towards the incommunicable union with the Universal Good. In Proclus it can scarcely be distinguished from Pantheism (ἐν ἑνὶ πάντα καὶ ἀμερῆ ἣνωται ἀλλήλοις· καὶ φοιτᾶ'/ πάντα διὰ πάντων, Inst. Theolog. § 186). In Plotinus it is different. He carefully preserves the distinction between the One and the Many, between the Supreme Good and all its immediate and derivative products. He does not ascribe personality to the Divine One except by metaphor; but he avoids attributing to the Divine Being either the evolution or the absorption of the universe, and he accords to man personality, freewill, and responsibility (Enn. 3, 4:5-7). He distinguishes between the agent in producing all things, and the all which is produced (Enn. 3, 8:8, 9). But there is confusion in his utterances, if not contradiction; though he may be credited with a more earnest anxiety to escape pantheistic extravagances than can be accorded to his Christian admirer, translator, and paraphrast, Marsilius Ficinus (q.v.). According to Plato, genuine knowledge is intuitive: according to Plotinus, it is immediate—the union of the knowing and the known; and the knowledge of the Godhead is only by direct communion (παρουσία, Enn. 6:9:47; 3, 6:18; 5, 5, 1; 3, 1-3; 6:2; 9:13). It is no wonder, then, that the meaning of Plotinus should be often obscure and ambiguous, and that it should be declared by Marsilius Ficinus to be discoverable, not by sense or human reason, but only by a more sublime capacity of intelligence (Plotini. Opera. Exhort. ad Auditores, etc.). This may afford some palliation for any indistinctness of the present exposition. It is due to a logical necessity rather than to a theological presumption that Plotinus asserts being to be posterior to the One, for he attaches being inseparably to the three hypostases of divinity which constitutes his three principles. It is an attempt to develop with entire internal consistency the Pythagorean doctrine of numbers, and the Platonic thesis of the One and the Many (Enn. 6, 6, 9). The Unum is Ens and Summa-um Esessential and primordial Being. There is no separation or  division between them, but only a theoretical and shadowy antecedence and sequence-out of time, irrespective of time, and beyond time.

The second principle of Plotinus is Mind-the intelligence per se—the Universal Reason (Νοῦς). The One, or the Good, projects a perpetual effulgence of itself, without loss of integrity or diminution of totality (περίλαμψις ἐξ αὐτοῦ) the image of its archetype (εἰκόνα ἐκείνου λέγομεν ειναι τὸν νοῦν). This yearns unceasingly for its original (ποθεῖ δὲ πᾶν τὸ γεννῆσαν τὸ γεννηθέν, καὶ τοῦτο ἀγαπᾶ'/, καὶ μάλιστα ὅταν ωσι μόνοι τὸ γεννῆσαν καὶ τὸ γεγεννημένον). The desire provokes an inclination or conversion of the offspring to its parent, of the similitude to its exemplar; and this reflection or bending back is itself' the Divine Mind, Intelligence, Universal Reason, whence all reason and thought are engendered (τῇ ἐπιστροφῇ πρὸς αὐτὸ ἑώρα· ἡ δὲ ὅρασις αὕτη νους, Enn. 5, 1, 6, 7). The Divine Mind embraces the eternal ideas which constitute the intelligible universe, and which it contemplates in the One. These are not types or shadows of things, but archetypes and perennial truths, whence all things sensible derive their essential constitution, and the broken and imperfect truth which they contain. It is a second cardinal tenet of Plotinus, in which he diverges from Plato, that ideas are immanent in the Divine Mind, and not extrinsic to it (Enn. 5, 1, 1, 2).

From Mind issues Soul-the universal spirit-the soul of the universe (ψυχὴν γεννᾶ'/ νοῦς). It dwells in the universal reason, as the universal reason dwells in the One (Enn. 5, 1, 7). The soul turns partly to the Divine Mind whence it proceeds, and contemplates the ideas presented there. It turns partly towards the sensible universe, which it fashions after the ideas. All souls are not contained in the universal soul-a doctrine espoused by Amelius, which amounts to Pantheism. There is a genuine plurality and hierarchy of souls, derived from the scull of the universe, not by separation or division, but by deliberate and intelligent production (Enn. 4:2, 2; 9:1). These three— the One, the Mind, the Soul-constitute the trinity of Plotinus. These three are one in essence, though distinct in function and in origin, and are all divine. From them, by the inaugurating potency of the first, by the presentations and concurrence of the second, and by the permanent creative energy of the third, all the order and beauty and variety and harmony of the universe are produced. But the universe is twofold: the intelligible, archetypal and eternal (ἀένναος ουσα φύσις, οὐ ῥέουσα); and that which is the image and adumbration of the archetype, the Sensible,  factitious and transitory (οὐγὰρ μένει, ἀλλὰ ῥεῖ ἡ σώματος φύσις πᾶσα, Enn. 4, 4:5; 7:8; comp. 5, 1, 6; 9:9). In the intelligible universe are only incorporeal ideas. It is the ideal world. In the sensible universe souls are incorporated in bodies, and distributed through them (Enn. 3, 4:1). The term souls is used by Plotinus with much greater latitude than would now be sanctioned, and is extended to irrational animals and plants, and even to the blind motions, chemical or physical, of organic and inorganic matter. The souls which actuate bodies descend from the realm of the intelligible, first to the sensible heavens, where they assume corporeal vesture, and thence proceed by successive declensions to lower and lower incorporations (Enn. 4:3, 15). Yet the soul in its separable state retains its immortal essence and divine character (θεῖον τὸ χρῆμα αὐτῆς καὶ θαυμαστόν, καὶ τῶν ὑπρὲ τὰ χρήματα φύσεων, Enn. 4:2, 1; 3, 22). This demission of souls is not necessarily a penalty or a retribution-not a banishment from God, as Empedocles said was his case; but it is the fulfilment of the object of creation, that all things might be perfect according to their perfectibilities, and that the sensible world might be the complete but inadequate reproduction of all things in the intelligible world (Enn. 4, 8:1).

These are the leading principles of the philosophy of Plotinus. They are extensions and sublimations of the tenets of Plato, to whom there is continually an implicit, and often an express reference (“Platonem ipsum sub Plotini persona loquentem,” Mars. Ficin. ad Audit.). In accordance with them, and with the endeavor to conciliate Platonism with Aristotelism and the elder schools, the several topics discussed in the Enneads are developed with such modifications and expansions of previous doctrine as were deemed requisite. Continual lacunae of course occur-both from the incompleteness of the remains and the absence of system in the procedure; but it is probable that most of these were designed to be supplied by reference to the body of the Platonic teachings. They may be certainly supplied in this manner, so far as is necessary to establish a general coherence between the several positions. With the execution of such a task we have no concern at present, our object being strictly limited to the exhibition of the distinctive characteristics of Plotinus.

The sensible world is occupied with body; and body is produced by the union of ideas with matter. The shadowy and attenuated nature of matter in the conception of Plato and the Platonists has already been exhibited. SEE PLATONIC PHILOSOPHY.

It is the ultimate subject or substratum from  which all bodies are formed: it is so entirely divested of all properties and accidents, which are the means of differentiation, it is such a pure residuum, or caput mortuno, that it is designated by Plotinus Bathos, the Depth-that which lies so low down in the constitution of body, so remote from apprehension, as to be accepted as its ultimate foundation. It is the lowest extreme, as the One is the highest. It is eminently characteristic of Plotinus that he recognizes matter in the intelligible universe (Enn. 2, 4, 1- 7; 6,7, 33), probably as one of the necessary primordial rerun. Body, which is the first and simplest product from matter, is an infinite, indeterminate something, having three dimensions, unlimited, not truly existent, and yet more than nothing. The One is of course indivisible: body is essentially divisible and mutable, being patient of endless alterations and alternations.

The sensible universe and its component members in all their multiplicity and variety are created by the Spirit, by the infusion of appropriate spirits, and the union of appropriate ideas with body, or a determinate portion of matter. The idea moulds its subject matter, differentiates it, individualizes (or individuates) it, animates it; dwelling and moving in it, or rather itself inhabited by its material partner. It is here that the conciliation of Plato and Aristotle is most thoroughly attained by Plotinus, the Platonic ideas being identified in their plastic function with the Aristotelian forms. These forms, or specific natures, descend by a regular concatenated series from the Universal Mind, which is the fountain of forms (Enn. 5, 9:3, 5, 8; 6:8:1). Everything, then, in the sensible world consists of the Corporeal and the ideal, in unutterable commixture— the union being transitory-the corporeal being subject to endless change, the ideal being immortal and unalterable in its essence. The perfection of everything consists in the completeness with which it appropriates and manifests the idea belonging to it, and thereby approximates in its own particular order of being to the One and the Good. Everything seeks its own perfection, everything turns to its own idea; and the original conversion of the first divine effluence, Mind, towards its fountain, the Good, is imitated throughout every grade in the descending scale of existence to the last and most rudimentary exhibitions of form. There is a dull, inert antagonism, a sullen insubordination in matter, which resists the process of this perfection: not a decided malignancy, such as is ascribed to it by Plato, but a resilience which generates physical evil, as moral evil is produced by defect of essential goodness, and by deflection and aberrancy from the good. The operation of spirit or mind upon matter,  of souls in their several degrees upon body, has been the stumbling-block of all philosophies, and was an insoluble enigma to Descartes and the Cartesians. Plotinus imagines a kind of pre-established harmony, like Leibnitz, but admits, also, a divine and concurrent grace (προαιρέσεις συνεργούς...ὁ δαίμων συνεργὸς εἰς πλήρωσιν αὐτῶν...τὰ συμπεσόντα τάδε πάντως ἀναγκαῖον τὴν ῎Ατροπον ἐπάγειν, Enn. 2, 3, 15; 4:3, 13; 4:3, 9). All this is only Platonism developed; but the development is pressed to originality when Plotinus retraces the process of being, and ascends from the lowest forms to the source of all form, the One, Great, Good, which is all in all.

All derivative being turns to the superior being whence it proceeds, and to the inferior being which proceeds from it, by a constant and loving libration that directs its attention both to the exemplar above and to the product of imitation below. Hence results the best of worlds possible (Enn. 2, 3, 18; 2, 9:8; 3, 2, 1-3), not pure from blemishes and blurs, in consequence of the inevitable contamination and peroration through conjunction with matter, and the limitations occasioned by material restraint, but ever involving the ideas proceeding from the divine intelligence, and ever seeking, with a multitudinous concord of aspirations, to attain the primordial perfection of the appropriate ideas, in the whole and in the parts; and thus to return to that communion and union with the One, the Good, and the true or real, from whence they have descended. The perfection of every nature, which every nature undepraved desires, is this assimilation to the divine. In aesthetics and in the works of art, this gives us the interpretation of beauty and of the beautiful; in life and conduct it explains and prescribes virtue and holiness and sanctification.

The essence of the doctrine of Plotinus is contained and charmingly displayed in his theory of beauty (Enn. 1, 6), and might be reproduced in its chief lines from it. A sagacious and just instinct has often led to the publication of this treatise by itself: for it is not only the most satisfactory and complete appreciation of the beautiful, it is also a miniature of the philosophy of Plotinus; and his theory of beauty is the counterpart and complement of his theory of righteousness (Enn. 3, 5, 1). Of course, only the briefest abstract of' this part of his speculations can be offered here. The simplest and most elementary form of beauty is the beauty of colors, sounds, forms; but the same principles are involved in every species of beauty. The sense of beauty arises from the joyous recognition in objects of sense of the perfections of the idea embodied in them (τὸ δὲ κάλλος  εὐμορφία τις ἐν τύποις, Enn. 4:7:8; 1, 6:1). It is an immediate and instinctive perception, which discerns in the excellence of the form (the Aristotelian form is nearly equivalent to idea, and signifies essential character, not outward shape), the presence, the perfection, and the participation of the divine reason and purpose in the creation; for the eternal is kindred with the beautiful (τὸ ἀϊvδιον συγγενὲς τῷ καλῷ, Enn. 5, 3, 1). The form, the idea, the design of God, revealed to the clear intelligence and quickened affection, constitutes beauty, both as producing cause and as produced emotion. Corporeal beauties, or things beautiful to sense, are only veils, shadows, spectral images of real beauty, and derive their power of communicating delight from the intellectual or transmundane beauty which they obscure even more than they display (Enn. 1, 6, 3,5). Intellectual beauty, or beauty in the intelligible world, is the pure effluence of God (Enn. 3, 8, 10; 5, 1); the perfect, beneficent plan of the good, accordant with the absolute excellence of the Divine Being (ἡ καλλονὴ ἐκεῖ νοητοῦ ἀγαθοῦ φύσις, Enn. 6, 7. 33). As the whole energies of the soul are directed towards the good for which it was constituted (Enn. 1, 7, 1; Procl. Inst. Theolog. § 209), its eager appetencies are instinctively excited by every manifestation of the good. The sense of beauty becomes both purified and intensified as the intelligent and sympathetic soul ascends nearer to the thought of the divine mind, and to the vision of the excellences and glories of the Divine (Enn. 1, 6:6). Thence all ideas proceed: thither all forms aspire; and “the power of beauty is the bloom of the universal beauty, which creates all beauty, generating it, and making it more beautiful from the redundancy of the beauty in the Divine, which is the beginning and the end of all beauty” (Enn. 6, 7, 32). The whole nature of beauty, therefore, consists in the immediate and loving apprehension of the goodness and wisdom and excellence of the Creator, as imperfectly shown in the incomplete perfections of parts of the creation. Whence is this faculty of recognition derived? It comes from the yearning of all spirit for the beautiful and the good and the divine. It is sustained, elevated, and illumined by the influx of the beautiful-by the epiphany in the soul of the splendors and loveliness of God. As the eye sees the sun by the light which proceeds from it, so the soul recognizes goodness by the goodness which God gives, and beauty by the apt sense and sensibility which are communicated from the source of all beauty-the beautiful in itself (φῶς ἄρα φῶς ὁρᾶ, οὑ δἰ ἄλλου, Enn. 5, 3, 6, et Mars. Ficin. ad loc. 5, 5, 7). Thus all things are suspended from the Divine, and are filled with  divinity (πάντα ἐξῆπται τῶν θεῶν. Μέστα παντα θεῶν, Procl. Inst. Theology § 145, 146).

This explanation may appear vague and visionary; but the philosophy of Plotinus can find no other mode of expression for its transcendental reveries. It is, however, no more indistinct than the language of more prosaic intellects in regard to the like subjects. It accords with the declarations of Avicenna and Averroes, of Duns Scotus and S. Thomas Aquinas, of Leibnitz and of Coleridge (Scot. In Sentent. 2, 11:1, tom. 6 Psalms 2, p. 652-5; S. Thom. Aquin. Summa. Theolog. 1, 89; 1, 3; 79, 4; 84, 5; Leibn. Princ. Philos. ad Pr. Eugen. § 42; Coleridge, Aids to Reflection, p. 242, 264, note).

Beauty thus connects itself immediately with the search after the first or supreme Good (Enn. 2, 9:8); and in its grades of ascension is a sure progress towards its apprehension. “Since all things are beautiful, and in some sort full of delight, all creatures of this sensible world lead the wise and contemplative mind to the Eternal God: they are the shadows, the echoes, and the pictures; the traces, the images, and the visions of that effectuating, exemplifying, and ordaining Artist” (S. Bonaventura, Itin. Mentis cad Deum, 100. 7; comp. Rog. Bacon, Opus Tertium, c. 64, p. 266).

“Ipse vocat nostros animos ad sidera mundus” (Manilii Astrionom. 4, 912).

Ugliness is defect of the idea and its inadequate realization. It corresponds to physical and moral evil, and indicates a falling away (πτῶμα τῆς ψυχῆς) from the goodness which was designed in the creation (Enn. 1, 6, 8, 9; 8, 14). The perfection of every nature is this re-assimilation to the divine. In the expressions of Plotinus with regard to human souls and man's duties there are frequent echoes of the contemporaneous Christianity which he opposed-exquisite utterances of religious fervor, in which Platonism seems to lose itself in the beauties of the new religion (Enn. 6, 9; 3, 2, 2, 5; 4, 6; 5, 1, 2; 3, 8, etc.). The highest aim of the spirit is access or reunion to God, which can be accomplished only through the constant intervention and co-operation of the Divinity (σπουδαῖος συνεργοῦντα ἑαυτῷ τὸν δαίμονα ἔχων, Enn. 4, 4, 6; comp. 1Th 2:13; Eph 2:18; Rom 8:11; Rom 8:16). For it is “God which worketh in you both to will and to do of his good pleasure” (Php 2:13). All things from the highest to the lowest turn by native constitution to the  more excellent nature whence they are derived, and the love within their soul seeks union with their original above. This universal conversion, permeating all things, binds the whole universe in an attitude of affectionate regard to the One and the Supreme Good, which is the Creator and the desire of all (Procl. 1omst. Theolog. § 57). In the lover of all righteousness, in man spiritualized and filled with the desire of holiness, it becomes ecstatic elevation and intimate communion with the Spirit of the Divine. “We are not cut off; or separated from God. We breathe the One, whose breath is our life, and we are preserved. This support is not given at one moment, and withdrawn at another, but is ever present for our guidance. Nay, more, we incline to the Good, and to the happiness above. There the soul is at rest and beyond ill, ascending to our true country, to the place which is pure of all evils. For the soul filled with God produces beauty and righteousness and virtue. God is its beginning and its end-its beginning, because it descends from him; its end, because he is the Good to which it aspires. There is the heavenly Love, and every soul is love. The soul, in its pure nature, is possessed with the love of God, and longs for union with him, as a virgin nurses the love of the beautiful for the beautiful. Thus the life of good and godly and happy men is a transport from the things of earth— a life uncharmed by things below -the flight of the single and solitary soul to the only One” (Enn. 6, 9, 9, 11).

For such sublimities of enthusiasm no language will suffice but the rapt Greek of Plotinus or the fervid Latin of Marsilius Ficinus, and even these faint and fail beneath the divine burden of the thought.
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## Ploucquet, Gottfried[[@Headword:Ploucquet, Gottfried]]

             a German philosopher, was born Aug. 25, 1716, at Stuttgard. He came from a Protestant family of French origin; his father was an innkeeper. While he was studying at Tübingen, he was so strongly impressed by Wolf's writings that, without giving up theology altogether, he gave special attention to the study of philosophy and mathematics. This twofold tendency strikingly appears in the theses which he defended in 1740 (Diss. qua Cl. Varignonii demonstratio geometrica possibilitatis transubstantionis enervatur), and in which he endeavored to reconcile Wolf's doctrines with the teachings of the Christian faith. After discharging in different places the duties of a minister and tutor, he was appointed in 1746 deacon at Freudenstadt. His memoir on the monads (Primaria Monadologic capita [Berlin, 1748, 4to]) opened to him in 1749 the Academy of Sciences of Berlin and directed to him the attention of the duke of Würtemberg, by whose protection he obtained, in 1750, the professorship of logic and metaphysics at Tübingen. He taught political economy at the same university, and was, in 1778, called to Stuttgard to teach this branch at the military school. His faculties having given way in consequence of a stroke of apoplexy, in 1782 he was compelled to abandon teaching. Ploucquet was an honest and open character, and he was gifted by nature with a clear and methodical mind. ‘“A champion of spiritualism,” says Mr. Haag, “he combated, with a degree of penetration equaled only by his erudition, the materialistic doctrines proclaimed by the philosophers of the 18th century, and feared not even to enter into contest with Kant. Then, ascending the stream of the centuries, he submitted to strict analysis the systems of ancient philosophy, which he tried to build anew in historical essays, worthy even now of our attention.” Ploucquet died at Stuttgard Sept. 13, 1790. He left a number of works, mostly published at Tübingen, and written with great purity, but rather exaggerated concision. The following are the most important: De miaterialismo (1750, 4to): — Principia de substantiis et phenomenis (Frankfort, 1758, 8vo): — De Pyrrholni epocha (1758, 4to): — Fundlamenta philosophite speculativce (7th ed. 1759, 8vo); it is an exposition of Leibnitz's system: — De dogmatibus Thaletis et Anaxagorae (1763, 4to): — Methodus calculandi in logicis (1763, 8vo). In this work he represents the syllogisms by geometrical figures and mathematical formulas; these methods, hinted at by Leibnitz, engaged him in discussions with Lambert and others: — Problemata de natura hominis ante et post  mortern (1766, 4to): — Institutiones philosophice theoreticma (1772, 1782, 8vo): — Elementa philosophiae contemplativae, sive de scientia ratiocinandi (Stuttgard, 1773, 4to): — Commentationes philosophiae selectiores (Utrecht, 1781, 4to): — Varice questiones metatphysic (1782, 4to). — Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Géneralé, 40, 494.

## Plough[[@Headword:Plough]]

(charash', חָרִשׁ, toplough; whence machareshah', מִחֲרֵשָׁה, and nacharesheth, מִחֲרֶשֶׁת, 1Sa 13:20; two instruments used in agriculture. One of these is perhaps the ploughshare, the other the coulter. SEE EAR ). Egypt, from the earliest times, has laid claim to the honor of the invention of this important implement, and as it was undoubtedly one of the first countries brought under culture by the hand of man after the flood, the claim may be well founded. Agriculture was also early practiced among the Hebrews, and, from their agreement in so many other matters, it is likely that the implements of the two nations were very nearly the same. The ancient Egyptian plough was entirely of wood, and of very simple form, like that still used in Egypt. It consisted of a share, two handles, and the pole or beam, which last was inserted into the lower end of the stilt, or the base of the handles, and was strengthened by a rope connecting it with the heel. It had no coulter, nor were wheels applied ‘to any Egyptian plough; but it is probable that the point was shod with a metal sock either of bronze or iron. It was drawn by two oxen, and the ploughman guided and drove them with a long goad, without the assistance of reins, which are used by the modern Egyptians. He was sometimes accompanied by another man, who drove the animals, while he managed the two handles of the plough; and sometimes the whip was substituted for the more usual goad. The mode of yoking the beasts was exceedingly simple. Across the extremity of the pole a wooden yoke or cross-bar, about fifty-five inches or five feet in length, was fastened by a strap, lashed backwards and forwards over a prominence projecting from the center of the yoke, which corresponded to a similar peg or knob at the end of the pole; and occasionally, in addition to these, was a ring passing over them, as in some Greek chariots. At either end of the yoke was a flat or slightly concave  projection, of semicircular form, which rested on a pad placed upon the withers of the animal; and through a hole on either side of it passed a thong for suspending the shoulder-pieces, which formed the collar. These were two wooden bars, forked at about half their length, padded so as to protect the shoulder from friction, and connected at the lower end by a strong broad band passing under the throat. SEE YOKE.

Sometimes the draught, instead of being from the shoulder, was from the head, the yoke being tied to the base of the horns; and in religious ceremonies oxen frequently drew the bier, or the sacred shrine, by a rope fastened to the upper part of the horns, without either yoke or pole (Wilkinson, Anc. Egypt. 2, 14 sq.). According to modern travelers the plough now used in Palestine differs in some respects from the ancient implement above described. It is lightly built with the least possible skill or expense, consisting of two poles, which cross each other near the ground. That nearest the oxen is fastened to the yoke, while the other serves, the one end as the handle, the other as the ploughshare. It is drawn by oxen, camels, cows, or heifers (Hackett, Script. Illust. p. 153 sq.; Thomson, Lanuad and Book, 1, 207 sq.). In Asia Minor substantially the same custom and implements prevail (Van Lennep, Bible Lands, p. 75 sq.). SEE AGRICULTURE.

## Plough-Monday[[@Headword:Plough-Monday]]

             the first Monday after twelfth day; so called from a diversion called fiol- plough, which was formerly in use on Ash-Wednesday, but afterwards transferred to this day. Old ploughs are preserved in the belfries of Bassingbourne and Barrington. Plough alms were one penny paid for every plough harnessed between Easter and Pentecost in 878, and in 960 payable on the fifteenth night after Easter.

## Ploughman[[@Headword:Ploughman]]

             (אַכָּר, ikkdr, Isa 61:5, which signifies not only a ploughman, but a husbandman in general). Among the Hebrews, the rich and the noble, it is true, in the cultivation of the soil did not always put themselves on a level with their servants; but none, however rich or noble or prophetically favored, disdained to put their hand to the plough, or otherwise to join occasionally in the labors of agriculture (1Sa 11:7; 1Ki 19:19; comp. 2Ch 26:10). SEE AGRICULTURE.

## Ploughmans Complaint, the[[@Headword:Ploughmans Complaint, the]]

             a remarkable anonymous work, published in England in the year 1352, which severely condemned the practices of popery, especially auricular confession, the celibacy and selfishness of the priests, the rapacity of the friars, the covetousness and negligence of the popes, etc. It was one among many means which opened the eyes of the people to the iniquity of the system, and prepared the way for the glorious Reformation.

## Ploughshare[[@Headword:Ploughshare]]

             (אֵת, eth, Isa 2:4). The ploughshare is a piece of iron, broad but not large, which tips the end of the shaft. So much does it resemble the short sword used by the ancient warriors that it may with very little trouble be converted into that deadly weapon, and when the work of destruction is over, reduced again into its former shape, and applied to the purposes of agriculture. In allusion to the first operation the prophet Joel summons the nations to leave their peaceful employments in the cultivated field, and buckle on their armor: “Beat your ploughshares into swords, and your pruning-hooks into spears” (Joe 3:10). This image the prophet Isaiah has reversed, and then applied to the establishment of that profound and lasting peace which is to bless the Church of Christ in the latter days: “And  they shall beat their swords into ploughshares, and their spears into pruning-hooks; nation shall not lift up sword against nation, neither shall they learn war any more.” SEE PLOUGH.

## Plowden, Charles[[@Headword:Plowden, Charles]]

             an English Roman Catholic divine who belonged to the Order of Jesuits, was born in 1743, and educated at Rome, where he entered into the society in 1759. On his return to his own country, after the suppression of his order in 1773, he was one of the most zealous advocates for the proposed reorganization of the Jesuits in England. He afterwards became president of the Catholic college of Stonyhurst, in Lancashire, and died in 1821. His publications are against Butler and Berington and for the restoration of the Jesuits (1792, 8vo; 1796, 8vo). Also, Remarks on the Memoirs of G. Panzani (Liege, 1794, 8vo): — Considerations of the Modern Opinions of the Fallibility of the Pope (1776, 8vo).

An older brother of his, Dr. FRANCIS PLOWDEN, a noted member of the English Chancery Bar, is the author of Jura Anglorum, the Rights of Englishmen (1792, 8vo), and Church and State (1795, 4to), which both plead for Roman Catholic recognition by the English government, and became the subject of much controversy. See Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors, 2, 1609, 1610. (J.H.W.)

## Plum, Friedric[[@Headword:Plum, Friedric]]

             a Danish Lutheran theologian, who died at Odensee, January 18, 1833, doctor of theology and bishop of Funen, is the author of, Efteredninger om den udenlandske nyere theologiske og pastorale Litteratur, etc. (Copenhagen, 1818 sq.): — Observationes in Textum et Versiones Maxime Graecas Obadiae et Habacuci (1796). See Winer, Handbuch der theol. Lit. 1:12, 224; Furst, Bibl. Jud. 3:107. (B.P.)

## Plumb, Elijah Whitox, D.D[[@Headword:Plumb, Elijah Whitox, D.D]]

             a Congregational minister, was born at Halifax, Vermont, July 28. 1798. He attended, Hopkins Academy at Hadley, Massachusetts; spent one year in Harvard College; graduated from Middlebury College in 1824; taught school the next two years in Brattleboro, Vermontt; from 1826 to 1828 was similarly employed in Hampton, N.H.; studied theology with Daniel Dana, D.D., of Newburyport; was ordained pastor, May 18, 1831, at Pawlet, Vermontt., and dismissed October 29, 1845; from 1846 to 1851 was pastor of the Presbyterian Church in Potsdam, N.Y.; in 1853 became principal of St. Lawrence Academy; and from 1864 to 1867 was acting pastor in Sterling, Illinois. The two succeeding years he resided at Potsdam without charge, and then removed to East Bloomfield, which was his residence until his death, July 12, 1879. See Cong. Year-book, 1879, page 26.

## Plumb-line[[@Headword:Plumb-line]]

             (אֲנָךְ, ansk, a plummet) or Plummet (מַשְׁקֵלֶת, mishkileth, Isa 28:17, or מַשְׁקֹלֶת, mishkoleth. ma weight). Amos says (Amo 7:7), “Behold, the Lord stood upon a wall, made by a plumb-line, with a plumb-line in his hand;” and in the threatenings denounced against Jerusalem for the idolatries of Manasseh, we read, “I will stretch over Jerusalem the line of  Samaria, and the plummet of the house of Ahab” (2Ki 21:13). In Zec 4:10, the original term for the plumb-bob is אֶבֶן בְּדַיל, eben bedil, stone of tin. The use of the plumb line in the measurement of superficial areas was early known to the Egyptians, and is ascribed to their king Menes. SEE HANDICRAFT.

## Plumer, William Swan, D.D., LL.D[[@Headword:Plumer, William Swan, D.D., LL.D]]

             a Presbyterian minister, was born at Greenssburg (now Darlington), Beaver County, Pennsylvania, July 26, 1802. He graduated from Washington College, Va., in 1825, and from Princeton Theological Seminary in 1827;  having been licensed to preach in 1826, he soon after organized a Presbyterian Church at Danville, subsequently another at Warrenton, N.C., and preached at Raleigh, Washington, and Newbern, in the same state. In 1834 he became a pastor in Richmond, Virginia, and in 1837 founded the Watchman of the South, a weekly religious journal, which he edited for eight years. The same year removed as pastor to Baltimore, Maryland. In 1854 he became professor of didactic and pastoral theology in the Western Theological Seminary at Allegheny City, Pennsylvania; in 1866 was called to the chair of theology in the Theological Seminary at Columbia, S.C., Where he remained until it was closed in 1880. He died at the Union Protestant Infirmary, Baltimore, Maryland, October 22 of the same year. Dr. Plumer was the author of many excellent works, among which are, Argument Against the Indiscriminate Incorporation of Churches and Religious Societies (1847, 8vo): — The Bible True, and Infidelity Wicked (New York, 18mo): — Plum, Thoughts for Children (Philadelphia, 18mo): — Short Sermons to Little Children (18mo): — Thoughts Worth Remembering (New York, 8vo): — The Saint and the Sinner (Philadelphia, 18mo): — The Grace of Christ (1853, 12mo): — Rome Against the Bible and the Bible Against Rome (1854, 18mo): — Christ our Theme and Glory (1855, 8vo): — The Church and her Enemies (Philadelphia, 1856, 18mo): — The Law of God as Contained in the Ten Commandments (ibid. 1864, 12mo): — Vital Godliness (New York, 1865, 12mo): — Jehovah Jireh ( Philadelphia, 1866, 12mo): — Studies in the Book of Psalms (1866): — The Rock of our Salvation (New York, 1867, 12mo): — The Words of Truth and Love (Philadelphia, 1868, 18mo): also commentaries on the epistles to the Romans and Hebrews, works of great merit: besides Memoirs and Select Remains of William Nevins, D.D. (1836, 12mo): and an abridgment of Stevenson on the Offices of Christ (Philadelphia, 1837, 16mo).He wrote more than fifty religious tracts, issued by six religious societies, several single sermons, and contributed largely to various religious journals and papers. See Necrol. Report of Princeton Theol. Sem. 1881, page 20; Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors, s.v.

## Plumptre, Edward Hayes, D.D[[@Headword:Plumptre, Edward Hayes, D.D]]

             a clergyman of the Church of England, was born in London, August 6, 1821. Graduating from University College, Oxford, in 1844, he became  fellow of Brasenose College 1844-47. In 1851-58 he was assistant preacher at Lincoln's Inn, and select preacher at Oxford, 1851-53, 1864- 66, 1872-73. He was also chaplain of King's College, London, 1847-68, and professor of pastoral theology there, 1853-63, and dean of Queen's College, London, 1855-75; prebendary of Portpool, in St. Paul's Cathedral, 1863-81, and professor of exegesis in King's College, London, at the same time. In 1869-73 he was rector of Pluckley, Kent. He was Grinfield lecturer on the Septuagint at Oxford in 1872-74, and vicar of Bickley, Kent, in 1873-81; principal of Queen's College, London, 1875-77. In 1881 he. was installed as Dean of Wells. He died in January 1891. He was the Boyle lecturer for 1866-67, and a member of the Old Testament Committee of Revision. He was the author of several Commentaries: — Introduction to the New 'Testament: — Life and Letters of Thomas Kerr: — and other volumes.

## Plumptre, James[[@Headword:Plumptre, James]]

             an Anglican divine of note was born in 1770, and was educated at Clare Hall, Cambridge, of which he afterwards became a fellow. After taking holy orders, he became in 1793 vicar of Great Gransdon, Huntingdonshire. He died in 1832. He is best known as a miscellaneous writer. Among his publications (of which there is a list in Allibone) we notice, Three Discourses on the Animal Creation (1816, 8vo): Popular Commentary on the Bible: — Sermons, vol. 1 and 2 (1821,1827, 8vo), which are pronounced practical and useful by Bickersteth (in his Christian Student).

## Plunket, Oliver[[@Headword:Plunket, Oliver]]

             an Irish Roman Catholic prelate, was born in 1629 at the castle of Rathmore, county of Meath, of a good Irish family. He completed his studies at Rome, was a professor of theology in that city, and finally elevated to the twofold dignity of archbishop of Armagh and primate of Ireland (1669). His zeal having aroused against him the suspicions of the Protestants, he fell a victim to the violent reaction of Toryism which took place in 1681. Accused of conspiracy against the court, he was arrested, carried to London, and sentenced to death by a fanatical jury. In vain four successive governors of Ireland testified to his loyalty; the court did not even await the arrival of his witnesses, and his means of defense could be produced in London only three days after his execution, which took place July 1, 1681, at Tyburn. He left a Collection of Episcopal Circulars and Pastoral Letters (Lond. 1686, 2 vols. 4to). See Bp. Burnet, Hist. of his Own Times, 2, 279. (J. H.W.)

## Plunket, Thomas Lord, D.D[[@Headword:Plunket, Thomas Lord, D.D]]

             a bishop of the Church of Ireland, was born in 1799, being the eldest son of William Conyngham Plunket, the Irish chancellor, distinguished as a lawyer, an orator, and a statesman, and whom he succeeded as second baron in 1854. Dr. Plunket was appointed dean of Down in 1831, and  promoted to the bishopric of Tuam in 1839. He became ecclesiastical commissioner in 1851, and died at Tourmakready, County Mayo, October 19, 1866, being at the time patron of ninety-five livings in his united diocese of Tuam, Killala, and Achonry. He was an indefatigable laborer in the missionary department of his work, especially in Collnaught. See Amer. Quar. Church Rev. January , page 655.

## Plunket, Thomas Span[[@Headword:Plunket, Thomas Span]]

             an Irish lord and prelate, was a son of William Conyngham Plunket, the great Irish chancellor, and was born in 1792. He was educated at Trinity College, Dublin, and, after having held various preferments, was appointed dean of Down in 1831, and eight years later was raised to the bishopric of Tuam. He was consecrated at Christ Church, Dublin, by the archbishop of Dublin, assisted by the bishops of Derry and Cashel; was appointed ecclesiastical commissioner in 1851, succeeded his father as second baron Plunket in 1853, and was patron of ninety-five livings in his united dioceses of Tuam. Killala, and Achonry. According to Charles's Church Directory, the gross value of the see is £5265, and the net value £4039. He did not confine his attention and care to the members of the Church of England in his diocese, but he threw himself into the missionary work among the Roman Catholics with remarkable zeal and energy. No opposition (and he had much to encounter) could daunt or obstacles deter him, and to his exertions are due, in no small degree, those tangible and indisputable results, in the shape of new churches, schools, and congregations of converts, which remain a memorial of his piety and zeal. He died at Tourenakeady, Galway, Oct. 19, 1866. See Appleton's Annual Cyclop. 6, 600, Ch. Journal, vol. 11; Men of the Times, s.v. (J. H. W.)

## Plunket, Thomas, D.D[[@Headword:Plunket, Thomas, D.D]]

             a noted Presbyterian Irish divine, flourished at Enniskillen in the second half of the 18th century. Having some scruples as to the received doctrine of the Trinity, he removed to Dublin, where he became minister of the Strand Street chapel. He died about 1780. His son was the noted Irish lord  William Conyngham Plunket, and his grandson bishop Thomas Span Plunket.

## Pluquet, Francois Andre Adrien[[@Headword:Pluquet, Francois Andre Adrien]]

             an ecclesiastical writer of France, was born at Baveux in 1716. He was professor of philosophy at the Collegee e France, canon of Cambray, anid died at Paris in 1790. He published, Examen du Fatalisme (Paris, 1757, 2 volumes): — Dictionaire des Heresies des de us rreurs et des Schismes (1762, 2 vols.): — Essai Philosophique et Politique sur le Luxe (1786): — De la Superstition et de l'Enthusiasme (published after his death, 1804). See Lichtenberger, Encyclop. des Sciences Religieuses, s.v. (B.P.)

## Pluralism[[@Headword:Pluralism]]

             SEE PLURALITIES.

## Pluralist[[@Headword:Pluralist]]

             is one that holds more than one ecclesiastical benefice with cure of souls. SEE PLURALITIES.

## Pluralities[[@Headword:Pluralities]]

             is a term used in canon law for the possession by one person of two or more ecclesiastical offices, whether of dignity or emolument. This practice, it is held by Non-Episcopalians, was generally forbidden in the early Church, and they quote for their authority the instructions of the apostle Paul (Tit 1:5). Others contend even that, instead of a plurality of churches to one pastor, we ought to have a plurality of pastors to one  church (Act 14:23). Episcopalians contend there is no impropriety in a presbyter holding more than one ecclesiastical benefice. A bishop could not hold two dioceses; a presbyter, however, might officiate in more than one parochial church, but not in two dioceses. In the Church of England pluralities originated in the poorness of many of the livings. Originally a clergyman might hold two or more livings if under the nominal value of £8. The distance between them was fixed by the canon law as not to be greater than thirty miles, but custom now tolerates forty-five. Two thousand parishes, it is said, want in this way a resident pastor. By those who thus evade the Canon, it is held that the prohibition is not absolute, and admits of possible exception, the natural ground of the prohibition being the impossibility, in ordinary cases, of the same individual adequately discharging the duties of more than one office, and that therefore, in cases in which this impossibility does not exist, the union of two or more offices in the hands of one person might, speaking absolutely. be permitted without infringing the divine law. Hence canonists distinguish between “compatible” and “incompatible” benefices or dignities.

Two benefices may be incompatible in three ways: 1, If each requires residence (ratione residentice); 2, if the duties of both fall to be discharged at one and the same time (ratione servitii); 3, if the revenue of either fully suffices for the becoming maintenance of the incumbent (ratione sentationis). In other cases, benefices or dignities are considered compatible, and with the due dispensation may be held by the same person. The rules by which dispensations from the law of residence are to be regulated, as well as the penalties for its violation, whether on the part of the patron or on that of the recipient, have formed the subject of frequent legislation, as in the third and the fourth councils of the Lateran, in the decretals of Innocent III and many other popes, and especially in those of the Council of Trent. In general, it may be said that the canon law regards as incompatible, 1, two benefices, each having the cure of souls; 2, two “dignities;” 3, a “dignity” and a cure of souls; 4, a cure of souls and a simple benefice requiring residence. In other cases than these, the pope is held to have the power of dispensing. There is no department of discipline, however, in which the tendency to relaxation has been greater or more persistent; and one of the gravest of the abuses of the Church was the prevalence of pluralism of incompatible benefices, even of bishoprics; and although a constant effort was made to prevent this abuse, the evasions of the law were not only frequent, but even screened from punishment. By 13 and 14 Victoria, c. 98, it is provided that no incumbent of a benefice shall take and hold  together with it another benefice, unless the churches are within three miles of one another by the nearest road, and the annual value of one of them does not exceed £100. Nor can two benefices be held together if the population of one exceeds 3000, and that of the other exceeds 500. The word benefice, in this sense, includes any perpetual curacy, endowed public chapel, parochial chapelry, or district chapelry. But a dispensation or license can be obtained from the archbishop, so as to allow two benefices to be held together; and if the archbishop refuse his license, the party may appeal to the Privy Council. A special provision is also contained in the statute whereby the head ruler of any college or hall in the universities of Oxford or Cambridge, or warden of Durham University, is prohibited from taking any cathedral preferment, or any other benefice. If any spiritual person holding a benefice shall accept another benefice contrary to the statute, the first benefice shall ipso facto become void. At the same time provision is made by statutes for uniting benefices where the aggregate population does not exceed 1500, and the aggregate yearly value does not exceed £500. In Ireland, no faculty or dispensation can be granted to any spiritual person to hold two or more benefices. In Scotland, before the Reformation, pluralities were also common. Abbacies and priories were likewise often bestowed in commendam. SEE COMMENDAM.

Of the twenty abbots that sat in the Parliament which decreed the Reformation, fourteen were commendators. Thus speaks the Second Book of Discipline: “Meikle less is it lawful that only person among these men sould have fyve, sax, ten, or twenty kirks, or mae, all having the charge of salles: and bruik the patrimonie thairof, either be admission of the prince or of the kirk, in this licht of the evangell; for it is but mockage to crave reformation where sic lyke hes place.” The question of pluralities in the Church of Scotland was raised in 1779, renewed in 1813, and the General Assembly decided against them in 1814 by an act which, however, was repealed in 1816. In 1817 it was enacted that no professor could hold a parish unless it was near the seat of the university. The question was again raised and keenly debated in 1824 to wit, the holding of a chair in a college and of a parochial charge at the same time. The university commission soon after disapproved of the practice, but not the General Assembly of that period. The tenure of many benefices by one person was finally abolished in the Church of England by I and II Victoria, c. 106. In the Roman Catholic Church this practice has been forbidden from a very early period in its history, as by the councils of Chalcedon (A.D. 451) and that of Nice (A.D. 787), and is still prohibited both by the Roman Catholic canon law and by  statute law in the Established Church of England. But the prohibition is evaded in various ways: and in all established churches pluralism, in one form or another, is not uncommon. See Hammond, Canons of the Church, p. 105 sq.

## Plurality of Worlds[[@Headword:Plurality of Worlds]]

             SEE WORLDS, PLURALITY OF.

## Pluschke, Johann G[[@Headword:Pluschke, Johann G]]

             an eminent German Oriental scholar, was born Aug. 20, 1780, at Rohnstock, near Schweidnitz, in Silesia. He studied theology and philology, and for a number of years held the professorship of philology at Leipsic. In 1818 he was called as doctor and professor ordinarius of theology to Amsterdam, to take the presidency of the Lutheran seminary at Amsterdam, and died between 1837 and 1840. Pliischke wrote, De radicum linunae Hebraicae natura, comm. grammatica (Leips. 1817): — De Psalterii Syriaci Alediolanensis a Caujeftno Bugato editi peculiari indole ejusdemque usu critico in emendando textu Psalterii Grceci sept. interpretum (Bonn, 1835): — Lectiones Alexandrince et Hebraicce, sive de emendando textu Veteris Testanenti Greci LXX interpretum et inde llebraico (ibid. 1837): — De emendando Pentateucho Graeco LXX interpretum et inde lebraico addito codd. Holmesianorum recensione et textus Graeci denuo castigati specimine (ibid. 1837). See Fürst. Bibl. Jud. 3, 107; Steinschneider, Bibliogr. Handb. p. 111; Winer, Handb. der theolog. Lit. p. 57, 121, 711; Thiersch, De Pentateuchi versione Alexandrina, p. 23; Zuchold, Bibl. Theologica, 2, 1001 sq. (B. P.)

## Plutarch[[@Headword:Plutarch]]

             an eminent Greek philosopher, noted also as a biographical and miscellaneous writer, deserves a place here for the moral tendency of all his writings, and the vast influence he has exerted in modern as well as ancient times. Indeed, all that we know of him, which is principally gleaned from his own and others' writings, places him in a high rank as measured by the ethics of society in his time, and sets forth the morality of certain portions of that society itself during the first century of our era, and among so- called heathens, in a light of no doubtful brilliancy. Many things he wrote might have been written by the most ardent disciple of the new creed, and much of his belief was more strictly in accordance with the teachings of the apostles than are the dogmas of other writers of those days who call themselves Christians. Yet, in taking his works as our guide, we find that Plutarch had no knowledge of the great innovation amid which he lived,  and which was disturbing the West and the East alike; or if he had a knowledge of it, he regarded it merely as a passing piece of Judaic sectarianism unworthy of his notice.

Life. — Plutarch, who lived from the reign of Claudius to that of Hadrian, was born at Chaeronea, a small city of Boeotia in Greece, which had also been the birthplace of Pindar. Plutarch's family was ancient in Chaeronea: his grandfather, Lamprias, was a man eminent for his learning and as a philosopher, and is often mentioned by Plutarch in his writings, as is also his own father. The time of Plutarch's birth is not known. He was early initiated in study, to which he was naturally inclined, and was placed under Ammonius, an Egyptian, who, having taught philosophy with reputation at Alexandria, thence traveled into Greece, and settled at Athens. Under this master he made great advances in knowledge; and like a thorough philosopher, more apt to regard things than words, he pursued this knowledge to the neglect of languages.

The Latin language, at that time, was not only the language of Rome, but of Greece also. Yet he became not conversant with it until the decline of life; and though he is supposed to have resided in Rome at different times, yet he never seems to have acquired a competent skill in it at all. He is reputed to have visited Egypt, which was at that time, as formerly it had been, famous for learning; and probably the mysteriousness of their doctrine might tempt him, as it had tempted Pythagoras and others, to go and converse with the priesthood of that country. On his return to Greece he visited the various academies and schools of the philosophers, and gathered from them many of those observations with which he has abundantly enriched posterity. He does not seem to have been attached to any particular sect, but culled from each of them whatever he thought excellent and worthy to be regarded. He could not bear the paradoxes of the Stoics, and yet was more averse to the impiety of the Epicureans; in many things he followed Aristotle; but his favorites were Socrates and Plato, whose memory he reverenced so highly that he annually celebrated their birthdays with much solemnity.

Besides this, he applied himself with extreme diligence to collect, not only all books that were excellent in their kind, but also all the sayings and observations of wise men, which he had heard in conversation, or had received from others by tradition; and likewise to consult the records and public instruments preserved in cities which he had visited in his travels. He took a particular journey to Sparta, to search the archives of that famous commonwealth, to understand thoroughly the model of their ancient  government, the history of their legislators, their kings, and their ephori; and digested all their memorable deeds and sayings with so much care that he has not omitted even those of their women. He took the same methods with regard to many other commonwealths; and thus was enabled to leave us in his works such a rich cabinet of observations upon men and manners, as, in the opinion of some, Montaigne and Bayle in particular, have rendered him the most valuable author of antiquity. It appears from his writings that. Plutarch visited Rome more than once, and that he delivered lectures on philosophy in his vernacular, then the language of the cultured Romans. It is probable that the substance of these lectures was afterwards embodied in his moral writings. The latter part of his life was spent in honor and comfort in his native city, where he passed through various magisterial offices, and enjoyed the honors and emoluments of the priesthood. The time and circumstances of his death are unknown.

Works. — The great work of Plutarch is his Parallel Lives (Βίοι Παράλληλοι), which contains the biography of forty-six distinguished Greeks and Romans, besides the lives of Artaxerxes Mnemon, Aratus, Galba, Otho, and Homer, which last is probably not by him. The forty-six lives are arranged in pairs or sets, each of which contains a Greek and a Roman, and the two lives in each pair are followed by a comparison of the characters of the two persons. These lives are: Theseus and Romulus, Lycurgus and Numa, Solon and Valerius Publicola, Themistocles and Camillus, Pericles and Fabius Maximus. Alcibiades and Coriolanus, Timoleon and AEmilius Paulus, Pelopidas and Marcellus, Aristides and Cato Major, Philopoemen and Flaminius, Pyrrhus and Marius, Lysander and Sulla, Cimon and Lucullus, Nicias and Crassus, Eumenes and Sertorius, Agesilaus and Pompey, Alexander the Great and Julius Caesar, Phocion and Cato Minor. Agis and Cleomenes and the two Gracchi, Demosthenes and Cicero, Demetrius Poliorcetes and M. Antonius, Dion and M. Brutus. The biographies of Epaminondas, Scipio, Augustus, Tiberius, Caligula, Claudius, Nero, Vitellius, Hesiod, Pindar, Crates the Cynic, Diophantus, Aristomenes, and the poet Aratus are lost. Plutarch's son, Lamprias, made a list of his father's works, which is partly preserved and printed by Fabricius (Bibliotheca Graeca).

In the department of biography, Plutarch is the only writer of antiquity who has established a lasting reputation. The plan of his biographies is briefly explained by himself in the introduction to the “Life of Alexander the Great,” where he makes an apology for the brevity with which he is  compelled to treat of the numerous events in the lives of Alexander and Caesar. “For,” he says, “I do not write histories, but lives; nor do the most conspicuous acts of necessity exhibit a man's virtue or his vice, but oftentimes some slight circumstance, a word or a jest, shows a man's character better than battles, with the slaughter of tens of thousands, and the greatest arrays of armies and sieges of cities. Now, as painters produce a likeness by a representation of the countenance and the expression of the eyes, without troubling themselves about the other parts of the body, so I must be allowed to look rather into the signs of a man's character, and thus give a portrait of his life, leaving others to describe great events and battles.” The object then of Plutarch in his biographies was a moral end, and the exhibition of the principal events of a man's life was subordinate to this his main design; and though he may not always have adhered to the principle which he laid down, it cannot be denied that his view of what biography should be is much more exact than that of most persons who have attempted this style of composition. The life of a statesman or of a general, when written with the view of giving a complete history of all the public events in which he was engaged, is not biography, but history. This extract from Plutarch will also in some measure be an apology for the want of historical order observable in many of the lives. Though altogether deficient in that critical sagacity which discerns truth from falsehood, and disentangles the intricacies of confused and conflicting statements, Plutarch has preserved in his Lives a vast number of facts which would otherwise have been unknown to us. lie was a great reader, and must have had access to large libraries. It is said that he quotes two hundred and fifty writers, a great part of whose works are now entirely lost. On the sources of Plutarch's Lives the reader may consult an essay by A. H. L. Heeren, De Fontibus et Auctoritate Vitarum Parallelarum Plutarchi Commenfationes IV (Gott. 1820,8vo).

Besides the Lives a considerable number of Plutarch's essays may be styled historical. They may all be read with pleasure, and some of them with instruction, not so much for their historical value as for the detached curious facts that are scattered so profusely through Plutarch's writings, and for the picture which they exhibit of the author's own mind. In one of these essays, entitled On the Malignity of Herodotus, he has, unfortunately for his own reputation, attacked the veracity and integrity of the father of history, and with the same success that subsequent writers, more ignorant and less honest, have made their puny attacks on a work the merit of which the closest criticism may enhance but can never depreciate. The Lives (f the Ten Orators, which are attributed to Plutarch,  are of little value, and may not be his; still they bear internal evidence, at least negatively, of not being of a later age than that of Plutarch. The Lives of Plutarch first appeared in a Latin version by several hands, at Rome, in 2 vols. fol., about 1470. This Latin version formed the basis of various Spanish and Italian translations. The first Greek edition was printed by Philip Giunta (Florence, 1517, fol.). Among more recent editions are those of Bryan (Lond. 1729, 5 vols. 4to), in Greek and Latin, which was completed by Moses du Soul, after Bryan's death; that of Coray (Par. 18091815, 6 vols. 8vo); and that by Schafer (Leips. 1826, 6 vols. 8vo). The translations are very numerous. The best German translation is said to be by Kaltwasser (Magdeburg, 1799-1806, 10 vols. 8vo). Another German translation appeared at Vienna in 1812. The best Italian translation is by Pompei. The French translation of Amyot, which appeared in 1559, has considerable merit, and has been often reprinted. The English translation of Sir Thomas North (Lond. 1612), which is avowedly made from that of Amyot, is often very happy in point of expression, and is deservedly much esteemed. The Lives were also translated into French by Dacier (Par. 1721, 8 vols. 4to). The translation sometimes called Dryden's, the first volume of which was published in 1683, was executed by a great number of persons. According to a note by Malone (Dryden's Prose Works, 2, 331), there were forty-one of them. Dryden himself translated nothing, but he wrote the dedication to the duke of Ormond, and the Life of Plutarch which is prefixed to the translation. The translation by John and William Langhorne, an insipid and tasteless version, has the merit of being tolerably correct in rendering the meaning of the original. The last and best English translation is that of professor Long, which however only includes the lives of those Romans who were concerned in the Civil Wars of Rome; this translation, which is enriched with a valuable body of notes, formed five volumes of Knight's “Monthly Volumes” (1844-1847).

The other writings of Plutarch, which consist of about sixty essays, are generally comprehended under the title of his Moralia, or Ethical Works, many of them being entirely of an ethical character. ‘he minor historical pieces already referred to, of which that on the malignity of Herodotus is one, are usually comprised in the collection entitled Moralia. Plutarch was fond of the writings of Plato; he was strongly opposed to the Epicureans: if he belonged to any philosophical sect, it was that of the Academics. But there is nothing like a system of philosophy in his writings, and he is not characterized by depth of thought or originality. He formed for himself a  system, it we may so name that which had little of the connected character of a system, out of the writings of various philosophers. But a moral end is always a parent in his Motralia, as well as in his biographies. A kind, humane disposition, and a love of everything that is ennobling and excellent pervade his writings, and give the reader the same kind of pleasure that lie has in the company of an esteemed friend, whose singleness of heart appears in everything that he says or does. Plutarch rightly appreciated the importance of education, and he gives many good precepts for the bringing up of children. His philosophy was practical, and in many of its applications, as for instance his “Letter of Consolation to Apollonius,” and his “Marriage Precepts,” he is as felicitous in expression as he is sound in his precepts. Notwithstanding all the deductions that the most fastidious critic may make from Plutarch's moral writings, it cannot be denied that there is something in them which always pleases, and the more so the better we become acquainted with them; and this is no small merit in a writer.

With regard to the purely ethical writings of Plutarch, archdean Trench says that they indicate a better state of society than is generally attributed to his age. Plutarch does not speak as one crying in the wilderness, but as to a circle of sympathetic hearers who will answer to his appeals. It may be supposed that his native kindliness of heart would prevent him from taking the full measure of the sin with which he was surrounded. No doubt he was deficient in the fierce indignation which consumed the heart of Tacitus and put a lash into the hands of Juvenal. But it is certain from many passages in his writings that he took no rose- colored view of life. Several of his statements almost amount to the confession of original sin. Plutarch's style bears no resemblance to the simplicity of the Attic writers. It has not the air of being much elaborated, and apparently his sentences flowed easily from him. He is nearly always animated and pleasing, and the epithet pictorial may be justly applied to him. . Sometimes his sentences are long and ill-constructed, and the order of the words appears not the best that could be chosen to express his meaning; certainly it is not the order in which the best Greek writers of an earlier age would have arranged their thoughts. Sometimes he is obscure, both from this cause and the kind of illustration in which he abounds. He occasionally uses and perhaps affects poetic words, but they are such as give energy to his thoughts and expression to his language. Altogether he is read with pleasure in the original by those who are familiar with him, but he is somewhat harsh and crabbed to a stranger. It is his merit, in the age in which he lived, treating of such subjects as biography and morals, not to  have fallen into a merely rhetorical style, to have balanced antitheses, and to have contented himself with the inanity of commonplaces. Whatever he says is manly and invigorating in thought, and clear and forcible in expression.

The first Greek edition of the Moralia, which is exceedingly incorrect, was printed by the elder Aldus, with the following title, Plutetrchi Opuscula. 82, Gr. (Ven. 1509, fol.). It was afterwards printed at Basle by Froben (1542, fol., and 1574, fol.). The only good edition of the Moralia is that printed at Oxford, and edited by D. Wyttenbach, who labored on it twenty- four years. This edition consists of six volumes of text (1795-1800), and two volumes of notes (1810-1821), 4to. There is a print of it which is generally bound in 5 vols. 8vo, with two volumes of notes. The notes by Wyttenbach were printed at Leipsic in 1821, in two vols. 8vo. The first edition of all the works of Plutarch is by H. Stephens (Geneva, 1572, 13 vols. 8vo), which is said to be correctly printed. This edition was reprinted several times. A complete edition, Greek and Latin, appeared at Leipsic (1774-1785, 12 vols. 8vo), with the name of J. J. Reiske, but Reiske did very little to it, for he died in 1774. An edition by J. C. Hutten appeared at Tübingen (1791-1805, 14 vols. 8vo). A good critical edition of all the works of Plutarch is still wanted. See Meth. Qu. Rev. July1851, art. 6; 1852, p. 383; Christian Rev. vol. 10 and 11; Catholic World, Sept. 1870; Neander, Christian Dogmas; Pressense, Religions before Christ, p. 183 sq.; Donaldson, Literature (see Index); Cudworth, Intellectual Development of the Universe (see Index in vol. 3); Lardner, Works; Schaff, Hist. of the Apostolic Church, p. 140, 152; Lond. Qu. Rev. Oct. 1861; Trench, Plutarch, His Life, His Lives, and His Morals (Lond. 1873, 12mo); Smith, Dict. of Class. Biog. s.v.

## Pluto[[@Headword:Pluto]]

             (Πλούτων, Rich), originally only a surname of Hades, as the giver or possessor of riches, is, in the mythology of Greece, the third son of Kronos and Rhea, and the brother of Zeus and Poseidon. On the tripartite division of the universe, he obtained the sovereignty of the under-world-the realm of darkness and ghostly shades, where he sits enthroned as a “subterranean Zeus”—to use the expression of Homer, and rules the spirits of the dead. His dwelling-place, however, is not far from the surface of the earth. Pluto is inexorable in disposition, not to be moved either by prayers or flatteries. He is borne on a car, drawn by four black steeds, whom he guides with  golden reins. His helmet makes him invisible, whence, according to some scholars, his name of Hades; although others, with at least equal probability, translate the word the “all-receiver.” In Homer, Hades never means a place, but always a person. Moreover, it is to be noticed that the poet does not, divide the realm of the shades into two separate regions. All the souls of the dead— good and bad alike mingle together. Subsequently, however, when the ethical conception of future retribution became more widely developed, the kingdom of the dead was divided into Elysium (q.v.), the abode of the good, and Tartarus (q.v.), the place of the wicked. This change also exercised an important influence on the conception of Pluto. The ruler of the under-world not only acquired additional power and majesty, but the very idea of his character was essentially modified. He was now regarded as a beneficent deity, who held the keys of the earth in his hand, and possessed its metallic treasures (whence his new name Pluto or Plutus), and who blessed the year with fruits, for out of the darkness underground come all the riches and swelling fullness of the soil. Hence, in later times, mortals prayed to him before proceeding to dig for the wealth hidden in the bowels of the earth.

Pluto married Persephone (Proserpina), the daughter of Demeter (Ceres), after carrying her off from the plains of Enna. He assisted his brothers— according to the mythological story— in their war against the Titans, and received from the Cyclops, as a reward for delivering them from Tartarus, the helmet that makes him invisible, which he lent to Hermes (Mercury) in the aforesaid war, to Perseus in his combat with the Gorgons, and which ultimately came to Meriones. The Erinyes and Charon obey his behests. He sits in judgment on every open and secret act, and is assisted by three subordinate judges, Eacus, Minos, and Rhadamanthus. The worship of Pluto was widely spread both among the Greeks and Romans. Temples were erected to his honor at Athens, Elis, and Olympia. Among trees and flowers, the cypress, boxwood, narcissus, and maidenhair were sacred to him; bulls and goats were also sacrificed to him amid the shadows of night, and his priests had their brows garlanded with cypress wreaths. In works of art he resembles his brothers Zeus and Poseidon; only his hair hangs down somewhat wildly and fiercely over his brow, and his appearance, though majestic, as becomes so mighty a god, has something gloomy and terrible about it. There can be little doubt that he, as well as Pan (q.v.), helped to trick out the conception of the devil prevalent during the Middle Ages, and not yet extinct. If it was from Pan that the devil derived those physical  characteristics alluded to in the famous “Address to the Devil” by the poet Burns:

  “O thou, whatever title suit thee, Auld Hornie, Satan, Nick, or Clootie,”

it is no less certain that it is to Pluto that he owes his position as “king of Hell,” “his Blackness,” and many of the insignia of his infernal royalty.

## Plymouth Brethren or Darbyites[[@Headword:Plymouth Brethren or Darbyites]]

             is the name of a religious body which originated almost simultaneously at Plymouth, England, and Dublin, Ireland, about the year 1830. They are most generally called after the name of the place where they first started in England, but sometimes they are called after their principal founder, John Darby, at the time a clergyman of the Episcopal Church of Ireland. He himself gave to his adherents the name of Separatists, because they left the Establishment and determined to maintain a separate existence as a Church.

Early History. — John Darby was born in England of a wealthy family, studied jurisprudence and became a lawyer, but, brought into the Church, he was strongly impressed with a call to the ministry, and, though opposed by his father, he took holy orders. Disinherited by the parent for disobedience, Darby found a friend and patron in his uncle, from whom he obtained at his decease quite an ample fortune. After ordination, Darby became gradually impressed with the idea that there was no ground for the doctrine of apostolical succession, and that any person feeling called to preach should exercise that liberty. He therefore denounced the claim of the Establishment as unwarranted, and finally broke with the Episcopalians. He, however, still held that there was a true Church, and that all who thought as he did should band themselves together and wait until Christ made his personal appearance, which they anticipated would be speedily. There were a few who united themselves together on the strength of these views, in Plymouth, England, and at Dublin, Ireland. At the former place they seemed to meet with most success. There their numbers increased to seven hundred and up to fifteen hundred; and so marked was their success that they came to be called “Plymouth Brethren.” (They have never taken this name themselves, but they do not seem to object to it.) The work increased, and bands were formed in London, Exeter, and several other places. Among those who united with them were many persons of wealth, who contributed considerable sums of money to spread their views. They  established a newspaper, known as the Christian Witness, Mr. Darby being its chief contributor. It was not long before they were violently opposed by the English clergy.

This opposition was so well directed and so ably conducted that the spread of the new faith was not only seriously checked, but their numbers were greatly reduced. In 1838, or near that time, Mr. Darby left England. He first visited Paris, where he remained for a time, and then went to Switzerland, where he found a more inviting field. The Wesleyan Methodists had commenced successful operations in Lausanne. Quite a number had withdrawn from the State Church and united with them. This excited the general attention of the people. Among the new proselytes to Methodism were many who still held the doctrine of predestination, and refused to accept the Wesleyan doctrine of Christian perfection. Those who held the doctrine of predestination were charged by those who had fully discarded it as having received but half the truth. At Vevay similar excitement prevailed. In this state of things, for the purpose of overthrowing the new faith, an influential member of the State Church at Lausanne invited Mr. Darby to come there and fight the Methodists. He went, and by his preaching, and the publication of a book entitled The Doctrine of the Wesleyans regarding Perfection, and their Use of the Holy Scriptures, he succeeded in so far bewildering them that not long after the greater part of them abandoned their faith, and either returned to the State Church or united with the Dissenters. Mr. Darby, besides, gave a series of lectures on the prophecies, entitled “Views regarding the actual Expectation of the Church, and the Prophecies which establish it.” They were largely attended by others than Dissenters, and produced a deep impression upon the public mind. They were published in book form, first in French, and subsequently translated into German and English, and may be found in Mr. Darby's published works.

In the estimation at least of the author they lifted the veil which had long, if not from the beginning, covered the prophecies. Such was Mr. Darby's influence among the people that the regular ministry was almost entirely ignored, and he became the accepted prophet. In fact, his publications had the effect directly to turn the people from the minister as a whole. It was his custom to administer the sacrament every Sabbath indiscriminately to Churchmen and Dissenters, which practice earned for him the reputation of being a large-hearted Christian, and anxious to make the Church one. But really his object was to alienate the people until he could get them under his personal control for organization, he himself being the center of the organization, as is but too clearly apparent from the fly-sheets or tracts which he published. One of  these, entitled Apostasy of the Actual Economy, lays the axe at the root of the tree of the Christian Church, leaving it a shapeless wreck. Another, On the Foundation of the Church, attacks all Dissenters, and denies their right to form any new Church. And still another, Liberty to preach Jesus possessed by every Christian, denies the existence of any priestly office in the Church, except the universal priesthood of believers. A tract entitled The Promise of the Lord, based on Mat 18:20, gave the shibboleth for the Darbyite gatherings. Another tract, entitled Schism, was issued, in which all who hesitated to take part in these gatherings were denominated “schismatics.” Thus the work of demolition went on. A small seminary was established in which to prepare men for the evangelistic work-that is, to spread their views and make disciples to them, and the result has been a widespread sect, with little or no organic unity.

Later History. — A division took place among the “Brethren,” under the leadership of B. W. Newton. It commenced in England and extended to the Continent. Mr. Newton, it is claimed, held with Irving that Christ was not sinless. This notion was repelled by most of the Darbyites, and Newton was subsequently expelled by Mr. Darby. (It might be interesting to inquire how Mr. Darby could consistently expel a man from his society when he ignores all organizations? If there be no organization, what is there to be expelled from?) ‘The Newton heresy extended to Vevay, where there was much trouble, the ‘Brethren” splitting into two factions, which was followed soon after by many other societies. Another division took place among them, in which the famous George Muller, of Bristol, England, was the most prominent. Other divisions have occurred, but they are of very little importance. The ‘‘Brethren” are more or less numerous in Paris. Lausanne, Holland, Italy, and Belgium, on the Continent; in Plymouth, Exeter, and London, in England; a very few are in the United States, but more in Canada. They are an earnest, self-sacrificing people.

Doctrines, etc. — The “Brethren” profess to have no creed but the Bible, and condemn all who avow a creed, as putting human opinions in the place of the Word of God; and yet we seriously doubt if there is a Church in the land which has a more clearly defined creed than they have. They denounce all commentaries on the Bible as misleading, and yet Mr. Darby himself has written commentaries quite extensively on the Bible, to say nothing of M'Intosh. In faith they seem to be strongly Antinomian. If once justified, it is their belief that the soul not only can never fall from grace finally, but can never fall into condemnation. ‘The soul's standing remains as pure as  Christ himself. In other respects they hold substantially the great and leading doctrines of the Gospel; but as they have no written creed or confession, it is exceedingly difficult to find out exactly what they do hold. Each one is in every respect allowed to hold what he pleases, consistently with continued practical evidence that he is a real Christian, which includes a belief in the leading doctrines of evangelical Christians. No one pretends in anything to judge for another, or make his convictions obligatory any further than he can, by more perfectly instructing the other, induce him to accept them.

Their views of what are called worship are also peculiar. This consists, they say, not in preaching or praying— petitioning-though these exercises may lead to worship, but simply in adoration, praise, and thanksgiving to God for what he is in himself, and what he is for those who render it. Hence worship can only be rendered by true Christians, in the breaking of bread and in the praise and thanksgiving which they render. Their services, therefore, for believers and for unconverted people are entirely distinct. They hold the obligation of the Church to come together the first day of the week to break bread; hence they observe the Lord's Supper every Sabbath morning, and believers alone are expected to come together then. They never preach in the morning, but usually simply exhort, two, or at the most three of them, speaking during the service. In the afternoon or evening of the Sabbath they preach to sinners.

The Plymouth Brethren are the opposite extreme to Irvingism and Mormonism, and yet resemble these in several respects. They, too, are a protest against the present state of the Church, Protestant as well as Catholic, which they denounce as Babel, and expect the speedy coming of the Lord. But while the Irvingites and Mormons lay claim to an apostolical hierarchy, the “Brethren,” like the Quakers, reject the specific ministry, and all written creeds and outward Church organization. They derive the disunion of the Church from the neglect to recognize the Holy Spirit as Christ's vicar on earth, and the all-sufficient interpreter of the Holy Scriptures. All human creeds, they say, involve a vital denial of this sufficiency of the Spirit, and practically restrict his operations. All believers are true spiritual priests, capacitated for worship (Heb 10:19; Heb 10:25), and all those who possess the qualifications from the Lord are not only authorized but obliged to evangelize the world and build up the Church, without ally ordination of men. This they consider to be the true apostolic mode of worship, according to 1 Corinthians 12, 14. But, unlike the Quakers, they retain the ordinance of baptism, and administer the Lord's Supper every week. As a body, they hold to adult believers' baptism only; but if one comes to  them who was baptized in infancy, while they receive him, they generally manage to convince him very soon of the importance of being rebaptized. As to the remainder of their creed, they seem to agree most with the Calvinistic system, and are said to be zealous in good works. See Guinness, Who are the Plymouth Brethren? (Phila. 1861); Dennett, Plymouth Brethren, their Rise, etc.; Biit. Qu. Oct. 1873, art. 3; Presbyt. Qu. Jan. 1872, p. 48; Marsden, Dict. of Churches, p. 91; Jahrb. deutscher Theologie, 1870, vol. 4; Dr. Steele, in the Advocate of Christian Holiness, 1876; Brit. and For. Ev. Rev. July1865, art. 2; Lond. Qu. Rev. No. 53, 1869, art. 3. (J. H. W.)

## Pl?che Noel-Antoine[[@Headword:Pl?che Noel-Antoine]]

             a French scientist of note, was born in 1688. He flourished at one time as abbot of Valence de St. Maur. He was also a professor of rhetoric at Rheims, and is distinguished as a naturalist and man of letters, and also for his opposition to the bull “Unigenitus.” He is the author of Spectacle de la Nature (9 vols.): — Hist. du Ciel (2 vols.): — La Mecanique des Langues; and some lesser works. among which is a Harmony of the Psalms and the Gospels (12mo). He died in 1761.

## Pneumatology[[@Headword:Pneumatology]]

             (from πνεῦμα, spirit, and λόγος, word) is the doctrine of spiritual existence. Considered as the science of mind or spirit, pneumatology consists of three parts: treating of the divine mind, theology; the angelic mind, angelology; and the human mind. This last is now called psychology, “a term to which no competent objection can be made, and which affords us, what the various clumsy periphrases in use do not, a convenient adjective, psychological” (Sir W. Hamilton, Reid's Works, p. 219, note). The belief in a return from the dead, apparitions, and spirits is largely incorporated in the traditions of the Jews, and prevailed almost universally in the scholastic ages. The mystic Jacob Bohme and Emanuel Swedenborg made it a popular phase of belief in Northern Europe, and Martinez Pasqualis and his disciple St. Martin caused it to prevail among the people of France and in Southern Europe. All these teachers have given accounts of the orders of spiritual beings who held communication with the living. In our own day spiritualism has branched out so extensively that it will be treated separately under that heading.

## Pneumatomachi[[@Headword:Pneumatomachi]]

             i.e. adversaries of the Holy Spirit, is a name properly applied to all those who entertain heretical opinions as to the Scripture doctrine of the Holy Ghost, e.g. the Sabellians (q.v.). The name originated after the subsidence of the Arian controversy, and was applied to that party, distinguished by the denial of the catholic faith regarding the Third Person of the Holy Trinity; some denying his divinity, others his personality also. The name is, however, more specially used to designate tie Macedonians, so called after Macedonius, who, after the death of Eusebius of Nicomedia, was called by  the Arian faction to the see of Constantinople, in opposition to the catholic bishop Paul. This led to bloody strife, inasmuch as a majority of the citizens were for Paul. The Arians got the better of their catholic adversaries with the help of the emperor Constantine, who took the part of Macedonits, and established him in the disputed see by force of arms: three thousand persons perished on that occasion. Macedonius, although called to the bishopric of Constantinople by strict Arians, seems not to have been very much of an Arian himself, but persecuted the Catholics after the fashion of other Semi-Arian bishops, and became, with Basilius of Ancyra, one of the chiefs of the Semi-Arians.

As a natural consequence of the rest of their doctrine, the Arians declared the Holy Ghost, who was little spoken of explicitly at the beginning of the Arian difficulties, to be a mere creature, and most of them held him to be an inferior creature to the Son. Not only the strict Arians, but also the Semi-Arians, who called the Son “God” and ὁμοιούσιος, questioned the divinity of the Holy Ghost. Macedonius made himself the leader of this increasing and strengthening pneumatomatical party, teaching emphatically that the Holy Ghost was a creature subservient to the Father and Son, and wholly different in nature from them (comp. Socrats, Hist. Eccles. 2, 46; Sozomen, 4:27; Theodoret. Hist. Ecclesiastes 2, 6; Taret. Fab. 5, 11; Epiphanius, Haer. 73 and 74). Ive then invented the artifice of the “Homoion,” and connecting himself closely with the Semi- Arian party, gave them his name (Theodoret, licer. Fab. 4, 5). At first therefore the term Macedonian was simply equivalent to Semi-Arian, and Socrates calls the reply of Liberius to the Serni-Arian legates a letter to the bishops of the Macedonians (Socrates, Hist. Ecc 4:12). The name of Macedonius appears in this reply. The good faith of this transaction is (to say the least) very doubtful (see the notes on the chapter of Socrates in Variorum Annotationes in Reading's edition of Valesius). and we are in uncertainty as to the opinions which Macedonius really held at the close of his life. But there is no uncertainty as to the course of the heresy. The letters of Liberius were exhibited at the Council of Tyana, and the deputies who presented them were acknowledged as members of the catholic body. This was probably in A.D. 368. But just as among the Arians there never was any unity of views as to the Son, there was none among the Pneumatomachi and Macedonians as to the Holy Ghost. Some contented themselves with holding the divinity of the Holy Ghost dubious, others denied it outright; some called him a creature, but most seem to have fallen in with the ideas of Macedonius. Among the most active partisans of this heresy were Marathonius and Eleusius, whom Macedonius called  respectively to the sees of Cyzicum and Nicomedia. The influence of Marathonius is shown by the fact that the Macedonians are sometimes called Marathonians. Macedonius was deposed by the strict Arians at the Synod of Constantinople in 360: he spent the remainder of his life obscurely in the vicinity of Constantinople. The exact (late of Macedonius's death is not known, but it appears to have been soon after the Council of Tarsus (see Tillemont, Hist. vol. 9).

The appearance of the Pneumatomachi, as such, is to be dated from A.D. 360, when Athanasius wrote against them, giving them the name here adopted. Athanasius was then in the deserts of Egypt, and Serapion, bishop of Thmuis, in Lower Egypt, requested his interposition. The heresies themselves were no novelties. It was a part of the Arian creed that the Holy Spirit was a created being, superior it might be in dignity, but nowise different in nature from the angels; and in the Gnostic systems we meet with Christ and the Holy Ghost as eons, SEE VALENTINIANS, the latter being held, in some cases at least, to be not a distinct person, but a divine energy diffused through the universe. But there was a great difference in the mode in which these heresies were held. They then appeared, not as proceeding from a special opposition to the greatness of the Holy Spirit, but as deductions from some other leading heresy to which they were subordinate. Thus in the case of the Arians, with which our present subject is concerned, the denial of the divinity of the Holy Spirit follows upon the denial of the divinity of the Son. For as it is impossible to advance the Third Person of the Trinity above the Second Person, the controversy turned therefore on the divinity of the Second. Dealing with this, the Council of Nicea did not touch specifically upon the subordinate heresy, but left it to stand or fall with the leading one. But when the leading heresy was abandoned, and yet the subordinate heresy retained, then the latter not only became prominent, but was seen to be adopted on its own independent grounds, for its own sake. The Arian half converted to catholicity was properly a Pneumatomachist. Such were those whom Athanasius dealt with in his letter to Serapion. They were seceders from the Arians who had embraced the true faith regarding the Son, but retained their error regarding the Holy Spirit. They were consequently opposed both by Catholics and Arians, but their true controversy was with the former: their contest with the latter (Athanasius urges) could only be pretended, inasmuch as both agreed in opposing the doctrine of the Trinity (Ad Serap. 1, 1, 2, 9, 32). This class, then, differed from the later  Macedonian class: it held Homoousian doctrine regarding the Son, whereas the Macedonians were Homoiousians. Athanasius calls them also Tropici, from their figurative interpretations of Scripture; but this is rather an epithet than a proper name.

In comparison with the Macedonian party, this earlier party can have been but small. It was, however, reinforced a few years later, as we shall show, upon the return of a large portion of the Semi-Arian body to catholicity. The adoption of the truth concerning the Son leads almost necessarily to the adoption of the truth concerning the Holy Spirit. The arguments of Athanasius (Ad Serap. 1, 29; 4:7) show forcibly how untenable a position is that which maintains a duality instead of a trinity. The original Monarchian tenet from which the Arians started is much more easily admissible.

The Pneumatomachi of the Macedonian school were the Semi-Arians left behind in schism when, in the year 366, the majority of the sect gave in their assent to orthodoxy, and were received into the Church. Before this time Macedonius, as we have seen above, had joined the Semi-Arian party, but proving thereby unacceptable to the Arians, was deposed by the Council of Constantinople, A.D. 360 (Theodoret, Hist. Ecclesiastes 2, 6). A council was appointed to meet in Tarsus to effect a reconciliation, but just before the meeting thirty-four Asiatic bishops assembled in Caria refused the Homoousion; and Valens, at the instigation of the Arian Eudoxius, by whom he had been recently baptized, forbade the council (Sozomen, Hist. Ecc 6:12). From this time, however, Semi-Arianism disappears from ecclesiastical history. The controversy regarding Christ's divinity ceased, and the denial of the divinity of the Holy Spirit became the distinguishing tenet of the Semi-Arian party, the tenet thus becoming associated with the name Macedonian, which the Semi-Arians had recently acquired. Of course there were some, as we have already had occasion to state, who called them Marathonians, saying that Marathonins, bishop of Nicomedia, had introduced the term Homoiousion (Socrates, Hist. Eccles. 2, 45).

It is to be noticed here that several writers, when treating of the present heresy, use the word Semi-Arian in another sense than that now given it. Philaster (Haer. c. 67) defines the Semi-Arians thus: “Hi de Patre et Filio bene sentiunt, unam qualitatis substantiam, unam divinitatem esse credentes, Spiritum autem non de divina substantia, nec deum verum, sed  factum atque creatum Spiritum praedicantes.” Augustine also (Haer. c. 3): “Macedoniani de Patre et Filio recte sentiunt, quod unius sint ejusdemque substantiae vel essentie, sed de Spiritu Sancto hoc nolunt credere, creaturam eum esse dicentes. Hos potius quidam SemiArianos vocant, quod in hac quaestione ex parte cum illis sint, ex parte nobiscum.” his use of the term Semi-Arian is now to be avoided, the distinctive mark of that party being the Homoiousion. But these two authorities show that the original Pneumatomachi, against whom Athanasius wrote, must have been largely reinforced from those who joined the Church under Liberius. This appears also from Epiphanius, who states that the Pneumatomachi proceeded partly from the Semi-Arians and partly from the orthodox. In the preceding article he had defined the Semi-Arians by the Homoiousion; and the “orthodox,” it cannot be doubted, were not the old Nicenes, but those who from the Arians had come over to the Homoiousion, and had been accepted by Liberius as orthodox. Thus of the Pneumatomachi some were orthodox regarding the divinity of the Son, and some retained the Homoiousion, and these latter are properly Macedonians, being SemiArians.

All these started with the tenet of the sect from which they sprung, namely, that the Holy Spirit is a created being, of the same order as the created angels (Theodoret and Epiphanius, 1. c.). The authorities of Philaster and Augustine are sufficient to show that this was retained by the majority of the party. But another opinion arose early. It proceeded-Eustathius of Sebastia being an example (Socrates, Hist. Eccles. 2, 45) — from a reluctance to call the Holy Spirit a creature. But as they who felt this reluctance would not consent to call him God, it followed necessarily that they were obliged to deny his personality. Still they assigned to the impersonal Spirit that which is assigned to the personal Spirit by Roman Catholics, as being the Vinculum (see Augustine, De Fide et Symbolo, § 19; Bull, Def. Fid. Nic. 2, 3, 13) of the persons of the Godhead. This is noted by Augustine (Hceres. c. 3): “Quamvis a nonnullis perhibeantur non Deum, sed Deitatem Patris et Filii dicere Spiritum Sanctum, et nullam propriam habere substantiam.”

What Catholics regard as God the Holy Ghost working in the world they regarded as a divine energy diffused through the world. Mosheim represents this, it appears upon insufficient grounds, to be the tenet of the Macedonians in general (Walch, Gesch. der Ketzereien, 3, 98).  The heresy of the Pneumatomachi was condemned, first, in a synod at Alexandria, A.D. 362, held by Athanasius on his return (Athanasius, Synod. Epist. ad Antioch. The epistle states that Arians, on their reception into the Church, are to anathematize those who say that the Holy Spirit is a created being and divided from the substance of Christ. A true renunciation of Arian doctrine is to abstain from dividing the Holy Trinity, from saying that one of the Persons is a created being). The Pneumatomachi were condemned secondly in a synod in Illyricum, A.D. 367 (Epist. Synod. ad Orient.; Hardouin, Concil. 1, 794; Sozomen, Hist. Eccles. 6:22); thirdly, in a synod at Rome, A.D. 367 (Damasi, Epist. ap. Theodoret. Hist. Ecclesiastes 5, 11, Vales. note); and, lastly, at the great Oriental council held at Constantinople, A.D. 381, where, in opposition to the heresies of Macedonius, Apollinarius, and Eunomius, the Nicene faith was confirmed and more fully stated. The first canon anathematizes the “Semi-Arians, or Pneumatomachi;” the seventh canon uses the name Macedonians, and orders the admission of converts from this heresy to be by unction. To the simple article of the Nicene Creed, “I believe in the Holy Ghost,” were added those clauses (excepting the Filioque) which stand at present as the complement of the catholic faith, viz., that to the Holy Ghost, who emanates from the Father, is due the same adoration and glorification as to the Father and to the Son. The Macedonians were invited to the Council of Constantinople in the hope that the reconciliation interrupted at Tarsus might be effected, but the hope was not realized (Socrates, Hist. Ecclesiastes 5, 8; Sozomen, Hist. Ecclesiastes 7, 7). Facunmdus states that Macedonius himself was invited to the council. This is no doubt an error. The council completed the work which was begun at Nicea, and finally declared the catholic faith regarding the Holy Trinity. Against its determination the Semi-Arian, now the Pneumatomachist, party was not able to make any effectual resistance. — Blunt, Dict. of Sects, s.v. See Schaff; Church History, 2, 639, 644; Neander, Hist. of Christian Dogma (see Index); Hefele, Conciliengesch. vols. 1 and 2; Alzog, Kirchengesch. 1, 281; Schröckh, Kirchengesch. vol. 6; Klee, Dogmengesch. pt. 1, ch. 2, p. 215.

## Poach, Andreas[[@Headword:Poach, Andreas]]

             a German Lutheran minister of the 16th century, studied at Wittenberg under Martin Luther, where also he was made namgister. In 1542 he was called to Jena as archdeacon; then he was appointed pastor at Nordhausen; and in 1550 he was called as pastor and professor of theology to Erfurt, where in 1572 in company with four others, he was deposed. He then  moved to Utenbach, near Jena, where he died, April 2, 1585. He edited Luther's Hauspostille, with Corrections and Additions (Jena, 1559 sq.), and wrote the biography of Ratzeberger (q.v.), Vom christlichen Abschied aus diesern Sterblichen, etc. (Jena, 1559). See Jocher, Gelehrten-Lexikon, s.v.; Winer, Handbuch de theol. Littérateur, 2, 130. (B. P.)

## Pobian, Moses[[@Headword:Pobian, Moses]]

             also called Fobian, a Jewish writer of some note, flourished in Greece in the first part of the 16th century. He published, איוב עם תרגום רומאני, the book of Job, with a Rumic, i.e. neo-Greek, translation in Hebrew letters (Constantinople, 1576): — עם תרגום רומאני משלי, the Proverbs, in the same manner (ibid. 1548):— חומש עם תרגום רומאני וספרדי, i.e. the Pentateuch, with a Rumic and Spanish translation, both in Hebrew letters, with the Challee of Onkelos and Rashi's commentary (ibid. 1547). The Spanish version of this work was reprinted at Ferrara in 1583. See Furst, Bibl. Judaica, 1, 285 sq.; Wolf, Bibl. Hebraea, I, 3, 1520. (B. P.)

## Pochard, Jean[[@Headword:Pochard, Jean]]

             a French theologian, was born in 1715 at La Cluse, near Pontarlier. After going through the regular course of studies at Besanon, he was offered by the archbishop of that diocese the direction of the seminary, and Pochard there taught theology for thirty years. He was afterwards appointed superior of the seminary, but the weakness of his health compelled him to resign these functions, as he had already resigned his chair. He died at Besanon Aug. 25, 1786. To him is due the revision of the Missal and Breviary of the diocese of Besanon, printed by order of the cardinal of Choiseul-Beaupre. These works are considered model performances. He had the largest share in the Mithode poumr la Direction des Ames (Neufchhteau, 1772, 2 vols. 12mo) of Urbain Grisot, which has often been reprinted. — Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Géneralé, s.v.

## Pochereth[[@Headword:Pochereth]]

             (Heb. Poke'reth, פֹּכֶרֶת, ensnaring; Sept. (Φακεράθ, v. r. Φαχεράθ, etc.), the name apparently of a person (“P. of Zebaim,” the Sept. in some copies supplies “son of” between the words) whose “children” were among  the Nethinim that returned from the captivity with Zerubbabel (Ezr 2:57; Neh 7:59). B.C. ante 540.

## Pociey, Hypatius[[@Headword:Pociey, Hypatius]]

             a Russian prelate, was born at Bajanise in 1541. He occupied a conspicuous place in the religious history of Russia by the share he had, in 1595, in the return of the western provinces of the empire to the Roman Catholic Church. He was sent to Rome, with several of his colleagues, to signify the obedience of the converted provinces to the holy see: we have an account of this event by Baronius. Pociev devoted his whole life to cementing and extending this union which was finally destroyed by the emperor Nicholas in 1839. Pociey was bishop of Vladimir and Bresc, and died at Vladimir July 28, 1613. He left a number of Homilies, published by Leo. Kiszka (Kazania y Homilie Hipacisca Pocieia, 1714, 4to) The Union, all exposition of the principal articles relating to the union of the Greeks with the Roman Church (Wilna, 1595): — all Account of the embassy which the Ruthenians, in 1476, sent to Sixtus IV (Wilna, 1605, 4to); we know only one copy of this work, that in the Imperial Library of St. Petersburg: — Privileges granted to the Uniates by the Kings of Poland (Wilna, s. d., about 1706): — divers Epistles disseminated in the Annales de la Societe Archlologique de Saint-Petersbourg, the most remarkable being addressed to the patriarch of Alexandria: — his Testament, inserted in the Review of Posen. Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Géneralé, s.v.

## Pockels, Carl Friedrich[[@Headword:Pockels, Carl Friedrich]]

             a German moralist, was born Nov. 15, 1757, at Wirmlitz, near Halle. In 1780, having completed his studies at the university in Halle, he was appointed tutor of the princes of Brunswick, and afterwards guardian of one of them, the duke ‘Augustus. When this house lost their estates, he lived as a private citizen at Brunswick. In 1813 he occupied again his former relation to duke Augustus. He died at Brunswick Oct. 29, 1814. Pockels's works, written in a fluent and elegant style, contain a treasury of sagacious and curious observations on man and society. He left, Beitrage zur Befordersung der Menschenkennltniss (Berlin, 1788-89, 2 parts, 8vo; followed by YeueBeit aiye, etc., Hamb. 1798, 8vo): — Fragmente zur Kenntniss des nenzschlichen Herzens (Hanover, 1788-94, 3 vols. 8vo): — Denlkwzuidigkeiten zur Bereicherung der Chauc akterkunde (Halle, 1794, 8vo): — Versuch einer Charakteristik des weiblichen Geschlechts  (Hanover, 1799-1802, 5 vols. 8vo); it is a writing full of witty remarks; the author published as a pendant Der Maunn (ibid. 1805-8, 4 vols. 8vo): — Karl Wilh. Ferdinand von Braunzschweig (Stuttgard, 1809, 8vo): — Ueber den Ulgayng müt Kindesrn (1811): — Ueber Gesellschaft, Geselligkeit und Unzgang (Hanover, 1813-16, 3 vols. 8vo). Pockels published a Taschenbuch, as keepsake, for the years 1803 and 1804; and, in common with Ch. Ph. Moritz, the Denkwü digkeiten zur Bef Orderung des Edlen und Schloznen (Berlin, 1786-88, 2 vols. 8vo), some articles in the Magatzin zur Efjithrlun gsseelenlehlre, and in the Brazuschweigisches Magazin. — Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Géneralé, s.v.

## Pocklington, John, D.D[[@Headword:Pocklington, John, D.D]]

             an English divine, noted also as an educator, flourished near the middle of the 17th century. He was at one time president of Pembroke Hall and Sidney College, Cambridge. He published Sermons (Lond. 1636): — Altare Christianum (1637, 4to), in answer to Williams's Holy Table. SEE WILLIAMS, JOHN.

## Pocock, Edward (1)[[@Headword:Pocock, Edward (1)]]

             an English Orientalist and theologian of great note, not only in his own times, but one whose scholarly acquirements are gladly acknowledged even in our day, was born Nov. 8, 1604. He studied in Oxford his native place, at the university, and devoted himself especially to the Oriental tongues, the Hebrew, Arabic, Chaldee, and Syriac first under the direction of Matthew Pason, and afterwards under that of William Bedwell. Pocock took his bachelor of arts degree in 1622, and his master's in 1626. Lud. de Dieu publishing a Syriac version of the Apocalypse at Leyden the following year, our author, after his example, began to prepare those four epistles which were still wanting to a complete edition of the New Testament in that language. These epistles were the second of Peter, the second and third of John, and that of Jude. All the other books, except these five, had been well printed by Albertus Widmanstadius, at Vienna, in 1555, who was sent into the West for that purpose by Ignatius, the Jacobite patriarch of Antioch, in the 16th century. Having met with a manuscript in the Bodleian Library proper to his purpose, Pocock engaged in this work and finished it; but laid it by, not having the courage to publish it, till the fame of it, in 1629, brought him into the acquaintance of Gerard Vossius, who, being then at Oxford, obtained his consent to carry it to Leyden, where it was  printed that year, in 4to, under the immediate care and inspection of Lud. de Dieu.

In 1628 Pocock had been received a fellow of the principal college of Oxford; but having decided to enter the priesthood, he was ordained priest in 1629, having entered into deacon's orders some time before, and he was appointed chaplain to the English factory at Aleppo, by the interest of Selden, as appears very probable. He arrived at that place, after a long voyage, Oct. 17, 1630. His residence in the East for six years furnished an opportunity of further study in the Oriental tongues. He acquired great skill in the Arabic tongue, and he likewise endeavored to get a further insight, if possible, into the Hebrew; but soon found it fruitless, the Jews there being very illiterate. He also improved himself in the Ethiopic and Syriac, of which last he made a grammar, with a praxis, for his own use. On Oct. 30, 1631, he received a commission from Laud, then bishop of London, to buy for him such ancient Greek coins and such manuscripts, either in Greek or the Oriental languages, as he should judge most proper for a university library -which commission Pocock executed to the best of his power. He also translated a number of historical works from the Arabic, collected a great quantity of Oriental manuscripts, which he sent to England, and made a careful study of the environs of Aleppo, with respect to natural history: the result of the latter study was intended to furnish a desirable addition to the commentaries of the Old Testament.

In 1634 the plague raged furiously at Aleppo; many of the merchants fled two days' journey from the city, and dwelt in tents upon the mountains: Pocock did not stir, yet neither he nor any of the English caught the infection. In 1636 he received a letter from Laud, then archbishop of Canterbury, informing him of his design to found an Arabic lecture at Oxford, and of naming him to the university as the professor; upon which agreeable news he presently settled his affairs at Aleppo, and took the first opportunity of returning home. On his arrival at Oxford this year, he took the degree of bachelor of divinity in July, and entered on the professorship in August; however, the next year, when his friend Mr. John Greaves concerted his - voyage to Egypt, it was thought expedient by Laud that Pocock should attend him to Constantinople, in order to perfect himself in the Arabic language, and to purchase more manuscripts. During his abode there, he was for some time chaplain to Sir Peter Wych, then the English ambassador to the Porte, and who became Pocock's most zealous protector. He collected during his stay in that city a number of Oriental manuscripts. In 1639 he received several letters from his friends. and particularly from the archbishop, pressing him to return home; and  accordingly, embarking in August, 1640, he landed in Italy, and passed thence to Paris. Here he met with Grotius, who was then ambassador at the court of France from Sweden, and acquainted him with a design he had to translate his treatise De veritate Christiatnae Religionis into Arabic, in order to promote the conversion of some of the Mohammedans.

Grotius was pleased with and encouraged the proposal, while Pocock did not scruple to observe to him some things towards the end of his book which he could not approve: as his advancing opinions which, though commonly charged by Christians upon Mohammedans, yet had no foundation in any of their authentic writings, and were such as they themselves were ready to disclaim. Grotius was so far from being displeased that he heartily thanked Pocock for the freedom he had taken; and gave him full leave, in the version lie intended, to expunge and alter whatever he should think fit. This work was published in 1660 at the sole expense of Mr. Robert Royle: Grotius's introduction was left out, and a new preface added by Pocock, showing the design of the work, and giving some account of the persons to whom it would be of use. On his return to England, in 1640, Pocock found himself in very difficult circumstances. His chair of Arabic had been stipended by archbishop Laud, but after the death of that prelate the revenues had been seized upon. Pocock now devoted himself entirely to study, and escaped by his retreat, as well as by the friendship of John Selden, who enjoyed a great influence in the republican party, the vexations, if not dangers, which his royalist opinions would have been sure to bring upon him. In 1643 he was presented by his college with the living of Childrey, in Berkshire, and in 1647, in consequence of the exertions of John Selden, he was reinstated in his Oxford chair, and two years later he was appointed professor of Hebrew.

The king, who was at that time a prisoner in the Isle of Wight, also bestowed on him a rich canonry. An act of Parliament confirmed the gift; but the canonry thus assigned to him being different from that originally annexed to the professorship, Pocock entered a protest against it, and refused to receive the profits. In the meantime he composed his Specimen Historiae Arabum, being extracts from the work of Abul-faraj in the original Arabic, together with a Latin translation and copious notes. This work, which was printed at Oxford in 1648 and 1650 (4to), was reprinted in 1806 by White, with some additions by Sylvestre de Sacy. In November 1650, about a year after publishing the preceding work, Pocock was ejected from his canonry, and it was intended to deprive him of the Hebrew and Arabic professorships; but, thanks to a petition signed by all the heads of houses, the masters, and scholars at  Oxford, Pocock was suffered to enjoy both places. In 1655 he was on the point of being deprived of his living, on the ground of “ignorance and insufficiency;” at least such were the charges preferred against him by Cromwell's committee. Some of his Oxford friends, however, wisely prevented the disgrace to the Roundhead party which would have followed the ejection, upon such grounds, of so eminent a scholar as Pocock. The most determined against this measure was Dr. John Owen (himself one of the Parliamentary commissioners), Seth Ward, John Wilkins, and John Wallis, who withstood the stupid and bigoted creatures to their face, and made them sensible of “the infinite contempt and reproach” which would reward such treatment of a man “whom all the learned, not of England only, but of all Europe, so justly admired for his vast knowledge and extraordinary accomplishments.” Meanwhile nothing had sufficed to check either his pious care of his parish or his pursuit of sacred and Oriental learning. In Arabic and Hebrew learning he was allowed to be second to none of his age.

From the first Pocock made his Oriental attainments subservient to Biblical illustration; and his contributions, directly and indirectly, to Biblical learning were numerous and extremely valuable. Of his connection with Walton's Polyglot, his biographer says: “From the beginning scarce a step was taken in that work [not excepting even the Prolegomena] till communicated to Mr. Pocock, without whose assistance it must have wanted much of its perfection;” he collated the Arabic Pentateuch, with two copies of Saadias's translation; drew up an account of the Arabic versions of that part of the Bible which is to be found in the Appendix to the Polyglot, and lent some of his own rich store of MSS. to the conductors of the work, viz. a Syriac MS. of the entire Old Testament, an Ethiopic MS. of the Psalms, two Syriac MSS. of the Psalms, and a Persian MS. of the Gospels. Soon after his escape from the commission's purposes Pocock published his Porta Mosis, being six prefatory discourses of Moses Maimonides's “Commentary upon the Mishna,” written in Arabic, but with the Hebrew letters. This work, which was the first production of the Hebrew press at Oxford, appeared in 1655, together with a Latin translation and numerous notes.

Pocock made this work the more useful to Biblical students by his copious Appendix Notarum Miscellanea, where he discusses many points of interest to Biblical scholars. Pocock reaped golden opinions on the publication of this now neglected though still very valuable work. In the following year Pocock appears to have entertained  the idea of publishing the Expositions of Rabbi Tanchum on the Old Testament, as he was at that time the only person in Europe who possessed any of the MSS. of that learned rabbi; but, probably from want of encouragement, he did not prosecute his design. In 1657 the English Polyglot appeared, in which Pocock had a considerable hand. He collated the Arabic Pentateuch, and also wrote a preface concerning the different Arabic versions of that part of the Bible, and the reason of the various readings to be found in them, the whole of which was inserted in the Appendix to the Polyglot. Those parts of the Syriac version of the New Testament which had remained unpublished are due to him; he accompanied them with a Latin version and annotations. In 1658 his Latin translation of the Annals of Eutychius was published at Oxford (in 2 vols. 4to), at the request and at the expense of Selden, who died before it appeared. At the Restoration, Pocock was restored (June 1660) to his canonry of Christ-church, as originally annexed to the Hebrew professorship by Charles I; but the frivolous court of Charles II thought as little of rewarding further his attachment to the royal cause as they were able to appreciate his works and his worth. He took his doctor of divinity's degree, and continued afterwards to discharge the duties of both his lectures, and to give to the world, to the end of his life, new proofs of his unrivalled skill in Oriental learning. He was consulted as a master by all the most learned men in Europe: by Hornius, Alting, Hottinger, Golius, from abroad; and by Cudworth, Boyle, Hammond, Castel, at home.

His next publication, in 1661, was the Arabic poem by Abli Ismail Thograi, entitled Lámiy-yatu-l-‘ajem, with a Latin translation, copious notes, and a learned preface by Dr. Samuel Clarke. But by far the most important as well as the most useful of Pocock's works was his translation of the entire work of Abul-faraj, which, along with the text and a few excellent notes, was printed at Oxford in 1663 (2 vols. 4to), entitled Gregorii Abul Farajii historia Dynastiarum. (This is a compendium of the general history of the world from the creation to his own time, i.e. about the end of the 13th century, and is divided into ten dynasties.) After the publication of this work Pocock seems to have devoted himself entirely to Biblical learning. In 1674 he published, at the expense of the university, his Arabic translation of the Church Catechism and the English Liturgy. Some time after, Fell, dean of Christchurch, having concerted a scheme for a commentary upon the Old Testament, to be written by some learned hands in that university, engaged our author to take a share. This gave occasion to his commentaries. In 1677 appeared his Commentarys on the Prophecies of  Micah and Malachi; in 1685 that on Hosea, and in 1691 that on Joel. It was his intention to comment upon others of the lesser prophets. In these commentaries, which are all in English. Pocock's skill in his favorite subject of Biblical Hebrew is very apparent. The notes, no doubt, are too diffuse, but they exhibit much profound learning in rabbinical as well as sacred Hebrew. In his critical principles he warmly defends the general purity of the Masoretic text against the aspersions of Isaac Vossius and the theory of Capellus; but, although his Masoretic predilections are excessive, he does not depreciate the Septuagint. His scheme ever was to reconcile by learned explanations the sacred original and the most venerable of its versions.

This great and good man labored on, harassed by enemies and neglected by friends, but respected for his purity of life, and admired for his matchless learning, in his professional and pastoral pursuits, to the very end of his life, his only distemper being extreme old age, which yet hindered him not, even the night before he died, from his invariable custom of praying from the liturgy with his family. He expired Sept. 10, 1691, after a gradual decay of his constitution, and his remains were interred in the cathedral of Christchurch, where a monument with an inscription is erected to his memory. As to his person, he was of a middle stature, and slender; his hair and eyes black, his complexion fresh, his look lively and cheerful, and his constitution sound and healthy. In his conversation he was free, open, and affable, retaining even to the last the briskness and facetiousness of youth. His temper was modest, humble, sincere; and his charity brought such numbers of necessitous objects to him that dean Fell used to tell him complainingly “that he drew all the poor of Oxford into the college property.” His theological works were collected in 2 vols. fol. in 1740 by Leonard Twells, who also wrote an account of the life and works of Pocock. Pocock's services to Oriental scholarship in Europe, especially in England, are wellnigh inestimable. Bishop Marsh says of him: “Should I begin to speak of the rare endowments of this admirable man, I should not be able to end his character under a volume. His rare learning appears in his writings.” “Pocock,” says Hallam, “was probably equal to any Oriental scholar whom Europe had hitherto produced.... No Englishman probably has ever contributed so much to that province of [Arabic] learning.” See Cattermole, Literature of the English Church, 1, 175; Hook, Ecclesiastical Biography, 8:98; Skeats, Hist. of the English Free Church, p. 63; Orme, Bibliotheca Biblia, s.v.; Perry, Hist. Ch. of Engl. (see Index in vol. 3); Stoughton, Eccles. Hist. of Engl. (since the Restoration), 2, 332;  Kitto, Cyclopaedia of British Literature, 3, 553; Allibone, Dict. of British and American Authors, vol. 2, s.v.; Biblical Repository, 10:2 sq. (J.H.W.)

## Pocock, Edward (2)[[@Headword:Pocock, Edward (2)]]

             an English Orientalist, son of the preceding, was born at Oxford in 1647, and educated at the university of that place. He published, under his father's direction, a philosophical treatise of Ibn-Tofahil, with a Latin version and notes, entitled Philosophus autodidactus (Oxford, 1671, 4to). The same treatise was translated into English by Ockley. He was on the point of publishing the Description of Egypt by Abdallatif in Arabic and in Latin when, being refused in 1691 the succession to the chair left vacant by his father's death, he renounced entirely his Oriental studies. This valuable work remained long unpublished: the Arabic text was printed at Tübingen at the close of last century, and was almost immediately translated into German. White published in 1800 the original and Pocock's Latin version (Oxf. 4to), with notes of his own.

His brother THOMAS translated into English a Hebrew treatise of Manasseh ben-Israel (Of the Terms of Life, Lond. 1699,12mo). (J.H.W.)

## Pococke, Richard[[@Headword:Pococke, Richard]]

             an English prelate, was born in 1704 at Southampton. It is believed that he belonged to the family of the preceding, notwithstanding the slight difference in the spelling of his name. He studied at Oxford, was received doctor, and embraced the ecclesiastical career. In 1734 and 1741 he traveled in the East, and published on his return a narrative of his journey, under the title, A Description of the East and some other Countries (Lond. 1743-45, 3 vols. in 2. folio, with 179 drawings and maps). This work most filly and with care delineates the countries and manners which make its reading interesting even now. Having accompanied lord Chesterfield to Ireland as chaplain, he remained in that country, and was appointed in 1756 bishop of Ossory. He had just been transferred to Meath when he died of apoplexy, in September 1765, There are some notices of him in the Philosophical Transactions and in the Archaeologia. (J. H.W.)

## Pocularies[[@Headword:Pocularies]]

             is an ecclesiastical term used for drinking-cups consecrated in churches.

## Poderis or Talaris[[@Headword:Poderis or Talaris]]

             is another name for the alb (q.v.).

## Podico, John De[[@Headword:Podico, John De]]

             (also called John de Valladolid or John Conversus), a convert from Judaism and noted as a writer, was born about the year 1335. He is the author of two anti-Jewish works, viz. Corcordia legis, cited very often by Alfonso de Spina in his Fortalitium fidei (p. 117, 155, 169, 170 sq.), and Declaratio super Aben Esram in decem pracepta; also quoted by Alfonso de Spina. He was permitted by the king, Don Henry, to hold religious disputations with Jews, and in 1375 such a disputation took place in the cathedral of Avila, where Moses Kohen de Tordesillas was the spokesman of the Jews. The main points to be discussed were the dogmas of Christianity, the Messiahship of Jesus, his divinity and incarnation, the Trinity, and the virginity of Mary. Four discussions were held, the result of which was published by Tordesillas in his עֵזֶר הָאּמֵוּנָה, or examination of one hundred and twenty-five passages of Scripture usually urged by Christians in favor of their religion. This book, which he designated “The Stronghold of the Faith,” he presented to the synagogue of Avila and Toledo. See Furst, Bibl. Judaica, 3, 435, 467; De Rossi, Dizionario storico degli Autori Ebrei (Germ. transl. by Hamberger), p. 317; the same, Bibl. Judaica antichristiana, p. 26; Gratz, Gesch. d. Juden, 8, 21 sq.; Lindo, Hist. of the Jews, p. 159; Finn, Sephardim, p. 311; Kalkar, Israel und die Kirche, p. 25. (B. P.)

## Podoniptae[[@Headword:Podoniptae]]

             (i.e. Feet-washers) is one of the names by which that branch of the Mennonites, otherwise known as Flemings, are sometimes designated. They maintain that the example of Christ, which has in this instance the force of a law, requires his disciples to wash the feet of their guests in token of their love; and for this reason they have been called Podonipta. But others deny that this rite was enjoined by Christ. SEE MENNONITES.

## Poe, Adam, D.D[[@Headword:Poe, Adam, D.D]]

             a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, noted for his devotion to its interests, literary, social, and religious, was born in Columbiana County, Ohio, July 21, 1804. Such limited advantages as the times and the means of  his parents afforded him for acquiring an education were eagerly embraced, and in the schools and by private tuition he secured the elements of a good English education and some knowledge of the classics, and formed a taste for reading and study which he continued through life. He received his early Christian training in the Presbyterian Church, and ever cherished for it a profound respect; but its distinctive doctrines did not find a response in his heart, and after careful examination and many severe spiritual conflicts he preferred the doctrines of religion as taught by the Methodist Episcopal Church. Having decided to give himself to the work of the ministry, to which he felt called of God, he was licensed to preach, and in 1826 became a traveling preacher in the Ohio Annual Conference.

He was effective from that date to the time of the illness which resulted in his death; and as a pastor, and in the other capacities in which he served the Church and her cause, he was a most efficient laborer of the Master. Dr. Poe entered the traveling ministry when the work involved sacrifices and demanded labors of no ordinary character. The circuits were of vast extent. An absence from home of twenty-eight days, with a sermon and a class or prayer meeting for each and every day, and a horseback ride of six hundred miles through the forests and the rough roads of the border settlements to complete a single round, was common. Unchecked by heat or cold, through drenching rains or chilling sleet or snow, along miry ways, and for unmeasured reaches of distance, the Christ-loving and Christ-serving itinerant pressed forward in his tireless rounds, hunting up the lost sheep of the house of Israel, and gathering them into the fold of the great Shepherd. No man ever entered the cause with firmer faith, with greater singleness of purpose, or with more unreserved devotion than did Adam Poe. As he began, so he continued to the end. His whole being was rooted and grounded in God. His pastoral appointments were as follows: 1827, on Brunswick Circuit; 1828, on Huron Circuit; 1829, in charge of Wayne Circuit; 1830, on Columbus Circuit; 1831, on Deer Creek Circuit; 1832-3, on Miami Circuit; 1834, Marietta. In 1835 Dr. Poe succeeded the celebrated William B. Christie as presiding elder of Wooster District, and continued on that and the Tiffin District some five years, when his impaired health demanded relief from such exhausting labors. In 1839 he was stationed in Mansfield; in 1840-41, in Delaware; in 1842, presiding elder on Norwalk District; in 1843 in Delaware a second time; in 1844, agent for the Ohio Wesleyan University; 1846, again in Mansfield; 1847-9, on Norwalk or Elyria District. From 1850 to the spring of 1852, he was presiding elder of Mansfield District. At the General Conference of 1852 he was, in a manner  highly creditable to himself, elected assistant agent of the Western Book Concern. To this office he was re-elected in 1856.

Upon the failure of the health of the Rev. L. Swormstedt in 1860, he was elected principal agent. To this office he was re-elected in 1864. The General Conference of 1868 would have gladly continued him in this relation had it not found him hovering between life and death. He died June 26, 1868. Dr. Poe was a sound thinker, safe rather than brilliant in his theological views, colloquial rather than oratorical in his style of speech, ever interesting and instructive in the pulpit and on the platform. His life was genial and Christian. A man of sterling integrity of character and honesty of purpose, of sound and godly judgment, he enjoyed the confidence of the Church to a degree rarely awarded to living men. Traversing the circuit, laboring in the station, charged with the arduous administration of the expansive district, or managing the vast interests of the Western Book Concern, he was the same sincere-hearted man, with one single purpose, to do well the work committed to him by the Church. This was the grand secret of his success. Dr. Poe had a commanding presence. The spirit of benevolence ruled in his heart, and its winning sunshine beamed in his countenance. He was frank almost to bluntness, yet no one could -mistake the generous impulses of his heart. He was fearless, but his courage was tempered with wisdom. He was social in a high degree; his winning smile, his genial spirit, and the facility and effectiveness with which he drew upon the rich storehouse of anecdote will not soon be forgotten by his intimate friends. Dr. Poe was greatly interested in the educational advantages of the Methodist Episcopal Church, but particularly the Ohio Wesleyan University, of which he may almost be said to have been the founder. His faith in the enterprise, and his devotion to it, were truly heroic. From its inception down to the hour of his death no personal or family interest was dearer to his heart than this grand, central educational institution of the Church in the state of Ohio. I e was a member of the board of trustees from the time of its foundation. See bishop Clark, in the Western Christian Advocate, July 8, 1868; Minutes of the North Ohio Conference, p. 34 sq.; N.Y. Christian Advocate, July 4, 1868. (J. H. W.)

## Poe, Daniel[[@Headword:Poe, Daniel]]

             a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, and brother of the preceding, was born in Columbiana County, Ohio, Oct. 12, 1809. In August, 1.82, he united with the Methodist Episcopal Church. Young as he was, he was soon appointed a class-leader, and was licensed to exhort. He  prepared at an academy for college, and studied at Augusta College, Kentucky. He was licensed to preach, and admitted into the Ohio Conference, and appointed to travel the Letart Falls Circuit, where he labored acceptably and successfully. The next year he was appointed to the Eaton Circuit, and the year following to the Hamilton Circuit, and in 1835 to the Oxford Circuit. In May 1836, he was sent to the Oneida and Menomonee Mission, west of Green Bay. He commenced a school among the Oneida Indians, and extended his visits to those at Brothertown, and other fragments of tribes scattered through the Wisconsin Territory, and finally succeeded in building up a flourishing mission, which continues to our day to exert a most salutary influence among this reclaimed savage tribe. In the autumn of 1838 Mr. Poe traveled on horseback, through an almost unbroken wilderness, from Green Bay to Alton, Ill., to attend the Illinois Conference lie was then transferred back to the Ohio Conference; but he could not get to Ohio in time to receive an appointment that year. In January 1839, his brother, \who was presiding elder of the Tiffin District, employed him on the Mexico Circuit, where he labored till the session of his Conference in September, 1839, when he was appointed to the M'Arthurstown Circuit. The next two years he was appointed to Tariton.

In September 1842, he was transferred to the Texas Conference. On his arrival there he addressed himself with his accustomed zeal and energy to his work, but one of the great wants of the country that first impressed him was the need of schools and teachers. In view of this destitution he returned to Ohio, in order to secure a corps of teachers. After a few months he returned to Texas, and shortly after commenced laying the foundations of an institution of learning at San Augustine. The next Conference resolved to adopt it and give it their patronage. But, besides this educational work, Mr. Poe served the San Augustine Circuit, which subjected him to the necessity of traveling some three hundred miles every four weeks. He kept up his engagements with regularity, and to the satisfaction of all concerned, but the exertion necessary to this end proved too much, and in 1844 he fell a prey to disease, and died after a very short illness. His last words were a testimony of the happy servant to whom the Master bade a hearty welcome. “Happy—very, very happy!” were the last words of Daniel Poe. “As a man of intellect,” says bishop Morris, “I should place Poe considerably above the medium, though his mind was sober and practical rather than striking or brilliant. His perceptions were quick and clear, and he had that strong common sense and sound, discriminating judgment that gave great weight to his counsels and great efficiency to his  movements. In his moral constitution he was distinguished chiefly for the resolute and the heroic. He had a naturally kind and amiable spirit. He was far from being impetuous in his movements or hasty in his decisions; but when his purpose was once deliberately and conscientiously formed it was impossible to divert him from the course of his sober convictions. With the highest degree of physical courage, he united that higher courage which has its foundation in principle and in faith. The sentiment of fear, except as it had respect to (God, never found a lodgment in his bosom.” His preaching was such as might have been expected from his solid and well- disciplined mind, and his earnest, resolute, and eminently Christian spirit. He spoke with great simplicity and directness, but without any of the graces of oratory. His discourses were well-considered, well-digested expositions of divine truth. See Sprague, Annals of the Amer. Pulpit, 7, 786 sq.; Finley, Sketches; Minutes of Conferences, 1845. (J. H. W.)

## Poelemberg, Kornelius[[@Headword:Poelemberg, Kornelius]]

             a Dutch painter, was born at Utrecht in 1586. His master was Abraham Bloemaert. He then went to Rome, where he enjoyed the lessons of Adam Elzheimer (1600). A member of the academic rank, he was there called II Brusco and Il Satiro. He Italianized his manner. His paintings were esteemed, and brought a good price even in Italy. Pope Paul V and the grand duke of Tuscany, Ferdinand II, endeavored in vain to keep him. After a few months spent in Florence (1621), he went back to Holland, where his fame had preceded him. He was received with great honors; Rubens became his friend. Charles I called him to London, where Poelemberg painted a great deal; but lie finally abandoned the service of the English monarch and returned to Utrecht, where he died, in 1660. His chief sacred works are: The Birth of Jesus, at Dusseldorf; Lot and his Daughters; the Martyrdom of St. Stephen; a Flight to Egypt; a Holy Family; an Angel announcing to the Shepherds the Birth of the Savior, in the Louvre, and one of his best; etc. At the great exhibition at Manchester (1851) the portrait of Poelemberg and his wife, painted by himself, and several landscapes, were greatly admired. He left also some good eau- fortes, but his engravings are rare and out of the market. Poelemberg's manner is remarkable for suavity and lightness; it betokens great facility and an uncommon science of the chiaro-oscuro; his masses are large, his backgrounds and first plans full of harmony; the details, especially those related to architecture, are carefully worked out; his figures (generally naked females) are swell grouped, but the drawing is seldom correct. See  Descamps, Vie des Peintres. 1, 214 sq.; Blanc, La Vie des Peintres (Ecole Hollandaise), liv. 94; Spooner, Biog. Hist. of the Fine Arts, s.v.; Mrs. Clement, Handbook of Painters, etc. p. 461.

## Poelenburg, Arnold[[@Headword:Poelenburg, Arnold]]

             a Dutch theologian, was born Sept. 12, 1628, at Horn, in the Netherlands, where he also became pastor in 1653, after having completed his studies. He removed to Rotterdam, and in 1659 became professor of theology of the Remonstrants (q.v.), and died Oct. 30, 1666. He wrote, Confutatio disputtationis F' Spanhemii de quinque articulis controversis, cuan refutatione argumenti Guil. Tuissi, cui solvendo ne diabolum? quidemo et angelos ejus esse pares gloriatur: — Dissert. epistol. qua demonstratur non posse remonstrantes integra conscientia cum Contraremonstrantibus vel congregationis vel S. Synaxeos communuionenm colere: — Epistola ad Christ. Hartzaekerum in qua liber octavus summae controversiarum Joh. Hornbeckii, qui est adversus remonstrantes refellitur, etc. See Cattenburgh, in Biblioth. Remonstrantiun; Jocher, Gelehrten Lexikon, s.v. (B. P.)

## Poenitentiale Romanum[[@Headword:Poenitentiale Romanum]]

             a collection of rules used in the Roman Catholic Church, prescribing the time and manner of penance, the forms of prayer to be employed for the reception of those who enter upon penance, and for reconciling penitents by solemn absolution. Its history can be traced to the ninth century. SEE PENITENTIAL.

## Poet[[@Headword:Poet]]

             (ποιητής, a doer, as often translated) occurs but once in this sense in the Bible. Paul quotes the poet Aratuls, a native, as well as himself, of Cilicia (Act 17:28): “We are the children (the race) of God.” This is part of a longer passage, whose import is, “We must begin from Jupiter, whom we must by no means forget. Everything is replete with Jupiter. He fills the streets, the public places, and assemblies of men. The whole sea and its harbors are full of this god, and all of us in all places have need of Jupiter.” It was certainly not to prove the being or to enhance the merit of Jupiter that Paul quotes this passage. But he has delivered out of bondage, as we may say, a truth which this poet had uttered, without penetrating its true meaning. The apostle used it to prove the existence of the true God, to a  people not convinced of the divine authority of the Scriptures, and who would have rejected such proofs as he might have derived from thence. SEE ARATUS.

The same apostle gives a pagan poet the name of prophet (‘it. 1, 12, “One of themselves, even a prophet of their own, said,” etc.), because, among the heathen, poets were thought to be inspired by Apollo. They spoke by enthusiasm. Oracles were originally delivered in verse. Poets were interpreters of the will of the gods. The poet quoted by Paul is Epimenides, whom the ancients esteemed to be inspired and favored by the gods. SEE EPIMENIDES.

The son of Sirach, intent on praising eminent men, enumerates bards or poets; who were, he says, “Leaders of the people by their counsels, and by their knowledge of learning meet for the people; wise and eloquent in their instructions: such as found out musical tunes, and recited verses in writing” (Sir 42:4). It is evident that he considered them as of great importance to the community; and we know that they were of great antiquity for Moses, himself a poet, refers to those who spoke in proverbs (Num 21:27), of which he inserts a specimen. Jacob was a poet, as appears from his farewell benediction on his sons. It appears extremely probable that the honorable appellation Nebi equally denoted a prophet, a poet, and a musician, as the poets principally were. SEE POETRY.

## Poetry, Christian[[@Headword:Poetry, Christian]]

             SEE HYMNOLOGY; SEE PSALMODY.

## Poetry, Hebrew[[@Headword:Poetry, Hebrew]]

             We propose here to discuss only the poetical elements of the Bible, or ancient Hebrew poetry. For the sake of brevity and perspicuity, we shall treat this subject under the distinct heads of the character of Hebrew poetry, its existing remains, its classification, its history, and its literature. In doing this we treat the subject from a modern scientific point of view.

I. The Essential Character of Ancient Hebrew Poetry. — Poetry is—in its nature the language of the imagination stimulated by the passions. While prose expresses the calm statements of memory and observation, or the deliberate conclusions of the judgment, poetry gives utterance to the impulsive sentiments of the taste, the emotions and the aspirations of the heart. History can only appear in poetry in the guise of legend, and reasoning only in the form of animated colloquy. The phraseology is in keeping with the difference in spirit. Poetry tends to a more exalted and elaborate style of language in accordance with the fervid state of the mind.  Hence the invention-spontaneous in most instances of measure, whether of simple numbers or rhyme, to meet this overwrought state of the mental faculties. Biblical poetry partakes of these characteristics. It is distinguished from the prose compositions of the same book by its peculiarities of diction, as marked as those of other languages, although not so prosodiacal. The reader is at once made aware of entering the poetical domain by a certain elevation of style, and by the employment of more frequent and extended tropes, as well as by greater abruptness and more decided energy in the phraseology. The formal rhythm consists not-as in Greek and Latin, or even in the modern tongues-in a measured quantity of syllables of a particular length in utterance, but in a peculiar balance and antiphony of the clauses constituting what is known as parallelism. Each of these peculiar traits of Hebrew poetry we take space to develop somewhat in detail.

One characteristic of Hebrew poetry, not indeed peculiar to it, but shared by it in common with the literature of other nations, is its intensely national and local coloring. The writers were Hebrews of the Hebrews, drawing their inspiration from the mountains and rivers of Palestine, which they have immortalized in their poetic figures, and even while uttering the sublimest and most universal truths never forgetting their own nationality in its narrowest and intensest form. Their images and metaphors, says Munk (Palestine, p. 444 a), “are taken chiefly from nature and the phenomena of Palestine and the surrounding countries, from the pastoral life, from agriculture and the national history. The stars of heaven, the sand of the seashore, are the image of a great multitude. Would they speak of a mighty host of enemies invading the country, they are the swift torrents or the roaring waves of the sea, or the clouds that bring on a tempest; the war-chariots advance swiftly like lightning or the whirlwinds. Happiness rises as the dawn and shines like the daylight; the blessing of God descends like the dew or the bountiful rain; the anger of Heaven is a devouring fire that annihilates the wicked as the flame which devours the stubble. Unhappiness is likened to days of clouds and darkness; at times of great catastrophes the sun sets in broad day, the heavens are shaken, the earth trembles, the stars disappear, the sun is changed into darkness and the moon into blood, and so on.

The cedars of Lebanon, the oaks of Bashan, are the image of the mighty man, the palm and the reed of the great and the humble, briers and thorns of the wicked; the pious man is an olive evergreen, or a tree planted by the waterside. The animal kingdom  furnished equally a large number of images: the lion, the image of power, is also, like the wolf, bear, etc., that of tyrants and violent and rapacious men; and the pious who suffers is a feeble sheep led to the slaughter. The strong and powerful man is compared to the he-goat or the bull of Bashan: the kine of Bashall figure, in the discourses of Amos, as the image of rich and voluptuous women; the people who rebel against the divine will are a refractory heifer. Other images are borrowed from the country life, and from the life domestic and social: the chastisement of God weighs upon Israel like a wagon laden with sheaves; the dead cover the earth as the dung which covers the surface of the fields. The impious man sows crime and reaps misery, or he sows the wind and reaps the tempest. The people yielding to the blows of their enemies are like the corn crushed beneath the threshing instrument. God tramples the wine in the winepress when he chastises the impious and sheds their blood. The wrath of Jehovah is often represented as all intoxicating cup, which he causes those to empty who have merited his chastisement: terrors and anguish are often compared to the pangs of childbirth. Peoples, towns, and states are represented by the Hebrew poets under the image of daughters or wives; in their impiety they are courtesans or adulteresses. The historical allusions of most frequent occurrence are taken from the catastrophe of Sodom and Gomorrah, the miracles of the departure from Egypt, and the appearance of Jehovah on Sinai.” Examples might easily be multiplied in illustration of this remarkable characteristic of the Hebrew poets: they stand thick upon every page of their writings, and in striking contrast to the vague generalizations of the Indian philosophic poetry. There is accordingly no poetry which bears a deeper or broader stamp of the peculiar influences under which it was produced. It never ceases to be Hebrew in order to become universal, and yet it is universal while it is Hebrew. The country, the clime, the institutions, the very peculiar religious institutions, rites, and observances, the very singular religious history of the Israelites, are all faithfully and vividly reflected in the Hebrew muse, so that no one song can ever be mistaken for a poem of any other people. Still it remains true that the heart of man, at least the heart of all the most civilized nations of the earth, has been moved and swayed, and is still pleasingly and most beneficially moved and swayed by the strains of Biblical poesy.

There is no ancient poetic age that can be put into comparison with that of the Hebrews but that of the two classic nations, Greece and Rome, and that of India. In form and variety we grant that the poetry of these nations  surpasses that of the Hebrews. Epic poetry and the drama, the two highest styles so far as mere art is concerned, were cultivated successfully by them, while among the Israelites we find only their germs and first rudiments. So in execution we may also admit that, in the higher qualities of style, the Hebrew literature is somewhat inferior. But the thought is more than the expression; the kernel than the shell and in substance the Hebrew poetry far surpasses every other. In truth, it dwells in a region to which other ancient literatures did not and could not attain-a pure, serene, moral, and religious atmosphere; thus dealing with mall in his highest relations, first anticipating, and then leading onwards, mere civilization. This, as we shall presently see more fully, is the great characteristic of Hebrew poetry; it is also the highest merit of any literature, a merit in which that of the Hebrews is unapproached. To this high quality it is owing that the poetry of the Bible has exerted on the loftiest interests and productions of the human mind, for now above two thousand years, the most decided and the most beneficial influence. Moral and religious truth is deathless and undecaying; and so the griefs and the joys of David, or the far-seeing warnings and brilliant portrayings of Isaiah, repeat themselves in the heart of each successive generation, and become coexistent with the race of man. Thus of all moral treasuries the Bible is incomparably the richest. Even for forms of poetry, ‘in which, it is defective, or altogether fails, it presents the richest materials. Moses has not, as some have dreamed, left us an epic poem, but he has supplied the materials out of which the Paradise Lost was created. The sternly sublime drama of Samson Agonistes is constructed from a few materials found in a chapter or two which relate to the least cultivated period of the Hebrew republic. Indeed, most of the great poets, even of modern days, from Tasso down to Byron, all the great musicians, and nearly all the great painters, have drawn their best and highest inspiration from the Bible. It may have struck the reader as somewhat curious that the poetical pieces of which we spoke above should, in the common version of the Bible, be scarcely, if at all, distinguishable from prose. We do not know whether there is anything extraordinary in this.

Much of classical poetry, if turned into English prose, would lose most of its poetic characteristics; but, in general, the Hebrew poetry suffers less than perhaps any other by transfusion into a prosaic element: to which fact it is owing that the book of Psalms, in the English version, is, notwithstanding its form, eminently poetic. There are, however, cases in which only the experienced eye can trace the poetic in and under the prosaic attire in which it appears in the vulgar translation. Nor until the  subject of Hebrew poetry had been long and well studied did the learned succeed in detecting many a poetic gem contained in the Bible. In truth, poetry and prose, from their very nature, stand near to each other, and in the earlier stages of their existence are discriminated only by faint and vanishing lines. If we regard the thought. prose sometimes even now rises to the loftiness of poetry. If we regard the clothing, the simpler form of poetry is scarcely more than prose; and rhetorical or measured prose passes into the domain of poetry. A sonnet of Wordsworth could be converted into prose with a very few changes; a fable of Krummacher requires only to be distributed into lines in order to make blank verse. Now in translations the form is for the most part lost; there remains only the subs stance, and poetic sentiment ranges from the humblest to the loftiest topics. So with the Hebrew poetry in its original and native state. Whether in its case poetry sprang from prose, or prose from poetry, they are both) branches of one tree, and bear in their earlier stages a very close resemblance. The similarity is the greater in the literature of the Hebrews, because their poetic a forms are less determinate than those of some other nations: they had, indeed, a rhythm; but so had their prose, and their poetic rhythm was more like that of, our blank verse than of our rhymed meter. Of poetical feet they appear to have known nothing, and in consequence their verse must be less measured and less strict. Its melody was rather that of thought than of art and s skill—spontaneous, like their religious feelings, and; therefore deep and impressive, but less subject to law and escaping from the hard limits of exact definition. Rhyme, properly so called, is disowned as well as meter. Yet Hebrew verse, as it had a kind of measured tread, so had it a jingle in its feet, for several lines are sometimes found terminating with the same letter. In the main, however, its essential form was in the thought. Ideas are made to recur under such relations that the substance itself marks the form, and the two are so blended into one that their union is essential to constitute poetry. It is, indeed, incorrect to say that “the Hebrew poetry is characterized by the recurrence of similar ideas” (Latham's English Language, p. 372), if by this it is intended to intimate that such a peculiarity is the sole characteristic of Hebrew poetry. One, and that the chief, characteristic of that poetry is such recurrence; but there are also characteristics in form as well as in thought. Of these it may be sufficient to mention the following: prose ordinarily presents; but as the true pronunciation of the Hebrew has long been lost, this quality can only be imperfectly appreciated.

2. There is a correspondence of words, i.e. the words in one verse, or member, answer to the words in another; for as the sense in the one echoes the sense in the other, so also form corresponds with form, and word with word. This correspondence in form will fully appear when we give instances (see below) of the parallelism in sentiment; meanwhile an idea of it may be formed from these specimens:

“Why art thou cast down, O my soul And why art thou disquieted in me?” (Psa 43:5).

“The memory of the just is a blessing: But the name of the wicked shall rot” (Pro 10:7).

“He turneth rivers into a desert, And water-springs into dry ground” (Psa 107:33).

In the original this similarity in construction is more exact and more apparent. At the same time it is a free and not a strict correspondence that prevails; a correspondence to be caught and recognized by the ear in the general progress of the poem, or the general structure of a couplet or a triplet, but which is not of a nature to be exactly measured or set forth by such aids as counting with the fingers will afford.

3. Inversion holds a distinguished place in the structure of Hebrew poetry, as in that of every other; yet here again the remark already made holds good; it is only a modified inversion that prevails, by no means (in general) equaling that of the Greeks and Romans in boldness, decision, and prevalence. Every one will, however, recognize this inversion in the following instances, as distinguishing the passages from ordinary prose:

“Amid thought in visions of the night, When deep sleep falleth upon men, Fear and horror came upon me” (Job 4:13).

“To me men gave ear and waited, To my words they made no reply” (Job 29:21).

“For three transgressions of Damascus, And for four will I not turn away its punishment” (Amo 1:3). was his sepulcher” (Isa 53:9).

4. The chief characteristics, however, of Hebrew poetry are found in the peculiar form in which it gives utterance to its ideas. This form has received the name of “parallelism.” Ewald justly prefers the term “thought-rhythm,” since the rhythm, the music, the peculiar flow and harmony of the verse and of the poem, lie in the distribution of the sentiment in such a manner that the full import does not come out in less than a distich. The leading principle is that a simple verse or distich consists, both in regard to form and substance, of two corresponding members: this has been termed Hebrew rhythm, or parallelismus membrorum. Three kinds may be specified:

(1.) There is, first, the synonymous parallelism, which consists in this, that the two members express the same thought in different words, so that sometimes word answers to word; for example:

“What is man that thou art mindful of him, And the son of man that thou carest for him!” (Psa 8:4).

There is in some cases an inversion in the second line:

“The heavens relate the glory of God, And the work of his hands the firmament declares” (Psa 19:2).

“He maketh his messengers the winds, His ministers the flaming lightning” (Psa 104:4).

Very often the second member repeats only a part of the first:

“Woe to them that join house to house, That field to field unite” (Isa 5:8).

Sometimes the verb which stands in the first member is omitted in the second:

“God, thy justice give the king, And thy righteousness to the king's son” (Psa 72:1).

Or the verb may be in the second member:

“With the jawbone of an ass, heaps upon heaps, With the jawbone of an ass have I slain a thousand men” (Jdg 15:16).  The second member may contain an expansion of the first:

“Give to Jehovah, ye sons of God, Give to Jehovah glory and praise” (Psa 29:1).

Indeed the varieties are numerous, since the synonymous parallelism is very frequent.

(2.) The second kind is the antithetic, in which the first member is illustrated by some opposition of thought contained in the second. This less customary kind of parallelism is found mostly in the Proverbs:

“The full man treadeth the honey-comb under foot, To the hungry every bitter thing is sweet” (Pro 27:7). Under this head comes the following, with other similar examples: “Day to day uttereth instruction, And night to night showeth knowledge” (Psa 19:2).

(3.) The third kind is denominated the synthetic: probably the term epithetic would be more appropriate, since the second member not being a mere echo of the first, subjoins something new to it, while the same structure of the verse is preserved; thus:

“He appointed the moon for seasons; The sun knoweth his going down” (Psa 104:19).

“The law of Jehovah is perfect, reviving the soul; The precepts of Jehovah are sure, instructing the simple” (Psa 19:7).

5. Intimately connected with the parallelistic structure is the strophic arrangement of Hebrew poetry. Usually the parallelism itself furnishes the basis of the versification. This correspondence in thought is not however, of universal occurrence. We find a merely rhythmical parallelism in which the thought is not repeated, but goes forward throughout the verse, which is divided midway into two halves or a distich:

“The word is not upon the tongue, Jehovah thou knowest it altogether” (Psa 138:4).

“Gird as a man thy loins, I will ask thee; inform thou me” (Job 39:3).  Here poetry distinguishes itself from prose chiefly by the division into two short equal parts. This peculiarity of poetic diction is expressed by the word זָמִר, to sing (strictly to play), which properly denotes dividing the matter, and so speaking or singing in separated portions. Among the Arabians, who, however, have syllabic measure, each verse is divided into two hemistichs by a caesura in the middle. The simple two-membered rhythm- hitherto described prevails especially in the book of Job, the Proverbs, and a portion of the Psalms; but in the last, and still more in the Prophets, there are numerous verses with three, four, or yet more members. In verses consisting of three members (tristicha) sometimes all three are parallel:

“Happy the man who walketh not in the paths of the unrighteous, Nor standeth in the way of sinners, Nor sitteth in the seat of scoffers” (Psa 1:1).

Sometimes two of the members stand opposed to the third:

“To all the world goes forth their sound, To the end of the world their words; For the sun he places a tabernacle in them” (Psa 19:4). Verses of four members contain either two simple parallels: “With righteousness shall he judge the poor, And decide with equity for the afflicted of the people; He shall smite the earth with the rod of his mouth; With the breath of his lips shall he slay the wicked” (Isa 11:4). Or the first and third answer to each other; also the second and fourth: “That smote the people in anger With a continual stroke; That lorded it over the nations in wrath With unremitted oppression” (Isa 14:6).

If the members are more numerous or disproportionate (Isa 11:11), or if the parallelism is important or irregular, the diction of poetry is lost and prose ensues; as is the case in Isa 5:1-6, and frequently in the later prophets, as Jeremiah and Ezekiel. The strophe, however, is frequently preserved in a quite extended form with several subdivisions, and the parallelism is often carried out in subordinate clauses; instances of  this are very common, especially in the book of Ecclesiastes. (See § 4, below.)

It is not to be supposed that each poem consists exclusively of one set of verse; for though this feature does present itself, yet frequently several kinds are found together in one composition, so as to give great ease, freedom, and capability to the style. We select the following beautiful specimen, because a chorus is introduced:

DAVID'S LAMENT OVER SAUL AND JONATHAN.

The Gazelle, O Israel, has been cut down on thy heights!

Chorus. How are the mighty fallen!

Tell it not in Gath, publish it not in the streets of Ascalon Lest the daughters of the Philistines rejoice, Lest the daughters of the uncircumcised exult.

Hills of Gilboa, no dew nor rain come upon you, devoted fields! For there is stained the heroes' bow, Saul's bow, never anointed with oil.

From the blood of the slain, from the fat of the mighty, The how of Jonathan turned not back. And the sword of Saul came not idly home. Saul land Jonathan! lovely and pleasant in life!

And in death ye were not divided; Swifter than eagles, stronger than lions! Ye daughters of Israel! weep for Saul!

He clothed you delicately in purple, He put ornaments of gold on your apparel.

Chorus. How are the mighty fallen in the midst of the battle! Jonathan, slain in thy high places!

I am distressed for thee brother, brother Jonathan, Very pleasant wast thou to me, Wonderful was thy love, more than the love of woman.

Chorus. How are the mighty fallen, And the weapons of war perished!  We have chosen this ode not only for its singular beauty, but also because it presents another quality of Hebrew poetry-the strophe. In this poem there are three strophes marked by the recurrence three times of the dirge sung by the chorus. The chorus appears to have consisted of three parts, corresponding with the parties more immediately addressed in the three several portions of the poem. The first choral song is sung by the entire body of singers, representing Israel; the second is sung by a chorus of maidens; the third, by first a chorus of youths in a soft and mournful strain, and then by all the choir in fill and swelling chorus. But in order to the reader's fully understanding with what noble effect these “songs of Zion” came on the souls of their hearers, an accurate idea must be formed of the music of the Hebrews. See Music. Referring to the articles which bear on the subject, we merely remark that both music and dancing were connected with sacred song in its earliest manifestations, though it was only at a comparatively late period, when David and Solomon had given their master-powers to the grand performances of the Temple-service, that poetry came forth in all its excellence, and music lent its full aid to its solemn and sublime sentiments.

6. In Hebrew, as in other languages there is a peculiarity about the diction used in poetry— a kind of poetical dialect, characterized by archaic and irregular forms of words, abrupt constructions, and unusual inflections, which distinguish it from the contemporary prose or historical style. It is universally observed that archaic forms and usages of words linger in the poetry of a language after they have fallen out of ordinary use. A few of these forms and usages are here given from Gesenius's Lehrgebdude. The Piel and Hiphil voices are used intransitively (Jer 51:56; Eze 10:7; Job 29:24): the apocopated future is used as a present (Job 15:33; Psa 11:6; Isa 42:6). The termination אָּת is found for the ordinary feminine אָּה (Exo 15:2; Gen 49:22; Psa 132:4); and for the plural אַּיםwe have אַּין (Job 15:13; Eze 26:18) and אִּי (Jer 22:14; Amo 7:1). The verbal suffixes, מוֹ, אָּמוֹ, and אֵּמו ֹ(Exo 15:9), and the pronominal suffixes to nouns, אָּמוֹ for אם, and אֵּיהוּ for אָּיו(Hab 3:10), are peculiar to the poetical books; as are וֹהַי (Psa 116:12), אֵּימו ֹ(Deu 32:37; Psa 11:7), and the more unusual forms, אֵּיהֵמָּה (Eze 40:16), אֵּיהֶנָה (Eze 1:11), אַּיכֶנָה (Eze 13:20). In poetical language also we find לָמוֹ for לו ֹ or לָהֶם, לְמוֹ for  לְ, בְּמוֹ for בְּ, כְּמוֹ for כְּ; the plural forms of the prepositions, אֵֵלי for אֶל, עֲדֵי for עִד, עֲלֵי; and the peculiar forms of the nouns, הִרְרַיfor הָרַי, הִרְרֵיfor ה4רֵי, עֲמָמַיםfor עִמַּים, and so on.

II. Existing Remains of Ancient Hebrew Poetry. — The poetry which is found in the Bible, rich and multifarious as it is, appears to be only a remnant of a still wider and fuller sphere of Shemitic literature. The New Testament is in fact comprised in our definition, for, besides scattered portions, which, under a prosaic form, convey a poetic thought, the entire book of the Apocalypse abounds in poetry. In no nation was the union of the requisites of which we have spoken above found in fuller measure than among the Hebrews. Theirs was eminently a poetic temperament; their earliest history was a heroic without ceasing to be a historic age, while the loftiest of all truths circulated in their souls, and glowed on and started from their lips. Hence their language, in its earliest stages, is surpassingly poetic. In one sense the Bible is full of poetry; for very much of its contents, which is merely prosaic in form, rises, by force of the noble sentiments which it enunciates, and the striking or splendid imagery with which these sentiments are adorned, into the sphere of real poetry. Independently of this poetic prose, there is in the Bible much writing which has all the ordinary characteristics of poetry. Even the unlearned reader can hardly fail to recognize at once the essence of poetry in various parts of the Bible. It is no slight attestation to the essentially poetic character of Hebrew poetry that its poetical qualities shine through the distorting coverings of a prose translation. Much of the Biblical poetry is, indeed, hidden from the ordinary reader by its prose accompaniments, standing, as it does, undistinguished in the midst of historical narrations.

It is a phenomenon which is universally observed in the literature of all nations, that the earliest form in which the thoughts and feelings of a people find utterance is the poetic. Prose is an after growth, the vehicle of less spontaneous, because more formal, expression. Snatches of poetry are discovered in the oldest prose compositions. Even in Gen 4:23 sq. are found a few lines of poetry, which Herder incorrectly terms “the song of the sword,” thinking it commemorative of the first formation of' that weapon. To us it appears to be a fragment of a larger poem, uttered in lamentation for a homicide committed by Lamech, probably in self-defense. SEE LAMECH. Herder finds in this piece all the characteristics of Hebrew poetry. It is, he thinks, lyrical, has a proportion between its several lines,  and even assonance; in the original the first four lines terminate with the same letter, making a single or semi-rhyme.

Another poetic scrap is found in Exo 32:18. Being told by Joshua, on occasion of descending from the mount, when the people had made the golden calf, and were tumultuously offering it their worship “The sound of war is in the camp;”

Moses said:

“Not the sound of a shout for victory,

Nor the sound of a shout for falling;

The sound of a shout for rejoicing do I hear.”

The correspondence in form in the original is here very exact and striking, so that it is difficult to deny that the piece is poetic. If so, are we to conclude that the temperament of the Israelites was so deeply poetic that Moses and Joshua should find the excitement of this occasion sufficient to strike improvisatore verses from their lips? Or have we here a quotation from some still older song, which occurred to the minds of the speakers by the force of resemblance? Other instances of scattered poetic pieces may be found in Num 21:14-15; also Num 21:18; Num 21:27; in which passages evidence may be found that we are not in possession of the entire mass of Hebrew, or, at least, Shemitic literature. Further specimens of very early poetry are found in Num 23:7 sq., Num 23:18 sq.; Num 24:3; Num 24:15. The ordinary train of thought and feeling presented in Hebrew poetry is entirely of a moral or religious kind; but there are occasions when other topics are introduced. The entire Song of Solomon many regard as purely an erotic idol, and considered as such it possesses excellences of a very high description. In Amo 6:3 sq. may be seen a tine passage of satire in a denunciation of the luxurious and oppressive aristocracy of Israel. Subjects of a similar secular kind may be found treated, yet never without a moral or religious aim, in Isa 9:3; Jer 25:10; Jer 48:33; Rev 18:22 sq. But, independently of the Song of Solomon, the most sensuous ode is perhaps the 45th Psalm, which Herder and Ewall consider an epithalamium. Further illustrations of this part of the subject appear under the next division.

The poetical character of the Revelation of John is evident to every attentive reader. Many parts are professedly songs, formal expressions of praise, triumph, or mourning. The language is not only highly figurative,  but it everywhere abounds with the most poetical images and modes of expression. Bishop Jebb has presented some of the songs in the form of Hebrew poetry; and Prof. Stuart has shown the metrical arrangement of a few other portions; he has also expressed his conviction that the form of poetry, as well as its spirit, prevails to a great extent throughout the work. The references to the Old Test. in this book are more numerous than in any other book of the New Test.; and they are not simple quotations, nor the transference of thought to a less poetic style of expression; but they are imitations, in general more poetic than the original. That they are presented in the form of Hebrew, and not of Grecian poetry, can occasion no surprise. No other poetry would accord, either with the habit of the apostle, or with the general character and design of the Bible. But this form of poetry would perfectly harmonize with both. The poetry of the Revelation of John appears to consist of the same description of parallelisms, with those intercalary lines and other irregularities which are found in the larger specimens of Hebrew poetry. The species of parallelism which most prevails is the synthetic or constructive; the others being obviously less suitable to the subject of the composition. There are, however, instances of every kind. Indeed, this book not only possesses the form and the spirit of Hebrew poetry, but it exhibits as much regularity in its parallelisms as any Hebrew poetry with which it can be justly compared. We give the following passages (Rev 1:1; Rev 1:5-6; Rev 21:23):

“The revelation of Jesus Christ,

Which God to him imparted,

To indicate unto his servants

What must come to pass ere long.

“To Him who loveth us, and washed us

From our sins in his own blood:

And constituted us a kingdom,

Priests unto God, even his Father,

To him be glory and dominion,

For ever and ever, Amen!

“And the city has no need of the sun

Nor of the moon to shine in it;

For the glory of God illumines it,

And the light thereof is the Lamb.”

III. Classification of Poetic Styles. — According to the Ancient Hebrew Designations— These appear to have special, if not exclusive reference to  what is now known as lyric poetry. The terms are of two classes. SEE PSALMS.

a. General titles, referring apparently to the musical form or purpose of the compositions.

(1.) שַׁיר, shir, a song in general, adapted for the voice alone.

(2.) מַזְמוֹר, mizmor, which Ewald considers a lyric song, properly so called, but which rather seems to correspond with the Greek ψαλμός, a psalm, or song to be sung with any instrumental accompaniment. SEE PSALM.

(3.) נְגַינָה, neginadh, which Ewald is of opinion is equivalent to the Greek ψαλμός, is more probably a melody expressly adapted for stringed instruments.

(4.) מִשְׂכַּיל, maskil, of which it may be said that if Ewald's suggestion be not correct, that it denotes a lyrical song requiring nice musical skill, it is difficult to give any more probable explanation. SEE MASCHEL.

(5.) מַכְתָּם, miktaim, a term of extremely doubtful meaning. SEE MICHTAM.

(6.) שַׁגָּיוֹן, shiggayon (Psa 7:1), a wild, irregular, dithyrambic song, as the word appears to denote; or, according to some, a song to be sung with variations. The former is the more probable meaning. The plural occurs in Hab 3:1. SEE SHIGGAION.

b. But, besides these, there are other divisions of lyrical poetry of great importance, which have regard rather to the subject of the poems than to their form or adaptation for musical accompaniments. Of these we notice:

(1.) תְּהלָּה, tehillah, a hymn of praise. The plural tehillim is the title of the book of Psalms in Hebrew. The 145th Psalm is entitled “David's (Psalm) of praise;” and the subject of the psalm is in accordance with its title, which is apparently suggested by the concluding verse, “The praise of Jehovah my mouth shall speak, and let all flesh bless his holy name for ever and ever.” To this class belong the songs which relate to extraordinary deliverances, such as the songs of Moses (Exodus 15) and of Deborah (Judges 5), and the Psalms 18, 68, which have all the air of chants to be sung in triumphal processions. Such were the hymns sung in the Temple-services,  and by a bold figure the Almighty is apostrophized as “Thou that inhabitest the praises of Israel,” which rose in the holy place with the fragrant clouds of incense (Psa 22:3). To the same class also Ewald refers the shorter poems of the like kind with those already quoted, such as Psalms 30, 32, 138, and Isaiah 38, which relate to less general occasions, and commemorate more special deliverances. The songs of victory sung by the congregation in the Temple, as Psalms 46, 48; Psa 24:7-10, which is a short triumphal ode, and Psalms 29, which praises Jehovah on the occasion of a great natural phenomenon, are likewise all to be classed in this division of lyric poetry. SEE HYMN.

(2.) קַינָה, kindh, the lament, or dirge, of which there are many examples, whether uttered over an individual or as an outburst of grief for the calamities of the land. The most touchingly pathetic of all is perhaps the lament of David for the death of Saul and Jonathan (2Sa 1:19-27), in which passionate emotion is blended with touches of tenderness of which only a strong nature is capable. Compare with this the lament for Abner (2Sa 3:33-34) and for Absalom (18:33). Of the same character also, doubtless, were the songs which the singing men and singing women spake over Josiah at his death (2Ch 35:25), and the songs of mourning for the disasters which befell the hapless land of Judah, of which Psalms 49, 60, 78, 137 are examples (comp. Jer 7:29; Jer 9:10 [9]) and the Lamentations of Jeremiah the most memorable instances. SEE LAMENTATION.

(3.) שַׁיר יְדַירֹת, shir yediddth, a love-song (Psa 45:1), in its external form at least. SEE CANTICLES.

(4.) תְּפַלָּה, tephillah, prayer, is the title of Psalms 17, 86, 90, 102, 142, and Habakkuk 3. All these are strictly lyrical compositions, and the title may have been assigned to them either as denoting the object with which they were written, or the use to which they were applied. As Ewald justly observes, all lyric poetry of an elevated kind, in so far as it reveals the soul of the poet in a pure swift outpouring of itself, is of the nature of a prayer; and hence the term “prayer” was applied to a collection of David's songs, of which Psalms 72 formed the conclusion. SEE PRAYER.

Other kinds of poetry there are which occupy the middle ground between the lyric and gnomic, being lyric in form and spirit, but gnomic in subject. These may be classed as

(5.) מָשָׁל, mashal, properly a similitude, and then a. parable, or sententious saying, couched in poetic language. Such are the songs of Balaam (Num 23:7; Num 23:18; Num 24:3; Num 24:15; Num 24:20-21; Num 24:23), which are eminently lyrical in character; the mocking ballad in Num 21:27-30, which has been conjectured to be a fragment of an old Amoritish war-song; and the apologue of Jotham (Jdg 9:7-20), both which last are strongly satirical in tone. But the finest of all is the magnificent prophetic song of triumph over the fall of Babylon (Isa 14:4-27).

(6.) חידָה, chidah, an enigma (like the riddle of Samson, Jdg 14:14), or “dark saying,” as the A.V. has it in Psa 49:5; Psa 78:2. The former passage illustrates the musical, and therefore lyrical character of these “dark sayings:” “I will incline mine ear to a parable, I will open my dark sayings upon the harp.” Macshal and chidah are used as convertible terms in Eze 17:2.

(7.) Lastly, to this class belongs מְלַיצָה, melitsah, a mocking, ironical poem (Hab 2:6).

2. The Masoretic Distribution. — The Jewish grammarians have attached the poetic accentuation only to the three books of Psalms, Job, and Proverbs. There is no doubt that the Song of Solomon is also poetical; and with these the book of Ecclesiastes was anciently, as it is still usually, conjoined, though the form of composition is less decidedly poetical. To these five are to be added the Lamentations of Jeremiah, and the smaller pieces scattered over the historical and prophetic writings. Keeping these latter out of view, we may say that the Hebrew poetical books are six in number; and these six may be divided into two groups of three, according to the class of poetical composition to which each belongs, viz.

(1) Psalms, Song of Solomon, and Lamentations, which are predominantly lyrical in their character; and

(2) Proverbs, Job, and Ecclesiastes, which are predominantly didactic. In the former the leading aim of the poet is not to instruct, but to give free utterance to the feelings of his own heart; in the latter the instruction of others is the object that is principally aimed at; though neither is the lyrical element altogether excluded from the latter, nor the didactic from the former. Of the more sustained and elaborate epic and dramatic poetry which was alike alien to the character of the Hebrew mind, and also in a certain measure inconsistent with the purpose of the Hebrew writings as a  divine revelation we have no examples, though some have applied the term “dramatic” in a loose sense to the book of Job, and in a more strict sense to the Song of Solomon.

3. Modern Terminology. — For epic poetry the constituent elements do not appear to have existed during the classic period of the Hebrew muse, since epic poetry requires a heroic age an age, that is, of fabulous wonders, and falsely so-called divine interpositions. But among the Israelites the patriarchal, which might have been the heroic age, was an age of truth and reality; and it much raises the religious and historical value of the Biblical literature that neither the singular events of the age of the patriarchs, nor the wonderful events of the age of Moses, nor the confused and somewhat legendary events of the age of the Judges, ever degenerated into mythology, nor passed from the reality, which was their essence, into the noble fictions into which the imagination, if unchastened and unchecked by religion, might have wrought them; but they retained through all periods their own essential character of earnest, lofty, and impressive realities. At a later period, when the religion of Moses had, during the Babylonian captivity, been lowered by the corruptions of the religion of Zoroaster, and an entirely new world of thought introduced, based not on reality but fancy, emanating not from the pure light of heaven, but from the mingled lights and shadows of primitive tradition and human speculation -then there came into existence among the Jews the elements necessary for epic poetry; but the days were gone in which the mind of the nation had the requisite strength and culture to fashion them into a great, uniform, and noble structure; and if we can allow that the Hebrews possessed the rudimental outlines of the epic, we must seek for them not in the canonical, but in the apocryphal books; and while we deny with emphasis that the term Epos can be applied as some German critics have applied it, to the Pentateuch, we can find only in the book of Judith, and with rather more reason in that of Tobit, anything which approaches to epic poetry. Indeed fiction, which, if it is not the essence, enters for a very large share into both epic and dramatic poetry, was wholly alien from the genius of the Hebrew muse, whose high and noble function was not to invent, but to celebrate the goodness of God; not to indulge the fancy, but to express the deepest feelings of the soul; not to play with words and feign emotions, but to utter profound truth and commemorate real events, and pour forth living sentiments.  Of the three kinds of poetry which are illustrated by the Hebrew literature, the lyric occupies the foremost place, commencing, as we have seen, in the pre-Mosaic times, flourishing in rude vigor during the earlier periods of the Judges, the heroic age of the Hebrews, growing with the nation's growth and strengthening with its strength, till it reached its highest excellence in David, the warrior-poet, and thenceforth began slowly to decline. In this period art, though subordinate, was not neglected, as indeed is proved by the noble lyrics which have come down to us and in which the art is only relatively small and low— that is, the art is inconsiderable and secondary— merely because the topics are so august, the sentiments so grand, the religious impression so profound and sacred. At later periods, when the first fresh gushing of the muse had ceased, art in Hebrew, as is the case in all other poetry, began to claim a larger share of attention, and stands in the poems for a greater portion of their merit. Then the play of the imagination grew predominant over the spontaneous outpourings of the soul, and among other creations of the fancy alphabetical poems were produced, in which the matter is artistically distributed sometimes under two-and-twenty heads or divisions, corresponding with the number of the Hebrew letters.

Gnomic poetry is the product of a more advanced age than the lyric. It arises from the desire felt by the poet to express the results of the accumulated experiences of life in a form of beauty and permanence. Its thoughtful character requires for its development a time of peacefulness and leisure; for it gives expression, not like the lyric to the sudden and impassioned feelings of the moment, but to calm and philosophic reflection. Being less spontaneous in its origin, its form is of necessity more artificial. The gnomic poetry of the Hebrews has not its measured flow disturbed by the shock of arms or the tumult of camps; it rises silently, like the Temple of old, without the sound of a weapon, and its groundwork is the home life of the nation. The period during which it flourished corresponds to its domestic and settled character. From the time of David onwards through the reigns of the earlier kings, when the nation was quiet and at peace, or, if not at peace, at least so firmly fixed in its acquired territory that its wars were no struggle for existence, gnomic poetry blossomed and bore fruit. We meet with it at intervals up to the time of the Captivity, and, as it is chiefly characteristic of the age of the monarchy, Ewald has appropriately designated this sera the “artificial period” of Hebrew poetry. From the end of the 8th century B.C. the decline of the nation was rapid, and with its  glory departed the chief glories of its literature. The poems of this period are distinguished by a smoothness of diction and an external polish which betray tokens of labor and art; the style is less flowing and easy, and, except in rare instances, there is no dash of the ancient vigor. After the Captivity we have nothing but the poems which formed part of the liturgical services of the Temple.

Whether dramatic poetry, properly so called, ever existed among the Hebrews, is, to say the least, extremely doubtful. In the opinion of some writers the Song of Songs, in its external form, is a rude drama, designed for a simple stage. But the evidence for this view is extremely slight, and no good and sufficient reasons have been adduced which would lead us to conclude that the amount of dramatic action exhibited in that poem is more than would be involved in an animated poetic dialogue in which more than two persons take part. Philosophy and the drama appear alike to have been peculiar to the Indo-Germanic nations, and to have manifested themselves among the Shemitic tribes only in their crudest and most simple form.

Each of these forms of poetry, as they appear in the Bible, requires a more distinct notice separately.

(1.) Lyrical Poetry. — The literature of the Hebrews abounds with illustrations of all forms of lyrical poetry, in its most manifold and wide- embracing compass, from such short ejaculations as the songs of the two Lamechs, and Psalms 15, 117, and others, to the longer chants of victory and thanksgiving, like the songs of Deborah and David (Judges 5; Psalms 18). The thoroughly national character of all lyrical poetry has already been alluded to. It is the utterance of the people's life in all its varied phases, and expresses all its most earnest strivings and impulses. In proportion as this expression is vigorous and animated, the idea embodied in lyric song is in most cases narrowed or rather concentrated. One truth, and even one side of a truth, is for the time invested with the greatest prominence. All these characteristics will be found in perfection in the lyric poetry of the Hebrews. One other feature which distinguishes it is its form and its capacity for being set to musical accompaniment. The names by which the various kinds of song were known among the Hebrews will supply some illustration of this. (See above.)

(2.) Gnomic Poetry. — The second grand division of Hebrew poetry is occupied by a class of poems which are peculiarly Shemitic, and which represent the nearest approaches made by the people of that race to  anything like philosophic thought. Reasoning there is none: we have only results, and these rather the product of observation and reflection than of induction or argumentation. As lyric poetry is the expression of the poet's own feelings and impulses, so gnomic poetry is the form in which the desire of communicating knowledge to others finds vent. There might possibly be an intermediate stage in which the poets gave out their experiences for their own pleasure merely, and afterwards applied them to the instruction of others, but this could scarcely have been of long continuance. The impulse to teach makes the teacher, and the teacher must have an audience. It has already been remarked that gnomic poetry, as a whole, requires for its development a period of national tranquility. Its germs are the floating proverbs which pass current in the mouths of the people, and embody the experiences of many with the wit of one. From this small beginning it arises, at a time when the experience of the nation has become matured, and the mass of truths which are the result of such experience have passed into circulation. The fame of Solomon's wisdom was so great that no less than three thousand proverbs are attributed to him, this being the form in which the Hebrew mind found its most congenial utterance. The sayer of sententious sayings was to the Hebrews the wise man, the philosopher. Of the earlier isolated proverbs but few examples remain. One of the earliest occurs in the mouth of David, and in his time it was the proverb of the ancients, “From the wicked cometh wickedness” (1Sa 24:13 [14]). Later on, when the fortunes of the nation were obscured, their experience was embodied in terms of sadness and despondency: “The days are prolonged, and every vision faileth,” became a saying and a byword (Eze 12:22); and the feeling that the people were suffering for the sins of their fathers took the form of a sentence, “The fathers have eaten sour grapes, and the children's teeth are set on edge” (Eze 18:2). Such were the models which the gnomic poet had before him for imitation. These detached sentences may fairly be assumed to be the earliest form, of which the fuller apophthegm is the expansion, swelling into sustained exhortations, and even dramatic dialogue. SEE PROVERB.

(3.) Dramatic Poetry. — The drama, in the sense in which the phrase is applicable to productions such as those of Euripides, Shakespeare, or Schiller, had no place in the literature of the Hebrews. This defect may be owing to a want of the requisite literary cultivation. Yet we are not willing to assign this as the cause, when we call to mind the high intellectual  culture which the Hebrews evinced in lyric and didactic poetry, out of which the drama seems naturally to spring. We rather look for the cause of this in the earnest nature of the Hebrews, and in the solemnity of the subjects with which they had to do in their literary productions. Nor is it any objection to this hypothesis that the drama of modern times had its birth in the religious mysteries of the Middle Ages, since those ages were only secondary in regard to religious truth, standing at a distance from the great realities which they believed and dramatized; whereas the objects of faith with the Israelites were held in all the fresh vividness of primitive facts and newly recognized truths. It is impossible, however, to assert that no form of the drama existed among the Hebrew people; the most that can be done is to examine such portions of their literature as have come down to us, for the purpose of ascertaining how far any traces of the drama proper are discernible, and what inferences may be made from them.

It is unquestionably true, as Ewald observes, that the Arab reciters of romances will many times in their own persons act out a complete drama in recitation, changing their voice and gestures with the change of person and subject. Something of this kind may possibly have existed among the Hebrews; but there is no evidence that it did exist, nor any grounds for making even a probable conjecture with regard to it. A rude kind of farce is described by Mr. Lane (Mod. Egypt, 2, ch. 7), the players of which “are called Mohabbazin. These frequently perform at the festivals prior to weddings and circumcisions at the houses of the great; and sometimes attract rings of auditors and spectators in the public places in Cairo. Their performances are scarcely worthy of description: it is chiefly by vulgar gestures and indecent actions that they amuse and obtain applause. The actors are only men and boys, the part of a woman being always performed by a man or boy in female attire.” Then follows a description of one of these plays the plot of which was extremely simple. But the mere fact of the existence of these rude exhibitions among the Arabs and Egyptians of the present day is of no weight when the question to be decided is whether the Song of Songs was designed to be so represented, as a simple, pastoral drama. Of course, in considering such a question, reference' is made only to the external form of the poem, and, in order to prove it, it must be shown that the dramatic is the only form of representation which it could assume, and not that, by the help of two actors and a chorus, it is capable of being exhibited in a dramatic form. All that has been done, in our opinion, is the latter. It is but fair, however, to give the views of those who hold the opposite. Ewald maintains that the Song of Songs is designed for  a simple stage, because it develops a complete action and admits of definite pauses in the action, which are only suited to the drama. He distinguishes it in this respect from the book of Job, which is dramatic in form only, though, as it is occupied with a sublime subject, he compares it with tragedy, while the Song of Songs, being taken from the common life of the nation, may be compared to comedy.

But M. Renan, who is compelled, in accordance with his own theory of the mission of the Shemitic races, to admit that no trace of anything approaching to the regular drama is found among them, does not regard the Song of Songs as a drama in the same sense as the products of the Greek and Roman theatres, but as dramatic poetry in the widest application of the term, to designate any composition conducted in dialogue and corresponding to an action. The absence of the regular drama he attributes to the want of a complicated mythology, analogous to that possessed by the Indo-European peoples. Monotheism, the characteristic religious belief of the Shemitic races, stifled the growth of a mythology and checked the development of the drama. Be this as it may, dramatic representation appears to have been alien to the feelings of the Hebrews. At no period of their history before the age of Herod is there the least trace of a theatre at Jerusalem, whatever other foreign innovations may have been adopted; and the burst of indignation which the high-priest Jason incurred for attempting to establish a gymnasium and to introduce the Greek games is a significant symptom of' the repugnance which the people felt for such spectacles. The same antipathy remains to the present day among the Arabs, and the attempts to introduce theatres at Beyrut and in Algeria have signally failed. But, says M. Renan, the Song of Songs is a dramatic poem there were no public performances in Palestine, therefore it must have been represented in private; and he is compelled to frame the following hypothesis concerning it: that it is a libretto intended to be completed by the play of the actors and by music, and represented in private families, probably at marriage-feasts, the representation being extended over the several days of the feast. The last supposition removes a difficulty which has been felt to be almost fatal to the idea that the poem is a continuously developed drama. Each act is complete in itself; there is no suspended interest, and the structure of the poem is obvious and natural if' we regard each act as a separate drama intended for one of the days of the feast. We must look for a parallel to; it in the Middle Ages, when, besides the mystery plays, there were scenic representations sufficiently developed. SEE CANTICLES.

It is scarcely necessary after this to discuss the question whether the book of Job is a dramatic poem or not. Inasmuch as it represents all action and a progress, it is a drama as truly and really as any poem can be which develops the working of passion, and the alternations of faith, hope, distrust, triumphant confidence, and black despair, in the struggle which it depicts the human mind as engaged in, while attempting to solve one of the most intricate problems it can be called upon to regard, It is a drama as life is a drama, the most powerful of all tragedies; but that it is a dramatic poem, intended to be represented upon a stage, or capable of being so represented, may be confidently denied. SEE JOB, BOOK OF.

(4.) Acrostics. — It only remains to notice that there are twelve poems in which the letters beginning each verse or couplet or stanza are arranged in alphabetical order. These are seven Psalms (viz. Psalms 25, 34, 37, 111, 112, 119, 145), Pro 31:10-31, and the first four chapters of the book of Lamentations. The device is a very simple one, and was probably adopted for the purpose of assisting the memory, and to make up for the want of a logical connection and progress in the thought. The more sublime poetry does not admit of being thus fettered. The Psalms in which we meet with it are all of a subdued and simple character, usually didactic. Yet even in these the alphabetical arrangement is seldom quite exact, usually one or two letters are omitted or repeated or transposed. In some of the alphabetic poems the strophical arrangement is marked more distinctly than in any other of the Hebrew poetical compositions; for example, in Psalms 119, which consists of twenty-two stanzas of eight lines each; and Lamentations 3, in which the stanza is of three lines. SEE PSALMS, BOOK OF.

IV. History of the Treatments of Hebrew Poetry. — In the 16th and 17th centuries the influence of classical studies upon the minds of the learned was so great as to imbue them with the belief that the writers of Greece and Rome were the models of all excellence; and consequently, when their learning and critical acumen were directed to the records of another literature, they were unable to divest themselves of the prejudices of early education and habits, and sought for the same excellences which they admired in their favorite models. That this has been the case with regard to most of the speculations on the poetry of the Hebrews, and that the failure of those speculations is mainly due to this cause, will be abundantly manifest to any one who is acquainted with the literature of the subject. But, however barren of results, the history of the various theories which  have been framed with regard to the external form of Hebrew poetry is a necessary part of the present article.

The form of Hebrew poetry is its distinguishing characteristic, and what this form is has been a vexed question for many ages. The ‘herapeutte, as described by Philo (De Vita Contempl. § 3, vol. 2, p. 475, ed. Mang.), sang hymns and psalms of thanksgiving to God, in divers measures and strains; and these were either new or ancient ones composed by the old poets, who had left behind them measures and melodies of trimeter verses, of processional songs, of hymns, of songs sung at the offering of libations or before the altar, and continuous choral songs, beautifully measured out in strophes of intricate character (§ 10, p. 484). The value of Philo's testimony on this point may be estimated by another passage in his works, in which he claims for Moses a knowledge of numbers and geometry, the theory of rhythm, harmony, and meter, and the whole science of music, practical and theoretical (De Vita Josis, 1, 5, vol. 2, p. 84).

The evidence of Josephus is as little to be relied upon. Both these writers labored to magnify the greatness of their own nation, and to show that in literature and philosophy the Greeks had been anticipated by the Hebrew barbarians. This idea pervades all their writings, and it must always be borne in mind as the keynote of their testimony on this as on other points. According to Josephus (Anit. 2, 16, 4), the Song of Moses at the Red Sea (Exodus 15) was composed in the hexameter measure (ἐν ἑξαμέτρῳ τόνῳ); and again (Ant. 4, 8, 44), the song in Deuteronomy 32 is described as a hexameter poem. The Psalms of David were in various meters, some trimeters and some pentaneters (Ant. 7, 12, 3). Eusebius (De Praea. Evang. 113, p. 514, ed. Col. 1688) characterizes the great Song of Moses and the 118th (119th) Psalm as metrical compositions in what the Greeks call the heroic meter. They are said to be hexameters of sixteen syllables. The other verse compositions of the Hebrews are said to be in trimeters. This saying of Eusebius is attacked by Julian (Cyrill. Contempul. 7, 2), who on his part endeavored to prove the Hebrews devoid of all culture. Jerome (Prim in Hiob) appeals to Philo, Josephus, Origen, and Eusebius, for proof that the Psalter, the Lamentations of Jeremiah, and almost all the songs of Scripture, are composed in meter, like the odes of Horace, Pindar, Alcweus, and Sappho. Again, he says that the book of Job from 3:3 to 42:6 is in hexameters, with dactyls and spondees, and frequently, on account of the peculiarity of the Hebrew language, other feet which have not the same syllables but the same time. In Epist. ad Patulam (Opp. 2, 709, ed.  Martianay) occurs a passage which shows in some measure how far we are to understand literally the terms which Jerome has borrowed from the verse literature of Greece and Rome, and applied to the poetry of the Hebrews. The conclusion seems inevitable that these terms are employed simply to denote a general external resemblance, and by no means to indicate the existence among the poets of the Old Testament of a knowledge of the laws of meter, as we are accustomed to understand the term.

There are, says Jerome, four alphabetical Psalms, the 110th (111th), 111th (112th), 118th (119th), and the 144th (145th). In the first two, one letter corresponds to each clause or versicle, which is written in trimeter iambics. The others are in tetrameter iambics, like the song in Deuteronomy. In Psalms 118 (119) eight verses follow each letter: in Psalms 144 (145) a letter corresponds to a verse. In Lamentations we have four alphabetical acrostics, the first two of which are written in a kind of Sapphic meter; for three clauses which are connected together and begin with one letter (i.e. in the first clause) close with a period in heroic measure (Heroici comma). The third is written in trimeter, and the verses in threes each begin with the same letter. The fourth is like the first and second. The Proverbs end with an alphabetical poem in tetrameter iambics, beginning, “A virtuous woman who can find?” In the Praef. in Chron. Euseb. Jerome compares the meters of the Psalms to those of Horace and Pindar, now running in iambics, now ringing with Alcaics, now swelling with Sapphics, now beginning with a half foot. What, he asks, is more beautiful than the song of Deuteronomy and Isaiah? ‘What more weighty than Solomon? What more perfect than Job? All these, as Josephus and Origen testify, are composed in hexameters and pentameters. There can be little doubt that these terms are mere generalities, and express no more than a certain rough resemblance, so that the songs of Moses and Isaiah may be designated hexameters and pentameters with as much propriety as the first and second chapters of Lamentations may be compared to Sapphic odes. The resemblance of the Hebrew verse composition to the classic metres is expressly denied by Gregory of Nyssa (1 Tract. in Psalm. cap. 4). Augustine (Ep. 131 ad Numeriulm) confesses his ignorance of Hebrew, but adds that those skilled in the language believed the Psalms of David to be written in metre. Isidore of Seville (Orig. 1, 18) claims for the heroic meter the highest antiquity, inasmuch as the Song of Moses was composed in it, and the book of Job, who was contemporary with Moses, long before the times of Pherecydes and Homer, is written in dactyls and spondees. Joseph Scaliger (Animadv. ad Eus. Chron. p. 6 b, etc.) was one of the first to  point out the fallacy of Jerome's statement with regard to the meters of the Psalter and the Lamentations, and to assert that these books contained no verse bound by metrical laws, but that their language was merely prose, animated by a poetic spirit. lie admitted the Song of Moses in Deuteronomy, the Proverbs, and Job to be the only books in which there was necessarily any trace of rhythm, and this rhythm he compares to that of two diameter iambics, sometimes of more, sometimes of fewer syllables, as the sense required. Gerhard Vossius (Be Nat. et Const. Artis Poet. lib. 1, c. 13, § 2) says that in Job and the Proverbs there is rhythm but no meter; that is, regard is had to the number of syllables, but not to their quantity. In the Psalms and Lamentations not even rhythm is observed.

But in spite of the opinions pronounced by these high authorities, there were still many who believed in the existence of a Hebrew meter, and in the possibility of recovering it. The theories proposed for this purpose were various. Gomarus, professor at Groningen (Davidis Lyra, Lugd. Bat. 1637), advocated both rhymes and meter; for the latter he laid down the following rules. The vowel alone, as it is long or short, determines the length of a syllable. Sheva forms no syllable. The periods or versicles of the Hebrew poems never contain less than a distich, or two verses, but in proportion as the periods are longer they contain more verses. The last syllable of a verse is indifferently long or short. This system, if system it may be called (for it is equally adapted for prose), was supported by many men of note; among others by the younger Buxtorf, Heinsius, L. de Dieu, Constantin l'Empereur, and Hottinger. On the other hand, it was vigorously attacked by L. Cappellus, Calovius, Danhauer, Pfeiffer, and Solomon van Til. Towards the close of the 17th century Marcus Meibomius announced to the world, with an amount of pompous assurance which is charming, that he had discovered the lost metrical system of the Hebrews. By the help of this mysterious secret, which he attributed to divine revelation, he proposed to restore not only the Psalms, but the whole Hebrew Scriptures, to their pristine condition, and thus confer upon the world a knowledge of Hebrew greater than any which had existed since the ages which preceded the Alexandrine translators. But Meibomius did not allow his enthusiasm to get the better of his prudence, and the condition on which this portentous secret was to be made public was that six thousand curious men should contribute £5 sterling apiece for a copy of his ‘book, which was to be printed in two volumes folio. It is almost needless to add that his scheme fell to the ground. He published some  specimens of his restoration of ten Psalms and six entire chapters of the Old Test. in 1690. The glimpses which he gives of his grand secret are not such as would make us regret that the knowledge of it perished with him.

The whole book of Psalms, he says, is written in distiches, except the first Islam, which is in a different meter, and serves as all introduction to the rest. They were therefore intended to be sung, not by one priest, or by one chorus, but by two. Meibomits “was severely chastised by J. H. Mains, B. II. Gebhardus, and J.G. Zentgravius” (Jebb, Sacr. Lit. p. 11). In the last century the learned Francis Hare, bishop of Chichester, published an edition of the Hebrew Psalms, metrically divided, to which he prefixed a dissertation on the ancient poetry of the Hebrews (Psalm. lib. in versiculos metriae divisuis, etc., Lond. 1736). Bishop Hare maintained that in Hebrew poetry no regard was had to the quantity of syllables. He regarded shivaus as long vowels, and long vowels as short at his pleasure. The rules which he laid down are the following. In Hebrew poetry all the feet are disyllables, and no regard is had to the quantity of a syllable. Clauses consist of an equal or unequal number of syllables. If the number of syllables be equal, the verses are trochaic, if unequal, iambic. Periods for the most part consist of two verses, often three or four, sometimes more. Clauses of the same periods are of the same kind, that is, either iambic or trochaic, with very few exceptions. Trochaic clauses generally agree in the number of the feet, which are sometimes three, as in Psa 94:1; Psa 106:1, and this is the most frequent; sometimes five, as in Psa 9:5. In iambic clauses the number of feet is sometimes the same, but they generally differ. Both kinds of verse are mixed in the same poem. In order to carry out these rules, they are supplemented by one which gives to the versifier the widest license. Words and verses are contracted or lengthened at will, by syncope, elision, etc. In addition to this, the bishop was under the necessity of maintaining that all grammarians had hitherto erred in laving down the rules of ordinary punctuation. His system, if it may be so called, carries its own refutation with it, but was considered by Lowth to be worthy a reply under the title of Metricae Harianae Brevis Confutatio, printed at the end of his De Sacra Poes. Heb. Praelectiones, etc.

Anton (Conject. de Metro Heb. Ant. Lips. 1770), admitting the meter to be regulated by the accents, endeavored to prove that in the Hebrew poems there was a highly artistic and regular system, like that of the Greeks and Romans, consisting of strophes, antistrophes, epodes, and the like; but his method is as arbitrary as Hare's. The theory of Lautwein (Versuch einer  richtingen Teorie von der bibl. Verskunst, Tub. 1775) is an improvement upon those of his predecessors, inasmuch as he rejects the measurement of verse by long and short syllables, and marks the scansion by the tone accent. He assumes little more than a free rhythm: the verses are distinguished by a certain relation in their contents, and connected by a poetic euphony. Sir W. Jones (Comment. Poes. Asiut. 1774) attempted to apply the rules of Arabic meter to Hebrew. He regarded as a long syllable one which terminated in a consonant or quiescent letter (א, ה, י); but he did not develop any system. The present Arabic prosody, however, is of comparatively modern invention; and it is not consistent with probability that there could be any system of versification among the Hebrews like that imagined by Sir W. Jones, when in the example he quotes of Son 1:5 he refers the first clause of the verse to the second, and the last to the fifteenth kind of Arabic meter. Greve (Ultima Caopita Jobi, etc., 1791) believed that in Hebrew, as in Arabic and Syriac, there was a metre, but that it was obscured by the false orthography of the Masorets. He therefore assumed for the Hebrew an Arabic vocalization, and with this modification lie found iambic trimeters, dimeters, and tetrameters to be the most common forms of verse, and lays down the laws of versification accordingly. Bellermann (Vetsuch über lie Metrik der Hebräer, 1813) was the last who attempted to set forth the old Hebrew meters. He adopted the Masoretic orthography and vocalization, and determined the quantity of syllables by the accentuation, and what he termed the Morensystem,” denoting by moren the compass of a single syllable. Each syllable which has not the tone accent must have three moren; every syllable which has the tone accent may have either four or two, but generally three. The moren are reckoned as follows: a long vowel has two; a short vowel, one; every consonant, whether single or double, has one more. Sheva simple or composite is not reckoned. The quiescent letters have no more. Dagesh forte compensative has one; so has metheg. The majority of dissyllabic and trisyllabic words, having the accent on the last syllable, will thus form iambics and anapests. But as many have the accent on the penultimate, these will form trochees. The most common kinds of feet are iambics and anapests, interchanging with trochees and tribrachs. Of verses composed of these feet, though not uniform as regards the numbers of the feet, consist, according to Bellermann, the poems of the Hebrew Scriptures.

Among those who believed in the existence of a Hebrew meter, but in the impossibility of recovering it, were Carpzov, Lowth, Pfeiffer, Herder to a  certain extent, Jahn, Bauer, and Buxtorf. The opinions of Lowth, with regard to Hebrew meter, are summed up by Jebb (Sacr. Lit. p. 16) as follows: “He begins by asserting that certain of the Hebrew writings are not only animated with the true poetic spirit, but in some degree couched in poetic numbers; yet he allows that the quantity, the rhythm, or modulation of Hebrew poetry, not only is unknown, but admits of no investigation by human art or industry; he states, after Abarbanel, that the Jews themselves disclaim the very memory of metrical composition; he acknowledges that the artificial conformation of the sentences is the sole indication of meter in these poems; he barely maintains the credibility of attention having been paid to numbers or feet in their compositions; and at the same time he confesses the utter impossibility of determining whether Hebrew poetry was modulated by the ear alone, or according to any definite and settled rules of prosody.” The opinions of Scaliger and Vossius have already been referred to. Vitringa allows to Isaiah a kind of oratorial measure, but adds that it could not on this account be rightly termed poetry. Michaelis (Not. 4 in Prael. 3), in his notes on Lowth, held that there never was meter in Hebrew, but only a free rhythm, as in recitative, though even less trammeled.

He declared himself against the Masoretic distinction of long and short vowels, and made the rhythm to depend upon tie tone syllable; adding, with regard to fixed and regular meter, that what has evaded such diligent search he thought had no existence. On the subject of the rhythmical character of Hebrew poetry, as opposed to metrical, the remarks of Jebb are remarkably appropriate. “Hebrew poetry,” he says (Sacr. Lit. p. 20), “is universal poetry; the poetry of all languages, and of all peoples: the collocation of words (whatever may have been the sound, for of this we are quite ignorant) is primarily directed to secure the best possible announcement and discrimination of the sense: let, then, a translator only be literal, and, so far as the genius of his language will permit, let him preserve the original order of the words, and he will infallibly put the reader in possession of all, or nearly all, that the Hebrew text can give to the best Hebrew scholar of the present day. Now, had there originally been meter the case, it is presumed, could hardly have been such; somewhat must have been sacrificed to the importunities of metrical necessity; the sense could not invariably have predominated over the sound; and the poetry could not have been, as it unquestionably and emphatically is, a poetry, not of sounds or of words, but of things. Let not this last assertion, however, be misinterpreted: I would be understood merely to assert that sound, and words in subordination to sound, do not in  Hebrew, as in classical poetry, enter into the essence of the thing; but it is happily undeniable that the words of the poetical Scriptures are exquisitely fitted to convey the sense; and it is highly probable that, in the lifetime of the language, the sounds were sufficiently harmonious: when I say sufficiently harmonious, I mean so harmonious as to render the poetry grateful to the ear in recitation, and suitable to musical accompaniment; for which purpose the cadence of well-modulated prose would fully answer; a fact which will not be controverted by any person with a moderately good ear that has ever heard a chapter of Isaiah skillfully read from our authorized translation; that has ever listened to one of Kent's anthems well performed, or to a song from the Messiah of Handel.”

Abarbanel (on Isaiah 5) makes three divisions of Hebrew poetry, including in the first the modern poems which, in imitation of the Arabic, are constructed according to modern principles of versification. Among the second class he arranges such as have no meter, but are adapted to melodies. In these occur the poetical forms of words, lengthened and abbreviated, and the like. To this class belong the songs of Moses in Exodus 15, Deuteronomy 32, the song of Deborah, and the song of David. The third class includes those compositions which are distinguished not by their form, but by the figurative character of their descriptions, as the Song of Songs, and the song of Isaiah.

Among those who maintain the absence of any regularity perceptible to the ear in the composition of Hebrew poetry may be mentioned Richard Simon (Hist. Lit. du V. T. 1, c. 8, p. 57), Wasmuth (Inst. Acc. Hebr. p. 14), Alstedius (Enc. Bibl. c. 27, p. 257), the author of the book Cozri, and R. Azariah de Rossi, in his book entitled Meor Enayim. The author of the book Cozri held that the Hebrews had no meter bound by the laws of diction, because their poetry, being intended to be sung, was independent of metrical laws. 1. Azariah expresses his approbation of the opinions Pf Cozri and Abarbanel, who deny the existence of songs in Scripture composed after the manner of modern Hebrew poems, but he adds, nevertheless, that beyond doubt there are other measures which depend upon the sense. Mendelssohn (on Exodus 15) also rejects the system of יתדית ותנוערת (literally, pegs and vowels). R. Azariah appears to have anticipated bishop Lowth in his theory of parallelism: at any rate his treatise contains the germ which Lowth developed and may be considered, as Jebb calls it, the technical basis of his system. But it also contains other elements, which will be alluded to hereafter. His conclusion, in Lowth's  words (Isaiah, prel. diss.), was as follows: “That the sacred songs have undoubtedly certain measures and proportions; which, however, do not consist in the number of syllables, perfect or imperfect, according to the form of the modern verse which the Jews make use of, and which is borrowed from the Arabians (though the Arabic prosody, he observes, is too complicated to be applied to the Hebrew language); but in the number of things, and of the parts of things that is, the subject and the predicate and their adjuncts, in every sentence and proposition. Thus a phrase containing two parts of a proposition consists of two measures; add another containing two more, and they become four measures; another again, containing three parts of a proposition, consists of three measures; add to it another of the like, and you have six measures.” The following example will serve for an illustration:

Thy-right-hand, O-Jehovah, is-glorious in-power, Thy-right-hand, O- Jehovah, hath-crushed the enemy. The words connected by hyphens form terms, and the two lines, forming four measures each, may be called tetrameters. “Upon the whole, the author concludes that the poetical parts of the Hebrew Scriptures are not composed according to the rules and measures of certain feet, dissyllables trisyllables, or the like, as the poems of the modern Jews are; but nevertheless have undoubtedly other measures which depend on things, as above explained. For this reason they are more excellent than those which consist of certain feet, according to the number and quantity of syllables. Of this, he says, you may judge yourself in the Songs of the Prophets. For do you not see, if you translate some of them into another language, that they still keep and retain their measure, if not wholly, at least in part? which cannot be the case in those verses the measures of which arise from a certain quantity and number of syllables.” Lowth expresses his general agreement with R. Azariah's exposition of the rhythmus of things; but instead of regarding terms or phrases or senses in single lines, as measures, he considered “only that relation and proportion of one verse to another which arises from the correspondence of terns, and from the form of construction; from whence results a rhythmus of propositions, and a harmony of sentences.” But Lowth's system of parallelism was more completely anticipated by Schöttgen in a treatise, of the existence of which the bishop does not appear to have been aware. It is found in his Horae Hebraicae, 1, 1249-1263, diss. 6 “de Exergasia Sacra.” This exergasia he defines to be the conjunction of entire sentences signifying the same thing; so that exergasia bears the same relation to  sentences that synonymy does to words. It is only found in those Hebrew writings which rise above the level of historical narrative and the ordinary kind of speech. Ten canons are then laid downs each illustrated by three examples, from which it will be seen how far Schöttgen's system corresponded with Lowth's.

(1.) Perfect exergasia is when the members of the two clauses correspond, each to each, as in Psa 33:7; Num 24:17; Luk 1:47.

(2.) Sometimes in the second clause the subject is omitted, as in Isa 1:18; Pro 7:19; Psa 129:3.

(3.) Sometimes part of the subject is omitted, as in Psa 37:30; Psa 102:28; Isa 53:5.

(4.) The predicate is sometimes omitted in the second clause as in Num 24:5; Psa 33:12; Psa 123:6.

(5.) Sometimes part only of the predicate is omitted, as in Psa 57:9; Psa 103:1; Psa 129:7.

(6.) Words are added in one member which are omitted in the other, as in Num 23:18; Psalm 102:29; Dan 12:3.

(7.) Sometimes two propositions will occur, treating of different things, but referring to one general proposition, as in Psa 94:9; Psa 128:3; Wis 3:16.

(8.) Cases occur, in which the second proposition is the contrary of the first, as in Pro 15:8; Pro 14:1; Pro 14:11.

(9.) Entire propositions answer each to each, although the subject and predicate are not the same, as in Psa 51:7; Psa 119:168; Jer 8:22.

(10.) Exerasia is found with three members, as in Psa 1:1; Psa 130:5. These canons Schöttgen applied to the interpretation of Scripture, of which he gives examples in the remainder of that and the following Dissertation.

But whatever may have been achieved by his predecessors, there can be no question that the delivery of Lowth's lectures on Hebrew poetry, and the subsequent publication of his translation of Isaiah, formed an era in the literature of the subject more marked than any that had preceded it. Of his system we have already given (§ 1) a somewhat detailed account, which  we here slightly expand; for whatever may have been done since his time, and whatever modifications of his arrangement may have been introduced, all subsequent writers have confessed their obligations to the two works above mentioned, and have drawn their inspiration from them. Starting with the alphabetical poems as the basis of his investigation, because in them the verses or stanzas were more distinctly marked, Lowth came to the conclusion that they consist of verses properly so called, “of verses regulated by some observation of harmony or cadence; of measure, numbers, or rhythm,” and that this harmony does not arise from rhyme, but from what he denominates parallelism. Parallelism he defines to be the correspondence of one verse or line with another; and divides it into three classes synonymous, antithetic, and synthetic.

(a.) Parallel lines synonymous correspond to each other by expressing the same sense in different but equivalent terms, as in the following examples, which are only two of the many given by Lowth:

“O-Jehovah, in-thy-strength the-king shall-rejoice; And-in-thy- salvation how greatly shall-he-exult! The-desire of-his-heart thou- hast-granted unto-him; And-the-request of-his-lips thou-hast-not denied” (Psa 21:1-2).

“For the-moth shall-consume-them like-a-garment: And-the-worm shall-eat-them like wool: But-my-righteousness shall-endure for- ever; And-my-salvation to-the-age of-ages” (Isa 51:7-8).

It will be observed from the examples which Lowth gives that the parallel lines sometimes consist of three or more synonymous terms, sometimes of two, sometimes only of one. Sometimes the lines consist each of a double member, or two propositions, as Psa 144:5-6; Isa 65:21-22. Parallels are formed also by a repetition of part of the first sentence (Psa 77:1; Psa 77:11; Psa 77:16; Isa 26:5-6; Hos 6:4); and sometimes a part has to be supplied from the former to complete the sentence (2Sa 22:41; Job 26:5; Isa 41:28). Parallel triplets occur in Job 3:4; Job 3:6; Job 3:9; Psa 112:10; Isa 9:20; Joe 3:13. Examples of parallels of four lines, in which two distiches form one stanza, are Psa 37:1-2; Isa 1:3; Isa 49:4; Amo 1:2. In periods of five lines the odd line sometimes comes in between two distiches, as in Job 8:5-6; Isa 46:7; Hos 14:9; Joe 3:16; or after two distiches closes the stanza, as in Isa 44:26. Alternate parallelism in stanzas of four lines is found in Psa 103:11-12; Isa 30:16; but the most  striking examples of the alternate quatrain are Deu 32:25; Deu 32:42, the first line forming a continuous sense with the third, and the second with the fourth (comp. Isa 34:6; Gen 49:6). In Isa 50:10 we find an alternate quatrain followed by a fifth line. To this first division of Lowth's Jebb objects that the name synonymous is inappropriate, for the second clause, with few exceptions, “diversifies the preceding clause, and generally so as to rise above it, forming a sort of climax in the sense.” This peculiarity was recognized by Lowth himself in his 4th Proelection, where he says, “idem iterant, variant, augent,” thus marking a cumulative force in this kind of parallelism. The same was observed by Apb. Newcome in his Preface to Ezekiel, where examples are given in which “the following clauses so diversify the preceding ones as to rise above them” (Isa 42:7; Isa 43:16; Psa 95:2; Psa 104:1). Jebb, in support of his own opinion, appeals to the passages quoted by Lowth (Psa 21:12; Psa 107:38; Isaiah 4:6, 7), and suggests as a more appropriate name for parallelism of this kind, cognate parallelism (Sacr. Lit. p. 38).

(b.) Lowth's second division is antithetic parallelism; when two lines correspond with each other by an opposition of terms and sentiments; when the second is contrasted with the first, sometimes in expressions, sometimes in sense only, so that the degrees of antithesis are various. As for example:

‘A wise son rejoiceth his father; But a foolish son is the grief of his mother”  (Pro 10:1).

“The memory of the just is a blessing; But the name of the wicked shall rot” (Pro 10:7).

The gnomic poetry of the Hebrews abounds with illustrations of antithetic parallelism. Other examples are Psa 20:7-8 :

‘These in chariots, and those in horses; But we in the name of Jehovah our God will be strong. They are bowed down, and fallen; But we are risen, and maintain ourselves firm.”

Comp. also Psa 30:5; Psa 37:10-11; Isa 54:10; Isaiah 9, 10. On these two kinds of parallelism Jebb appropriately remarks: “The antithetic parallelism serves to mark the broad distinctions between truth and falsehood, and good and evil: the cognate parallelism discharges the more difficult and more critical function of discriminating between different  degrees of truth and good on the one hand, of falsehood and evil on the other” (Sacr. Lit. p. 39).

(c.) Synthetic or constructive parallelism, where the parallel “consists only in the similar form of construction; in which word does not answer to word and sentence to sentence, as equivalent or opposite; but there is a correspondence and equality between different propositions, in respect of the shape and turn of the whole sentence, and of the constructive parts such as noun answering to noun, verb to verb, member to member, negative to negative, interrogative to interrogative.” One of the examples of constructive parallels given by Lowth is Isaiah 1, 5, 6 :

“The Lord Jehovah hath opened mine ear, And I was not rebellious; Neither did I withdraw myself backward I gave my back to the smiters, And my cheeks to them that plucked off the hair; My face I hid not from shame and spitting.”

Jebb gives as an illustration Psa 19:7-10 :

“The law of Jehovah is perfect, converting the soul, The testimony of Jehovah is sure, making wise the simple,” etc.

It is instructive, as showing how difficult, if not impossible, it is to make any strict classification of Hebrew poetry, to observe that this very passage is given by Gesenius as an example of synonymous parallelism, while De Wette calls it synthetic. The illustration of synthetic parallelism quoted by Gesenius is Psa 27:4 :

“One thing I ask from Jehovah. It will I seek after My dwelling in the house of Jehovah all the days of my life, To behold the beauty of Jehovah, And to inquire in his temple.”

In this kind of parallelism, as Nordheimer (Gram. Anal. p. 87) observes, “an idea is neither repeated nor followed by its opposite, but is kept in view by the writer, while he proceeds to develop and enforce his meaning by accessory ideas and modifications.”

(d.) To the three kinds of parallelism above described Jebb adds a fourth, which seems rather to be an unnecessary refinement upon than distinct from the others. He denominates it introverted parallelism, in which he says, “there are stanzas so constructed that, whatever be the number of lines, the first line shall be parallel with the last; the second with the  penultimate; and so throughout in an order that looks inward, or, to borrow a military phrase, from flanks to center” (Sacr. Lit. p. 53). Thus:

“My son, if thine heart be wise, My heart also shall rejoice; Yea, my reins shall rejoice When thy lips speak light things” (Pro 23:15-16).

“Unto Thee do I lift up mine eyes,—O Thou that dwellest in the heavens; Behold as the eyes of servants to the hand of their masters; As the eyes of a maiden to the hands of her mistress: Even so look our eyes to Jehovah our God, until he have mercy upon us” (Psa 123:1-2).

Upon examining these and the other examples quoted by bishop Jebb in support of his new division, to which he attaches great importance, it will be seen that the peculiarity consists in the structure of the stanza, and not in the nature of the parallelism; and any one who reads Ewald's elaborate treatise on this part of the subject will rise from the reading with the conviction that to attempt to classify Hebrew poetry according to the character of the stanzas employed will be labor lost and in vain, resulting only in a system which is no system, and in rules to which the exceptions are more numerous than the examples.

A few words may now be added with respect to the classification proposed by De Wette, in which more regard was had to the rhythm. The four kinds of parallelism are:

1. That which consists in an equal number of words in each member, as in Gen 4:23. This he calls the original and perfect kind of parallelism of members, which corresponds with meter and rhyme, without being identical with them (Iie Psalmen, Einl. § 7). Under this head are many minor divisions.

2. Unequal parallelism, in which the number of words in the members is not the same. This again is divided into

a. The simple, as Psa 68:33.

b. The composite, consisting of the synonymous (Job 10:1; Psa 36:7), the antithetic (Isa 15:4), and the synthetic (Isa 15:5).

c. That in which the simple member is disproportionately small (Isa 40:10).

d. Where the composite member grows up into three or more sentences (Isa 1:3; Isa 65:10).

e. Instead of the close parallelism there sometimes occurs a short additional clause, as in Psa 23:3.

3. Out of the parallelism, which is unequal in consequence of the composite character of one member, another is developed, so that both members are composite (Psa 31:11). This kind of parallelism again admits of three subdivisions.

4. Rhythmical parallelism, which lies merely in the external form of the diction. Thus in Psa 19:11 there is nearly an equal number of words:

“Moreover by them was thy servant warned, In keeping of them there is great reward.”

In Psa 30:3 the inequality is remarkable. In Psa 14:7 is found a double and a single member, and in Psa 31:23 two double members. De Wette also held that there were in Hebrew poetry the beginnings of a composite rhythmical structure like our strophes. Thus in Psalms 42, 43, a refrain marks the conclusion of a larger rhythmical period. Something similar is observable in Psalms 107. This artificial structure appears to belong to a late period of Hebrew literature, and to the same period may probably be assigned the remarkable gradational rhythm which appears in the Songs of Degrees, e.g. Psalms 121. It must be observed that this gradational rhythm is very different from the cumulative parallelism of the Song of Deborah, which is of a much earlier date, and bears traces of less effort in the composition. Strophes of a certain kind are found in the alphabetical pieces in which several Masoretic clauses belong to one letter (Psalms 9, 10, 37, 119; Lamentations 3); but the nearest approach to anything like a strophical character is found in poems which are divided into smaller portions by a refrain, and have the initial or final verse the same or similar (Psalms 39, 42, 43). In the opinion of some the occurrence of the word Selah is supposed to mark the divisions of the strophes.

It is impossible here to do more than refer to the essay of Kister (Theol. Stud. und Krit. 1831, p. 40-114) on the strophes, or the parallelism of verses in Hebrew poetry, in which he endeavors to show that the verses are  subject to the same laws of symmetry as the verse-members, and that consequently Hebrew poetry is essentially strophical in character. Ewald's treatise requires more careful consideration; but it must be read itself, and a slight sketch only can here be given. Briefly thus: Verses are divide(d into verse-members in which the number of syllables is less restricted, as there is no syllable meter. A verse-member generally contains from seven to eight syllables. Two members, the rise and fall, are the fundamental constituents. Thus (Jdg 5:3): “Hear, ye kings! give ear, ye princes! I to Jehovah, I will sing.” To this all other modifications must le capable of being reduced. The variations which may take place may be either amplifications or continuations of the rhythm, or compositions in which a complete rhythm is made the half' of a new compound, or we may have a diminution or enfeeblement of the original. To the two members correspond two thoughts which constitute the life of' the verse, and each of these again may distribute itself. Gradations of symmetry are formed,

1. By the echo of the whole sentence, where the same sense which is given in the first member rises again in the second, in order to exhaust itself more thoroughly (Gen 4:23; Pro 1:8). An important word of the first member often reserves its force for the second, as in Psa 20:8; and sometimes in the second member a principal part of the sense of the first is further developed, as Psa 49:5.

2. When the thought trails through two members of a verse, as in Psa 110:5, it gives rise to a less animated rhythm (comp. also Psa 141:10).

3. Two sentences may be brought together as protasis and apodosis, or simply to form one complex thought; the external harmony may be dispensed with, but the harmony of thought remains. This may be called the intermediate rhythm. The forms of structure assumed by the verse are many.

(1.) There is the single member, which occurs at the commencement of a series in Psa 18:2; Psa 23:1; at the end of a series in Exo 15:18; Psa 92:9; and in the middle, after a short pause, in Psa 29:7.

(2.) The bimembral verse is most frequently found, consisting of two members of nearly equal weight. the number of members from two to three, so that the complete fall may be reserved for the third, all three possessing the same power; or by combining four members two and two, as in Psa 18:7; Psa 28:1.

The varieties of this structure of verse are too numerous to be recounted, and the laws of rhythm in Hebrew poetry are so free that of necessity the varieties of verse-structure must be manifold. The gnomic or sententious rhythm, Ewald remarks, is the one which is perfectly symmetrical. Two members of seven or eight syllables, corresponding to each other as rise and fall, contain a thesis and antithesis, a subject and its image. This is the constant form of genuine gnomic sentences of the best period. Those of a later date have many members or trail themselves through many verses. The animation of the lyrical rhythm makes it break through all such restraints, and leads to an amplification or reduplication of the normal form; or the passionate rapidity of the thoughts may disturb the simple concord of the members, so that the unequal structure of verse intrudes with all its varieties. To show how impossible it is to attempt a classification of verse uttered under such circumstances, it will be only necessary to quote Ewald's own words: “All these varieties of rhythm, however, exert a perfectly free influence upon every lyrical song, just according as it suits the mood of the moment to vary the simple rhythm. The most beautiful songs of the flourishing period of poetry allow, in fact, the verse of many members to predominate whenever the diction rises with any sublimity; nevertheless, the standard rhythm still returns in each when the diction flags, and the different kinds of the more complex rhythm are employed with equal freedom and ease of variation, just as they severally accord with the fluctuating hues of the mood of emotion and of the sense of the diction. The late alphabetical songs are the first in which the fixed choice of a particular versification-a choice, too, made with designed art- establishes itself firmly, and maintains itself symmetrically throughout all the verses” (Dichter d. AIten Bundes, 1, 83; transl. in Kitto's Journal, 1, 318). It may, however, be generally observed that the older rhythms are the most animated, as if accompanied by the hands and feet of the singer (Numbers 21; Exodus 15; Judges 5), and that in the time of David the rhythm had attained its most perfect development. By the end of the 8th century B.C. the decay of versification begins, and to this period belong the artificial forms of verse. the Jewish grammarians, to which reference was made in remarking upon the system of R. Azariah. They have the merit of being extremely simple, and are to be found at length, illustrated by many examples, in Mason and Bernard's Heb. Gram. (vol. 2, No. 57), and accompanied by an interesting account of modern Hebrew versification. The rules are briefly these:

1. That a sentence may be divided into members, some of which contain two, three, or even four words, and are accordingly termed binary, ternary, and quaternary members respectively.

2. The sentences are composed either of binary, ternary, or quaternary members entirely, or of these different members intermixed.

3. That in two consecutive members it is an elegance to express the same idea in different words.

4. That a word expressed in either of these parallel members is often not expressed in the alternate member.

5. That a word without an accent, being joined to another word by Makkeph, is generally (though not always) reckoned with that second word as one. It will be seen that these rules are essentially the same with those of Lowth, De Wette, and other writers on parallelism, and from their simplicity are less open to objection than any others that have been given.

In conclusion, after reviewing the various theories which have been framed with regard to the structure of Hebrew poetry, it must be confessed that beyond the discovery of very broad general laws, little has been done towards elaborating a satisfactory system. Probably this want of success is due to the fact that there is no system to discover, and that Hebrew poetry, while possessed in the highest degree of all sweetness and variety of rhythm and melody, is not fettered by laws of versification as we understand the term. Some advance towards an elucidation of the metrical structure of the poetical books, and especially in their strophic arrangement, has been made by Delitzsch in his Commentaries; but the whole subject admits of a more careful and minute adjustment of the clauses and phrases than has yet been achieved.

Modern Hebrew poetry, although tolerably copious, is altogether cast in the mould of the poems of the several European nations among whom the Jews are scattered, and is therefore stiffly artificial, generally with rhyme,  etc. It is of little value theologically. A very fair collection of specimens may be seen in Martinet's Hebräische Chrestomathie (Bamberg, 1837).

V. Literature. — England has the credit of opening a new path in this branch by the above-noticed publication of bishop Lowth's elegant and learned Praelectiones de Sacra Poesi Hebraeorum (Oxon. 1753, which may be found also in Ugolini Thesaur. vol. 31; the editions having Michaelis's Notae et Epimetra are to be preferred; that of Oxon. 1810, is good: the work was translated into English by Gregory). On the didactic poetry of the Hebrews the reader may consult Umbreit. Sprüche Sal. Einleitung; Rhode, De Vet. Poetar. Sapientia Gnom. Hebraeor. imp. et Graecorum. (Havn. 1800); Unger, De Parabolar. Jesu natura, etc. (Leipz. 1828). Le Clerc, in his Biblioth. Univers. 9, 226 sq., has given what is worth attention; see also Hist. abregee de la Poesie chez les Hebr. in the “History of the Academy of Inscriptions,” 23, 92 sq. But the work which has, next to that of Lowth, exerted the greatest influence, is a posthumous and unfinished piece of the celebrated Herder, who has treated the subject with extraordinary eloquence and learning, Vom Geist der Ebrdischen Poesie (1782, to be found in his collected writings; also Tübing. 1805, and Carlsruhe, 1826); see also Gügler, Die Heilkunst der Hebräer (Landshut, 1814); and Guttenstein, Die poet. Literat. d. alten Israelit. (Mannh. 1835). The subject of metre has been skillfully handled by Bellermann, Versuch über d. Metrik der Hebräer (Berl. 1813). Much useful information may be found in De Wette's Einleitung id. A. Test. (ibid. 1840; translated into English by Theodore Parker, Boston, 1843). In Wellbeloved's Bible translations of the poetical portions may be found, in which regard is paid to rhythm and poetical form; a very valuable guide in Hebrew poetry, both for form and substance, may be found in Noyes's Translation of Job (Cambridge, 1827); of the Psalms (Boston, 1831); and of the Prophets (ibid. 1833); but the best, fullest, and most satisfactory work on the subject is by Ewald, Die poet. Bücher des Alten Bundes (Göttingen, 1835-9, 4 vols. 8vo). See also Critica Biblica, 1, 111 sq.; Carpzov, Introd, ad Libr. Can. Bibl. pt. 2, c. 1; Schramm, De Poesi Hebräer. (Helmst. 1723); Jebb, Sacred Literature; Saalschütz, Von der Form, der Hebr. Poesie (Kinigsberg, 1825, which contains the most complete account of all the various theories); Nicolas, Herme de la Poesie Hebraique (Paris, 1833); Sarchi, Heb. Poetry, Ancient and Modern (Lond. 1824); Wenrich, De Poesice Heb. et Arab. indole (Leipz. 1843); Meier, Gesch. der poet. National - Literatur der Hebräer (Leipz. 1853); the commentaries of De  Wette, Delitzsch, and Hupfeld on the Psalms; and the works enumerated in Danz, Universal-Theol. Wörterbuch, p. 215 sq.; in Darling, Cyclopedia Bibliographia (Holy Scriptures), col. 28 sq.; and in Schaff's essay on the Poetical Books of the O.T., prefixed to the Am. ed. of Lange's Commentary on Job, p. 7.

## Poetry, Hebrew (Post-Biblical)[[@Headword:Poetry, Hebrew (Post-Biblical)]]

             In speaking of post-Biblical poetry, we mean those poetical productions which have come down to us from the so-called Sopherite Age, i.e. from about B.C. 500 to A.D. 70. Productions written after this period are properly designated by the name Neo-Hebraic Poetry.

The divine service of the second Temple, under Ezra and his successors, was mainly a restoration, rather than a new institute; but the inspired material for liturgy was now more copious. The Psalms, several of which, like the melodious swan song of a departing inspiration, were written in the Ezra-Nehemiah time, formed of themselves a primary element. So, at the Feast of Tabernacles, the Asaphites chanted the Confitemini of the 118th Psalm (Ezr 3:10-11; comp. Neh 12:24; 1Ch 26:1). The titles given to some Psalms by the men of the Great Synagogue indicate a stated use of them at certain periods of week-day and Sabbath worship (comp. Mishna, Taamid, ad fin.; Sopherim, sect. 18; and the inscriptions for the Psalms in the Septuagint, evidently rendered from Hebrew ones). Thus Psalms 24 is called ψαλμὸς...τῆς μιᾶς σαββάτου; 48, δευτέρᾷ σαββάτου; 94, τετράδι σαββάτου; 29. ἐξοδίου σκηνῆς; 38:περὶ σαββάτου; 111-119, Α᾿λληλούϊα. The “fifteen Songs of Degrees” (שירי המעלות, Chald. שורא דאתאמר על מסוכין דתהומא, i.e. “the hymn which was said upon the steps of the abyss”) were evidently liturgical, and probably derive their name from the fifteen semicircular steps at the Nicanor gate of the great court of the Temple, on which the Levites stood while singing them. So the Mishna (Succah, 5, 4):” On the fifteen steps which led into the women's court, corresponding with the fifteen songs of degrees, stood the Levites with their instruments of music, and sang.” Besides, the Great Hallel (q.v.) and certain verses of Psalms were also used, as may be seen from the treatise Succah, 4:5.

The poetry of this period is preserved in four forms: of Tephillah, Berakah, Shir, and Mashal.

I. The Tephillah, or Prayer. — Of this form we have the four collects offered by the high-priest on the Day of Atonement (q.v.), as preserved in the Jerusalem Gemara and Midrash Jelamdenu, and which run thus:

1. For Himself and his Family: “Lord, I have committed iniquity, I have transgressed, I have sinned, I and my house. Pardon, O Lord, the iniquities and transgressions and the sins which I have committed and sinned before thee, I and my house, as it is written in the law of Moses, thy servant: for on that day will he atone for you to make you clean, from all your transgressions shall ye before Jehovah be cleansed” (Yomah, 3, 7).

2. For Himself and the Priesthood: “Lord, I have committed iniquity, I have transgressed, I have sinned, I and my house, and the sons of Aaron, thy consecrated people. I beseech thee, Lord, to pardon the iniquities, transgressions, and sins which I and my house, and the sons of Aaron, thy consecrated people, have perversely committed, as it is written in the law of Moses, thy servant: for on that day,” etc. (ibid. 4, 2).

3. For the People at large: “Lord, thy people, the house of Israel, have done perversely; they have transgressed, they have sinned before thee. I beseech of the Lord to pardon the iniquities, transgressions, and sins which thy people, the house of Israel, have perversely committed, and by which they have sinned and transgressed; as it is written in the law of Moses, thy servant: for on that day,” etc.

4. When he came out from the Holy of Holies: “May it please thee, O Lord our God, and the God of our fathers, that neither this day nor during this year any captivity come upon us; yet if captivity befall us this day or this year, let it be to a place where the law is cultivated. May it please thee, O Lord our God, and the God of our fathers, that no want come upon us either this day or this year; but if want visit us this day or this year, let it be due to the liberality of our charitable deeds. May it please thee, O Lord our God, and the God of our fathers, that this year may become a year of cheapness, of fullness, of intercourse, and of trade: a year with abundance of rain, of sunshine, and of dew: one in which thy people Israel shall not require assistance one from another. And listen not to the prayers of those who go forth on a journey. And as to thy people Israel, may no enemy exalt himself against them. May it please thee, O Lord our God, and the God of our fathers, that the houses of the men of Saron may not become their graves.”

II. The Berakah, or Benediction. — The benedictory adoration of the name and dominion of God is a most proper and all-pervading element in the Hebrew liturgy. Many of their prayers begin and end with it. The berakahs at the close of the several books of the Psalms (Psa 41:13; Psa 72:18; Psa 106:48) were probably added by Ezra, or the prophetical men of his time, on the final arrangement of the canonical Psalter (comp. on these doxologies Grätz, in Monatsschrift für d. Judenthunt, 1872, 21:481 sq.). Those which accompany the prayers of the Shemoneh Esreh, or eighteen benedictions, comp. the art. SEE LITURGY, are believed to be of the same period. Thus Maimonides: “These benedictions were appointed by Ezra the sopher, and the bethdin; and no man hath power to diminish from or add to them” ([Hilchoth Keriath Shena, 1, 7; and lilch. Tefila, 1, 11). “In the innumerable instances where, in the Mishna and Aboda, this form occurs, in which the everlasting name is hallowed, and the truth of the divine dominion is reverently confessed, it appears to have been the pious desire of the institutors of the synagogue ritual that supplication, with prayer and thanksgiving, should give a spirit and tone to the entire life of the people. Indeed, almost all the affairs of Hebrew life have the prescription of their appropriate benedictions” (comp. Berachoth, ch. 6-9; Rosh ha-Shanah, 4, 5; Tactmith, 2, 2, etc.).

III. The Shir, or Song, Chant (from shevar, שְׁוִר, Sansc. swar, swara, “a song;” the Arab. zabara, i.q. savara., whence zubar, like the Hebrew mizmor, of the same import), is a metrical composition, designed for chanting, and consisting generally of the strophe, antistrophe, and epode. We have a fine Biblical model in the fifteenth chapter of Exodus, on which see Kennicott and Lowth. Apart from the divine poetry of the Scriptures, there are but scanty remains of Hebrew songs of a date prior to the destruction of Jerusalem. In the Mishna and Gemara we come upon a few reminiscences of them, as in the treatise Succah, fol. 53, Colossians 1, where, in connection with the solemnities of the Feast of Tabernacles, we find the following chant:

THE PIOUS AND THE MEN OF RENOWN.

“O happy youth, devoted sage,

Who will not put to shame our age!

THE PENITENTS.

“O happy, also, is our age,

Which now atones for youth, not sage!

CHORUS.

“O happy be on whom no guilt doth rest,

And he who sinn'd with pardon shall be blest.”

These songs were accompanied by the musical instruments of the Levites, who stood on the fifteen steps which led to the court of the women. Here is another, a sort of confession made by the Levites at the same feast. “When the Levites,” says the Mishna, “reached the gate that leads out to the east, they turned westward, their faces being towards the Temple, and employed these words:

“Our fathers, here established by thy grace,

Had turn'd their backs upon thy holy place,

And to the rising sun they set their face;

But we will turn to thee, Jehovah God,

Our eyes are set on thee, Jehovah God.”

Another fragment of a song has been preserved in the Mishna (Taanith, ad fin.), and was sung on the 15th day of Ab, when the collection of wood required in the sanctuary was finished. Then the maidens all went forth, arrayed in white garments specially lent them, that so rich and poor might be on an equality, into the vineyards around Jerusalem, where they danced and sung: “Around in circle gay the Hebrew maidens see, From them the happy youth their partners choose; Remember beauty soon its charms must lose, And seek to win a maid of fair degree.

“When fading grace and beauty low are laid, Yet her who fears the Lord shall praise await; God blessed her handiwork, and, in the gate, ‘Her works have followed her,' it shall be said.”

IV. The Mashal. — This word, according to its Sanscrito-Shemitic root, denotes comparison or resemblance. “In the older Hebrew writings the word is applied to prophecy, to doctrine, to history in the loftier style, and to instruction given in a kind of poetic form, sometimes with the accompaniment of the harp or other music; because, in these various manners of instruction, material things are employed in the way of parallel or comparison, to illustrate those which are supersensible or spiritual.  Hence mashal became a general name for all poetry which relates to the ordinary or every-day economy of life, with a still more specific application to a distinct epigrammatic saving, proverb, maxim, or reflection, carrying in itself some important principle or rule of conduct. The mashal, then, may be said to consist commonly of two elements: the thesis, principal fact or lesson, and the type, emblem or allusion by which it is explained or enforced. The latter may be one of the phenomena of nature, or an imaginary transaction in common life (parable); or an emblematic group of human agents (apologue); or of agents nonhuman, with an understood designation (fable). Sometimes the mashal takes a mathematical cast; and the doctrine or principle is laid down after a certain arithmetical proportion or canon, midah (Pro 6:16; Pro 30:15; Pro 30:18; Pro 30:21; Sir 23:16; Sir 25:1; Sir 25:8-9; Sir 26:5; Sir 26:25; Sir 26:27-28). When there is no image or allusion of these kinds used, the mashal becomes sometimes an acute, recondite, yet generally pleasant assertion or problem gryphos, the ‘riddle,' or ‘enigma;' in Hebrew, chidah, חידה(Jdg 14:12); and sometimes an axiom or oracle of practical wisdom-massa, מִשּׂא, a ‘burden,' a weighty saying, from masac, ‘to bear;' and when conveyed in a brilliant, sparkling style of speaking it becomes melifsah, מליצה, the pleasant witticism or the pungent reproof. The remaining form of the mashal is the motto (apophthegm), where some moral is sententiously expressed without a simile, and generally without the parallelism, as we see in the mottoes of the Hebrew sages in the book Aboth.” Of such mottoes, we mention the following of Hillel:

“The more flesh, the more worms;

The more riches, the more care:

The more wives, the more witchcraft,” etc.;

or:

“Because thou madest float,

They made thee float:

In turn, who made thee float

Shall also float this having reference to a skull floating on the water;

or:

“Each one who seeks a name,

Shall only lose his fame;

Who adds not to his lore,

Shall lose it more and more;

Each one deserves to perish

Who study does not cherish;

That man shall surely fade

Who with his crown (i.e. of learning or merit) does trade.”

A valuable relic of meshalim is preserved in a book known among us as The Wisdom of Jesus the Son of Sirach, from which we will quote a few sentences: “Honor the physician before you require his aid” (Sir 38:1). “Three things are contrary to all reason: a proud beggar; a rich man who denies it (lives and acts as if he were poor); and all old man who commits adultery” (Sir 25:3-4). “A good wife is a good gift; such is granted to him who fears the Lord. A bad wife is a leprosy to her husband; let him divorce her, and he will be cured of his leprosy” (ch. 26). “Before you vow, consider the vow” (Sir 28:23). SEE PARABLE.

The non-Palestinian poetry of this time we pass over, it being written in Greek. See Delitzsch, Zur Geschichte der jüdischen Poesie, p. 17-29, 177 sq.; Etheridge, Introduction to Hebrew Literature, p. 92 sq.; Steinschneider, Jewish Literature, p. 35 sq.; Edersheim, History of the Jewish Nation, p. 349 sq., 559 sq.; id. The Temple, its Ministry and Services as they were in the Time of Jesus Christ, p. 246 sq., 270 sq., 286 sq. (B. P.)

## Pogatschar, Johannes[[@Headword:Pogatschar, Johannes]]

             prince bishop of Laybach, was born at Brezov, January 22, 1811. From 1838 to 1852 he occupied the theological chair at the Laybach Theological Seminary, was made prince bishop in 1875, and died January 25, 1884. For many years he edited the Laybbach Church Gazette, and in the ecclesiastico-political affairs he sided with the Austrian government in behalf of the new school-laws. (B.P.)

## Poggio, Braccolini Giovanni-Francesco[[@Headword:Poggio, Braccolini Giovanni-Francesco]]

             a celebrated Italian humanist, who contributed richly to the revival of classical studies in the period of the Italian Renaissance, and did much to encourage scholarship in the Church of Rome, was born at Terranuova, near Florence, in 1380. He was the grandson of a notary, and studied the Latin language under the direction of Giovanni di Ravenna, the Greek under Emanuel Chrysoloras, and applied himself also to the Hebrew a fact which confutes the opinion of Huetius and others, who have said that this language was not cultivated in Italy till after the 14th and 15th centuries.  After the completion of his education he went to Rome, and was for some time a copyist, and finally entered the service of the cardinal di Bari. In 1413 Poggio was appointed apostolic secretary, a poorly paid charge, which he occupied forty years. Thus he spent a large part of his life in brilliant surroundings. Eight popes bequeathed him to one another, as he had belonged to the chattels of St. Peter. The life which he led in the office he held was favorable to study, and he devoted much of it to inquiries into antiquity. His great title to the esteem of posterity is the zeal he displayed in the search for the monuments of Roman literature. He made his most important discoveries during a protracted stay in Switzerland, whither he repaired in 1414 to attend the Council of Constance. He visited the library of the monastery of St. Gall, which he found in a kind of dungeon. Here he discovered a copy, almost complete, of Quintilian's Institutiones Orattoriae, of which fragments only were known at the time; four books of the Argonautica of Valerius Flaccus, and the Commentaries of Asconius Pedianus. Afterwards he found, in divers places, the History of Ammianus Marcellinus and Frontinus's Treatise on Aqueducts. The searches which he caused to be made in the monasteries of France and Germany brought to light the works of Manilius, of Vitruvius, of Columella, of Priscianus, of Nonius Marcellus. a considerable portion of the poems of Lucretius and Siliums Italicus, eight orations of Cicero, twelve comedies of Plautus, etc.

The freedom with which Poggio criticized several acts of the Council of Constance, especially in the affair of Jerome of Prague, was punished with a short disgrace, during which he visited England. Beaufort, bishop of Winchester, received him with distinction. But as little effect followed the brilliant promises of the prelate, and as the English libraries offered no temptations to a man of Poggio's propensities, he left a country the inhabitants of which he describes as plunged in the grossest sensuality, and returned to Rome at the close of 1420. He was reinstated into his former charge. The calm which the pontifical court enjoyed for some years gave him full leisure to correspond with his friends Niccoli, Leonardo d'Arezzo. Traversari, etc., and to write several dialogues and philosophical treatises, in which he exposes without mercy the failings of monks and priests which Poggio was most competent to describe, as he had himself at the time three sons by a mistress, though he was an ecclesiastic. His own course he excuses in the following pleasantry, in one of his letters to cardinal Julian of St. Angelo: “You say that I have sons, which is not lawful for a cleric; and without a wife, which does not become a laic. I may answer that I have  sons, which is fitting for laics; and without a wife, which from the beginning of the world has been the custom of clerics; but I will not defend my failings by any excuse.”

When, after the accession of Eugenius IV, in 1434, a sedition compelled the pope to retire to Florence, Poggio set out on his way to join his master. He was taken by soldiers of Piccinino, and given his liberty only after a heavy ransom paid by his friends. In; Florence he met Filelfo, against whom he had long entertained a secret jealousy, which changed into actual hatred when his venerated and beloved Niccoli was the object of a violent attack from Filelfo. He launched against his enemy a libel, in which he heaped up all the most injurious and obscene expressions which the Latin language would afford. Filelfo answered him in the same style; whereupon Poggio replied in a still more insulting strain. After a truce of four years this edifying dispute between two of the most distinguished men of their time recommenced: Poggio wrote against Filelfo a libel full of the most atrocious accusations, almost all of his own invention. Filelfo again returned the blow. They were reconciled afterwards: neither had damaged himself in the eyes of their contemporaries, who enjoyed these invectives as literary dainties. Meanwhile Poggio had bought a villa in the vicinity of Florence, and formed there a museum of sculptures, medals, and other objects of art. Towards the close of 1435 he had married the young and beautiful Vaggia di Bondelmonti. He was poor and on the decline of life; but the young heiress of an illustrious and ancient family was in love with his literary fame, which had induced the senate of Florence to grant immunity from taxes to him and his descendants. His married life was a happy one.

He returned to Rome with the papal court, after a sojourn of ten years at Florence. During this period he had published a choice selection of letters, and composed two dialogues, full of the most curious remarks on the manners of his time (On Nobility and On the Misfortunes of Princes). He had, besides, written the panegyrics of Niccoli, Lorenzo di Medici, of the cardinal Albergato, and of Leonardo d'Arezzo. At the request of pope Nicholas V, with whom he was in great favor, he translated into Latin the first five books of Diodorus Siculus; about the same time he dedicated his version of Xenophon's Cyropaediat to Alfonso, king of Naples, and compelled the king, by the sarcastic remarks with which he filled his letters to his friends, to reward him with a present of six hundred ducats, whereupon he chanted, in the most pompous strains, the encomiums of the  king. To please pope Nicholas, he wrote a violent invective against the antipope, Felix V. lie wrote also, under the same pope's auspices, an interesting dialogue On the Vicissitudes of Fortune, which, besides many curious incidents in the history of Italy in the 14th and 15th centuries, contains an account of the journey of the Venetian Niccolo Conti into India and Persia, and a precious description of the monuments of Rome as they were at his time. During the plague which broke out in Rome in 1450, he retired to his birthplace, where he published his famous Facetiae, a collection of tales, partly borrowed from the French fabliaux, and excessively licentious. This book was eagerly read throughout Europe. Soon afterwards he published his Historia Disceptativa Convivmalis, a dialogue full of satirical attacks against physicians and lawyers. He returned to Rome in 1451, but in 1453 he was offered the position of chancellor of the republic of Florence, and a few months after his removal to that city was in addition made prior of the arts. In the latter quality he had to look to the maintenance of good order and of the public liberties. Though he was now fully seventy-two years of age, he applied himself to study more intensely than ever; and in that last period of his life, though he had an employment which took up much of his time, he composed the most considerable of his works. His love of retirement induced him to build a country house near Florence, which he called his academy, and in which he took much delight.

He always spent the summer there. From this period and place dates his History of Florence, for which he consulted the archives of the republic, which were committed to his care. This book is one of the best historical works of the time. The Florentines, to show their gratefulness, erected to the author a statue, which now forms part of a group of the twelve apostles in the church of S. Maria del Fiore. Poggio died at Florence Oct. 30, 1459. He had some estimable parts, but these cannot make us forget his vindictive character, his irascibility, his bad manners and bad morals. Poggio appears by his works to have had a great passion for letters, and as great a regard for those that cultivated them. He excelled in Greek and Latin literature, and was one of the principal restorers of it. His pursuits were not confined to profane antiquity: we see by his quotations that he was versed in ecclesiastical history and the fathers, and especially in the writings of Chrysostom and Augustine. Poggio's treatises, especially his dialogues, are feeble imitations of the classics; though written in an easy, witty, and sometimes elegant manner, they are full of solecisms, Italicisms, and even barbarisms. His letters are altogether neglected. But the rest of his writings are still read, owing to  their variety of subjects, to some ingenious ideas, and to the freedom of speech, sometimes the grace, by which they are characterized. His Works were published at Strasburg (1510, fol.; 1513, 4to), at Paris (1511, 4to; 1513, fol.), and at Basle (1538, fol.). The latter edition, by Bebel, is the best; but it is still incomplete, and does not contain the following works, afterwards published apart: De Hypocrisia (Lyons, 1679, 4to), a violent pamphlet against the clergy: Historia Florentina (Ven. 1715, 4to; and in tom. 20 of the Scriptores of Muratori), translated into Italian by Giacomo, the third of the five sons whom Poggio had by his legitimate wife (Ven. 1476, fol.; Florence, 1492 and 1598, 4to): — De Varietate Fortunce (Par. 1723, 4to), with fifty-seven unpublished Letters of Poggio. The Facetiae have often been printed apart (1470, 4to; Ferrara, 1471; Nuremb. 1475; Milan, 1477; Par. 1478, 4to; Utrecllt, 1797, 2 vols. 24mo). Poggio's Latin translation of Diodorus Siculus was published at Venice (1473, 1476, fol.) and at Basle (1530, 1578, fol.). See Thorschmidt, Vita Poggocia (Wittemb. 1713); Recanate, Vita (Ven. 1715); Lenfatt, Pogianna (1720, and enlarged 1721); Nicron, Memoires, vol. 9; Shepherd, Life of Poggio (Loud. 1802, 8vo); Nisard, Les Gladiateurs de le Republique des Lettres, vol. 1; Trollope, History of Florence (see Index in vol. 5); Hallam, Literary Hist. of Europe (Harper's edition), 1, 64, 92; id. Middle Ages (see Index); Christian Schools and Scholmars, 2, 30(6310; Piper, Monumental Theologie, § 148, 150, 153, 214; Milman, Latin Christianity, 8, 123; Edinb. Rev. 64, 32 sq.; Schlegel, Hist. of Literatutre, lect. 11; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Géneralé, s.v.

## Pogoda[[@Headword:Pogoda]]

             is in Slavic mythology the name of a god of the spring and of fine weather. Pogoda is a pure Slavic word, and means weather. He is supposed to have been of a kind and amiable disposition-the god of sunny weather, of bright skies, of smiling springs; yet the qualification of dobra (good) would seem to be necessary in such a case. The description given of his exterior appearance is perhaps still less authentic than that of his functions: young and beautiful, crowned with blue flowers, blue wings on his shoulders, clothed in a blue garment interwoven with silver, stretched on a bed of flowers resting quietly in the bright air. It is not likely that the Slaves one thousand years ago could have drawn such pictures of their gods.

## Pohlman, Henry Newan, D.D[[@Headword:Pohlman, Henry Newan, D.D]]

             a Lutheran minister. was born at.Albany, N.Y., March 8, 1800. In August 1820, he graduated from Hartwick Seminary the first student in the first Lutheran theological seminary in the United States. In March following he received license to preach in Rhinebeck, and in May was ordained in New York city. After serving a few months in two small churches at Saddle River and Ramapo, N.J., he took charge of the Lutheran churches in Hunterdon County, which at that time numbered three, many miles apart. For twenty-one years he continued in this work, until each of these congregations was able to support. its own pastor. The great event of his ministerial life was a remarkable revival of religion at New Germantown during the winter of 1839-40. In 1843 he became pastor of the Evangelical Lutheran Ebenezer Church in Albany, N.Y., and remained in this pastorate about three years. Of the General Synod he was three times elected  president, and was a delegate from 1836 to every meeting of that body. At the time of his admission to the ministry the General Synod had just been. formed, and the New York Ministerium, a party to the original convention, had already withdrawn. This led to the creation of two parties in the ministerium, resulting in 1830 in the formation of the Hartwick Synod. Dr. Pohlman, with a few other friends of the General Synod, decided to remain with the ministerium; and in 1836 the ministerium renewed its connection with the General Synod. He took an active part in the work of organizing churches. On September 3,1867, after the New York Ministerium had decided to withdraw from the General Synod, a new synod was organized, and Dr. Pohlman was elected its first president, and held this position until his death in Albany, January 20, 1874. For many years he was a trustee of the State Idiot Asylum at Syracuse. During thirty years he was a trustee of Hartwick Seminary. For three years he assumed the duties of corresponding secretary of the Lutheran Mission Board in New York, and for some time afterwards was an active member of the executive committee. See Quar. Rev. of Evang. Luth. Church, 4:359.

## Pohlman, William John[[@Headword:Pohlman, William John]]

             a missionary of the Reformed (Dutch) Church, was born at Albany, N. Y., in 1812, of pious parents who belonged to the Lutheran Church. His father was of German descent. Converted at the age of sixteen, he united with the First Reformed Church of Albany, under the care of Dr. John Ludlow. Devoting himself to the Christian ministry, Pohlman studied three years at the Albany Academy, entered Rutgers College in 1832, graduated in 1834, and then entered the theological seminary at New Brunswick. While a student in this institution he consecrated himself to the foreign missionary work. In August, 1836, he offered himself to the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions, in a memorable letter, which concluded with these sentences: “I wish to enlist for life. If in your view I can be of any service, I lay my all at your feet. ‘Silver and gold have I none, but such as I have give I thee.' Send me abroad to publish glad tidings to the idol-serving nations. Send me to the most desert part of all the howling wildernesses of heathenism, to the most barbarous climes, or to more civilized regions. Send me to the millions of pagans, to the followers of the false prophet to the Jews or the Gentiles, to Catholics or Protestants. Send me, in fine, wherever God opens an effectual door. Send me— for necessity is laid upon me; yea, woe is unto me if I preach not the Gospel' to the perishing heathen.” In this spirit he was sent to Borneo. He was ordained as an evangelist in April 1838, by the Classis of Albany, and with his wife, a sister of the late Dr. John Scudder, the famous missionary to India, sailed for his field May 25.

They arrived at the island of Java Sept. 10, and after a brief sojourn at Singapore went to Batavia, where they were compelled to remain a whole year before the Dutch government would permit them to go to Borneo. Meanwhile he studied the Malay language, which prepared him to hold intercourse with the people to whom he was sent. After the year expired he settled at Pontianak, in Borneo, and immediately began his missionary labors. Mrs. Pohlman died in 1845. She was a woman of like spirit with himself and with her brother-a devoted, intelligent, and laborious missionary's wife and sister. After six years of unremitting toils on this island, Mr. Pohlman was transferred to China in 1844, with the Rev. Elihu Doty, to establish the Amoy Mission, in connection with David Abeel, D.D. He had studied the Chinese language during his residence in Borneo, and so was the better prepared to do efficient work at once in his new field. For five years more he gave himself up unreservedly to this noble service. Dr. Abeel's feeble health compelled  his return to America in 1845, and he died in 1846. SEE ABEEL, DAVID.

But the mission was planted under the most encouraging auspices. A church building was erected in Amoy, with funds from America, when there were but three communicant members of the mission. Three other distinct missionary churches, all of which are now self-sustaining, have swarmed out of this hive. Native preachers and helpers have been raised up, and the mission has been long regarded as a model of evangelizing work in China. The strictly missionary work in Amoy is now at an end; and the churches there would doubtless live and grow and propagate Christianity, like those of ancient times, even if all American missionaries were withdrawn from them. Such is the fruit of the labors of Mr. Pohlman and his associates and successors. His valuable life and labors were suddenly ended at Breaker's Point by shipwreck of the vessel on which he was bound from Hong Kong to Amoy, Jan. 5, 1849. Pirates attacked the sinking ship, but “Mr. Pohlman sprang from the ship and was drowned.” The ruling principle of Mr. Pohlman's life was his consecration to God. He gave himself and his all to Christ, and to the world for Christ's sake. He spared nothing. He was “totus in illis.” He was amiable, buoyant, frank, earnest, enthusiastic, and tenacious to the last degree in prosecuting his good purposes. His disposition was very cheerful. He had no crotchets. But with practical common sense and intense energy and zeal, he lived and labored for the kingdom of Christ. His preaching, correspondence, and public services glowed with this one spirit, which has left its permanent impress upon the mission and Church of which he was so conspicuous a servant. (W.J.R.T.)

## Poilly, Fran?ois de[[@Headword:Poilly, Fran?ois de]]

             a French engraver, was born at Abbeville in 1622 or 1623. His father was a goldsmith. After working for three years in the studio of Pierre Daret, he went to Rome in 1649 and remained there until 1656. He engraved during his stay in Italy some drawings in a manner which resembles that of Bloemaert. On his return to France, he engraved with equal success portraits and historical subjects. His portraits are sought for even now, perhaps less on account of the merits of an art which must be confessed to be somewhat cold and monotonous, than of the persons they represent. Poilly was honored with the title of ordinary engraver to the king. He reproduced the works of Raffaelle, Giulio Romano, Guido, Carraccio, Le Brun, Mignard, Le Sueur, Poussin, Ph. de Champagne, etc. The great reputation he enjoyed in his time attracted to his studio a number of pupils,  among them Gerard Edelinck. Nicolas de Poilly, his brother, Scotin, Roullet, etc. Poilly and his brother lived together with the Mariette family, for whom Gerard worked. Poilly died at Paris, March 1693. Though Poilly's style is very laborious, there are about four hundred prints which bear his name, in which however he was of course assisted by his pupils. His masterpiece is the print from Mignard's celebrated picture, now lost, of San Carlo Borromeo administering the Sacrament to the Milanese attacked with the Plague. A catalogue of his prints was published by R. Hecquet in 1752. See Ioefer, Nouv. Biog. Géneralé, s.v.; Mrs. Clement, Handbook of Painters, Sculptors, Architects, and Engravers, s.v.

## Poimen[[@Headword:Poimen]]

             (ποιμήν), i.e. pastor, is a name given to ministers of the Gospel in the New-Testament writings and by the early Church. It is a term recommended by the circumstance that Christ had compared himself to a shepherd and his people to a flock; and the apostle Peter had called him the Chief Shepherd. SEE PASTOR.

## Poindexter, Abram Maer, D.D[[@Headword:Poindexter, Abram Maer, D.D]]

             a Baptist divine, was born in Bertie County, N.C., September 22, 1809. He studied at Columbian College, Washington, D.C., but did not graduate. He united with the Church in 1831, was licensed in 1832, and ordained in 1834. Most of his life was spent in Halifax County, Virginia. For a time. he acted as financial agent of Columbian and Richmond Colleges, was secretary of the Southern Baptist Publication Society, and officially connected with the Foreign Mission Board of the Southern Baptist Convention. He died May 7, 1872. Dr. Poindexter ranked high as a preacher, especially on occasions where a large body of the people were assembled. He was also distinguished as a most skilful debater. See Cathcart, Baptist Encyclop. page 924. (J.C.S.)

## Pointed[[@Headword:Pointed]]

             In the English Prayer-book the Psalter, Venite, Te Deum, etc., are punctuated throughout in a peculiar manner by the insertion of a colon in or near the middle of each verse without regard to grammatical rules. This is done with the design of facilitating the chanting by presenting to the eye the most natural division of the verse, or that which will most readily correspond with the movement of the chant-tune. In allusion to this, the title of the English Prayer-book states that the Psalms of David are pointed (or punctuated) as they are to be sung or said in churches.” In the American editions the grammatical punctuation has been restored, and the above portion of the title omitted.

## Pointed Style[[@Headword:Pointed Style]]

             especially applied to the Pointed arch, is an architectural term first used in the 14th century. The Pointed style occurs in Egypt, Italy, Greece, and Mexico in ancient buildings, merely as a freak of the architect, an accident, or irregularity. Some authors have traced its origin to the avenues of a forest; others have seen it in the palm, in the wooden churches of an earlier period, or the intersecting arcade. Some refer it to the Goths, like  Warburton; or to the Saracens, like Christopher Wren. SEE GOTHIC ARCHITECTURE.

## Pointer, John[[@Headword:Pointer, John]]

             an English divine of some note, flourished in the first half of the 18th century as chaplain of Merton College, Oxford, where he was probably educated, and as rector of Slapton. He published, besides several works of an altogether secular character, Oxonienses Academia (Lond, 1749, 12mo). See Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors, s.v.

## Points, Hebrew[[@Headword:Points, Hebrew]]

             SEE MASORAH.

## Pointz, Robert[[@Headword:Pointz, Robert]]

             an English theologian of some repute, flourished near the middle of the 16th century. He was educated at Oxford University, and was made perpetual fellow of New College in 1554. He was obliged to go abroad after the accession of queen Mary, he having embraced the Reformed doctrines, and preferring exile to abnegation of his religious convictions. He went to Louvain, and settled there as pastor of a Protestant congregation. He wrote several controversial works against the Romanists, examining their different characteristic doctrines. Among these are, Testimonies for the Real Presence (Lond. 1566, 16mo): — Miracles performed by the Eucharist (1570). See Wood, Athenae Oxonienses, 3, 715.

## Poiret, Pierre[[@Headword:Poiret, Pierre]]

             a French philosopher of mystical tendency, and a writer whose works are of great importance to the students of French theological thought, was born at Metz April 15, 1646. He lost his father, a mechanic, when but six years of age. As he showed some disposition for the fine arts, he entered as an apprentice the studio of a sculptor, where he learned the elements of drawing. At thirteen years he studied humanities, and from 1661 to 1663 he was tutor at Basle, and there studied at the same time philosophy and theology. He finally entered the evangelical ministry, and after residing for a while at Hanau, was called as pastor to Heidelberg in 1667; married there, and acquired the reputation of a good preacher. In 1672 he was appointed pastor at Anweiler, in the duchy of Zweibrticken. Here he  familiarized himself with the writings of the philosopher Descartes, and of the mystics Kempis, Tauler, and Antoinette Bourignon, and commenced to turn his thoughts towards the spiritual life. In 1673 a dangerous illness converted him fully to mysticism. The war having disturbed his peaceful studies, he first took refuge in Holland, then at Hamburg, in the house of Mlle. Bourignon to whom he had been long attached by feelings of esteem and admiration. In 1680 he established himself at Amsterdam.

Speaking of his exemplary life there, Bayle says that “from a great Cartesian he had become so pious that, in order to apply himself the better to the things of heaven, he had broken off almost every intercourse with the earth.” In order to live in more complete seclusion, he retired in 1688 to Rheinsberg, near Leyden, where he spent more than thirty years in the exercise of piety, and in the composition of spiritual and ascetic works. He died there May 21, 1719. Poiret is not the founder of a sect; he established no conventicles, because he attached no importance whatever to dogmatical questions. His theological system lacked speculative clearness and consistency, and was rather a subjective theology of the adoring heart and soaring fancy than of the seeing intellect. It lays little stress upon the forms and rules of any particular Church, and placed the ideal of the Christian life in retired, uninterrupted communion with self and with God. For him, morals were the essence of religion. Hence there was never a more tolerant theologian. If he avoided all intercourse with the world, it was to preserve the integrity of his conscience. Far from being indifferent, he was full of zeal for the Christian religion, which he defended on several occasions, especially against Spinoza. All those who were acquainted with him agree in the' praise of his meekness, his modesty, the purity of his life, the kindness of his heart. It would be unjust to deny that there are excellent things in his works.

He displays a surprising sagacity in resolving the most subtle questions of metaphysics, and an uncommon talent in throwing light on the most obscure principles of theosophy. There is a methodical spirit in his writings, which is a fruit of his close study of Descartes and his system, under an appearance of disorder, is admirably connected and developed. He left about forty works, of which by far the most important is his De AEconomia Divina, under the French title, L'Economie Divine, ou Systeme universel, et démontré des AEuvres et des Desseins de Dieu envers les Hommes (Amsterd. 1687, 7 vols. 8vo), in which he means to show with certainty the general harmony of nature and grace, of philosophy and theology, of reason and faith, of natural and Christian ethics. The principle of the philosophic fabric which Poiret sought to  construct, and which really systematizes and also explains the wild and incoherent rhapsodies of Bourignon is abstraction, or the preference of a presumed illumination to reason; the same in essence as the quietism of Molinos, the annihilation of the Hindu philosophy, and the divine vision of Bohme. Theologically there are, perhaps, some things that may be considered valuable in Poiret's writings.

Opposed on the one hand to Descartes, and on the other to the then growing opinions of Locke, against whom he wrote an able treatise (Fibides et Ratio colltace ac suo utraque loco novitae adversus Piincipia J. Lockii), Poiret sought to mend weakness of reason by faith, and badness of will by grace. But the extension of his religious notions into the proper boundaries of speculative philosophy, to say nothing of his strong tendency to fanaticism, points him out to us as one of the most decided instances of mysticism in his age. Most peculiar are Poiret's Christological views. According to ch. 11 of this same treatise, the (ideal) Son of God assumed human nature soon after the creation of man, and prior to his fall, in such a manner that he (the Son of God) took from Adam his body and a divine soul. Poiret also ascribed to Christ, previous to his incarnation in the Virgin Mary, not only various manifestations, but also human “emotions and sufferings,” and an unwearying intercession for mankind, his brethren (his office as high- priest). But in the Virgin Mary he assumed mortal flesh. “The body of Jesus Christ, assuming the flesh and blood of the blessed Virgin, is as little composed of two different bodies as a white and shining garment, dipped in a vessel dark and full of color, and coming into contact with the matter which composes this darkness, is thereby changed into a double garment, or into two garments instead of one.” A complete list of Poiret's works would be useless without a description of them, for which we have not space. The curious may consult the Cataiogue Raisonne, in the Memories of J. P. Niceron (Par. 1727-1745). We have room here for the most important writings only. Among these we would mention Cogitationes Rationalis (de Deo, animo et malo (Amsterd. 1677, 4to). The edition of 1715 has besides a dissertation against the hidden atheism of Bayle and Spinoza: — La Paix des bonnes Amles dans toutes les Parties du Christianisme (ibid. 1687, 12mo). He advises peace in God between all righteous persons, without distinction of communion or rites. the essential is to go to God by the road of morality, the rest is of little account: — Idea Theologiae Christianas juxta Principia J. Behmi (ibid. 1687, 12mo). He avows that to understand Bohme is all but impossible: — Les Principes solides lde la Religion et de la Vie Chretienne appliques à l'Education des  Enfants (ibid. 1690, 1705, 12mo). This book, disapproved by the ministers of Hamburg, was translated into German, English, Flemish, and Latin: — De Eruditione triplici sotida, superficiaria et falsa lib. 3 (ibid. 1692, 12mo, and 1707 4to). His purpose is to show that there can be no real erudition without inspiration from above: — Theologie du Coeur (Cologne, 1696, 1697, 16mo): — La Theologie reelle, vulgairement dits la Thiologie Germanique (Amsterd. 1700, 12mo). This translation of a German work of the 16th century, translated before by Castalion, had been published in 1676. Poiret accompanied it with a Letter on the mystical authors; the latter are 130 in number, and Poiret gives most curious details about their principles, character, life, and works: — Theologie Mysticae Idea (ibid. 1702, 12mo): — F-ides et Ratio adversus Principia J. Lockii (ibid. 1707, 12mo): — Bibliotheca Mysticoruunm Selecta (ibid. 1708, 8vo): — Posthuma (ibid. 1721, 4to). Poiret translated The Imitation of Jesus Christ (ibid. 1683, 12mo, sev. edit.), which he paraphrased partly according to the interior sense; the works of St. Catherine of Genoa (1691, 12mo), and those of Angele de Foligny (1696, 12mo). He edited the (Euvres d'Antoinette Bourignon (Amsterd. 1679 and following, 19 vols. 12mo), with a most circumstantial Life, which was reprinted apart (1683, 2 vols. 12mo), and followed by an apologetic Memoire, inserted in the Nouvelles de la Republique des Lettres (1685); an answer to the attacks of Scckendorf (Monitum Necessariunm, 1686, 4to); several mystical Opuscules; and after having published several of the writings of Mme. Guyon, among others, Le Nouveau et l'Ancien Testament (Cologne, 1713- 1715, 20 vols. 12mo); her Vie, ecrite par elle-meme (1720, 3 vols. 12mo); and her Poesies (1722, 12mo), brought out a complete edition with great care, in 39 vols., furnishing them with elaborate introductions, prefaces, and apologies, sufficient to make several volumes in themselves. In all this there is manifest, as in the editing of Mile. Bourignon's writings, a remarkable willingness to hide himself entirely behind the beloved objects upon which he spends his toil; so that now in many instances it is impossible to tell just how much of the worth and beauty of whole volumes is to be assigned to himself rather than to the reputed authors. Nearly all of Poiret's writings have been translated into Latin, Dutch, and German. See Walch, Religionsstreitigkeiten ausser der evangel. — Luther. Kirche, liv, 911 sq.; Niceron, flist. des Hommes illustres, 4, 144 sq.; 10:140 sq.; Grisse, Literaturgesch. vol. 3, pt. 3, p. 479 sq.; Erdmann, Verstuch einer Gesch. d. neuern Philosophie, vol. 1, pt. 2, p. 217 sq.; Bibliotheca Bremens. Theol. Philol. tom. 3, pt. 1, p. 75; Noack, Mystik 217; Niedner,  Zeitschr.fiir die hist. Theol. 1853-54; Hagenbach, Vorlesungen über die Kirchengesch. 4, 326 sq.; Dorner, On the Person of Christ, 1, 231 sq.; Morell, Speculatiae Philos. of Europe, p. 201; Comment. de Vita et Scriptes Petri Poiaret, in his Posthuma (Amsterd. 1721, 8vo); Jervis, Hist. of the Church of France (see Index); Hurst, Hist. of Rationalism (see Index); Haag, La France Protestante, s.v.; Histoire des Dogmes (see Index).

## Poirey, Francois[[@Headword:Poirey, Francois]]

             a French Jesuit, was born in 1584 at Vesoul. He entered the Society of Jesus at the age of seventeen years; was a successful teacher of humanities, rhetorics, philosophy, and Holy Writ, and was appointed superior of a house of his order at Nancy; rector of the college of Lyons, and of that of Dole. He left, Ignis Holocausti (Pont-a-Mousson, 1629, 16mo):La Manieae de se disposer a bien mourir (Douai, 1638, 16mo): — Le bon Pasteur (Pont-a-Mousson. 1630,12mo: — Le Science des Saints (Par. 1638, 4to), etc. He died at Dole Nov. 25, 1637. — Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Géneralé, s.v.

## Poirier, Germain, Dom[[@Headword:Poirier, Germain, Dom]]

             a learned French Benedictine, was born Jan. 8, 1724, at Paris. He was not quite fifteen years of age when he entered the Congregation of Saint-Maur. After teaching philosophy and theology in the houses of his order, he was appointed secretary to the visitor-general of France, and resigned this place for another which was more congenial to his tastes, that of guardian of the archives of Saint-Denis. In 1762 he published in the Nouvelle Collection des Historiens de la France, vol. 11, which contains the reign of Henry I, an excellent Preface, which forms the fourth part of it, and is, according to Dacier, the most substantial and best work ever written on the first Capetian kings. Tired of the troubles by which his congregation was agitated, he left it in 1765, but re-entered it two years later, and was intrusted with the archives of Saint-Germain-des-Pres. In 1785 he was admitted as free associate into the Academie des Inscriptions. During the Revolution he was a member of the commission of monuments, and exerted himself actively ill preserving from destruction a number of valuable manuscripts. In 1796 he was appointed librarian of the Arsenal, and in 1800 he succeeded Legrand d'Aussy in the National Institute: He united to a rare erudition a no less rare modesty; he worked for the  pleasure he found in the work; hence his easy willingness to communicate the fruit of his researches to any one who recurred to him. His death revealed the secret of his virtues and of his benevolence; the blessings of the poor, their testimonies of gratitude-written testimonies, found, with a few pieces of money, in his bureau-were his whole treasure. He wore cheap clothes, and condemned himself' to privations, to be able to give food and clothing to the poor. He died at Paris Feb. 2, 1803. Besides what has been mentioned, he wrote several historical Memoires, which were read in the academy of which he was a member, etc. See Dacier, Eloge de Dom Poirier (Paris, 1804, 8vo). — Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Géneralé, s.v.

## Poisal, John, D.D[[@Headword:Poisal, John, D.D]]

             a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church South, was born at Martinsburg, W. Virginia, May 13, 1807. He was converted when a youth, and in his nineteenth year was admitted into the Baltimore Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church, in which, and in the corresponding Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church South, after its separation, he continued, with the exception of a few years in the New York and the Philadelphia conferences, to labor with great efficiency and success until his death, June 25, 1882. See Minutes of Annual Conferences of the M.E. Church South, 1883, page 14.

## Poison[[@Headword:Poison]]

             is the rendering in the A. V. of the Bible of two Hebrew and two Greek terms, but they are so general as to throw little light upon the knowledge and practice of poisons among the Hebrews.

1. חֵמָה, chemaih, from the root signifying “to be hot,” is used of the heat produced by wine (Hos 7:5), and the hot passion of anger (Deu 29:27, etc.), as well as of the burning venom of poisonous serpents (Deu 32:24; Deu 32:33; Psa 58:4; Psa 140:3). In all cases it denotes animal poison, and nut vegetable or mineral. The only allusion to its application is in Job 6:4, where reference seems to be made to the custom of anointing arrows with the venom of a snake, a practice the origin of which is of very remote antiquity (comp. Homer, Od. 1, 261, 262; Ovid, Trist. 3, 10, 64; Fast. 5, 397, etc.; Pliny, 18:1). The Soanes, a Caucasian race mentioned by Strabo (11, 499), were especially skilled in the art. Pliny (6, 34) mentions a tribe of Arab pirates who infested the Red Sea, and were armed with poisoned arrows like the Malays of the coast of Borneo. For this purpose the berries of the yew-tree (Pliny, 16:20) were employed. The Gauls (Pliny, 27:76) used a poisonous herb, limeum, supposed by some to be the “leopard's bane,” and the Scythians dipped their arrow-points in vipers' venom mixed with human blood. These were so deadly that a slight scratch inflicted by them was fatal (Pliny, 11:115). The practice was so common that the name τοξικόν, originally a poison in which arrows were dipped, was applied to poison generally. SEE ARROW. In Palestine and the countries adjacent were many venomous snakes, as well as insects, such as the scorpion and the scolopendra; but no such practice obtained among the Jews. Poisonous plants were as well known as in other countries, and we have an instance of a miracle wrought by Elisha  (2Ki 4:38), to prevent mischief by the accidental shredding of a wild gourd into a mess of pottage prepared for the sons of the prophets. This fruit or vegetable was probably the colocynth; and when those who were about to partake of it were repelled by its nauseous bitterness, the prophet commanded a handful of meal to be thrown into the pot, and thus rendered its contents fit for human food. SEE GOURD.

2. ראֹשׁ(once רוֹשׁ, Deu 32:32), rosh, if a poison at all, denotes a vegetable poison primarily, and is only twice (Deu 32:33; Job 20:16) used of the venom of a serpent. In other passages where it occurs it is translated “gall” in the A. V., except in Hos 10:4 where it is rendered “‘hemlock.” In the margin of Deu 29:18 our translators, feeling the uncertainty of the word, gave as an alternative “rosh, or, a poisonful herb.” Beyond the fact that, whether poisonous or not, it was a plant of bitter taste, nothing can be inferred. That bitterness was its prevailing characteristic is evident from its being associated with wormwood (Deu 29:18 [17]; Lam 3:19; Amo 6:12), and from the allusions to “water of rosh” in Jer 8:14; Jer 9:15; Jer 23:15. It was not a juice or liquid (Psa 69:21 [22]; comp. Mar 15:23), but probably a bitter berry, in which case the expression in Deu 32:32, “grapes of rosh,” may be taken literally. It grew in the fields (Hos 10:4), was bitter to the taste (Jer 23:15; Psa 69:22; comp. Lam 3:5), and bore clusters, perhaps something like the belladonna (Deu 32:32.

Yet here the words עַנְּבֵי רוֹשׁmight also be rendered poison grapes, carrying out the figure of the vine, without special allusion to the poison plant). Any special rendering which would suit all the passages is uncertain, since all the old translators have but general expressions (Sept. χολή, Vulg. Jel, or else some word meaning bitter; yet in the passage from Hosea 1. c. ἄγρωστις, Ven. MS. τιθύμαλος), and there is no kindred word found in the other dialects to compare. Oedmanu (4, 83 sq.) referred the word to the poisonous colocynth (Cucumis colocynthi, Linn.), which grows almost everywhere in Arabia and Palestine; a plant with a creeping stem, bright green leaves, and bears a fruit with a strangely bitter juice (Fabri Evagat. 2, 417 sq.). But this fruit is not a berry, but an apple, of the size of the closed hand; nor does the colocynth shoot up among the grain. Michaelis (Fragm. etc., p. 145) would understand the hyoscyamus or the darmnel (Lolium temulentum). (But see Oedmann. ut stp. p. 85.) This meaning suits the passage in Hosea well (Rosenmüller, Alterth. 4, 1, 118), but not that in  Deu 32:32; nor does the lolium produce so active a poison that it could be mentioned by way of eminence in these passages. Indeed, many moderns disbelieve its poisonous properties entirely. Celsius (lierobot. 2, 46 sq.) explains rosh of the cicuta or hemlock, but is opposed by Michaelis and Oedmann (ut sup. p. 84). Gesenius (Thesaur. p. 1281), on the ground that the word in Hebrew also signifies “head,” rejects the hemlock, colocynth and darnel of other writers, and proposes the “poppy” instead (comp. Livy, 1, 54, Papaverum capita, Papaver somnifelrum), from the “heads” in which its seeds are contained, and from which the Orientals have extracted opium from a remote antiquity. This was known to the ancients to be poisonous, when taken in excess (Pliny, 20:76). But it may be doubted whether the poppy could be so directly and pre-eminently styled the poison plant (it was even placed on the table as a sidedish, Pliny, 19:53); and if rosh had denoted a plant so well known, surely some one of the old interpreters would have discovered it. “Water of rosh” would thus be simply ‘opium;” but it must be admitted that there appears in none of the above passages to be any allusion to the characteristic effects of opium. The effects of the rosh are simply nausea and loathing. It was probably a general term for any bitter or nauseous plant, whether poisonous or not, and became afterwards applied to the venom of snakes, as the corresponding word in Chaldee is frequently so used. SEE HEMLOCK.

3. Ι᾿ός, strictly something emitted, as a missile weapon; hence the venom of a serpent (Jam 3:8; Rom 3:13). SEE SERPENT.

4. Φάρμακον, prop. medicine, hence often a deadly potion. There is a clear case of suicide by poison related in 2Ma 10:13, where Ptolemaeus Macron is said to have destroyed himself by this means. But we do not find a trace of it among the Jews, and certainly poisoning in any form was not in favor with them. Nor is there any reference to it in the N.T., though the practice was fatally common at that time in Rome (Sueton. Nero, 33, 34, 35; Tüb. 73; Claud. 1). It has been suggested, indeed, that the φαρμακεία of Gal 5:20 (A. V. “witchcraft”) signifies poisoning, but this is by no means consistent with the usage of the word in the Sept. (comp. Exo 7:11; Exo 8:7; Exo 8:18. etc.), and with its occurrence in Rev 9:21, where it denotes a crime clearly distinguished from murder (see Rev 21:8; Rev 22:15). It more probably refers to the concoction of magical potions and love philters. SEE WITCHCRAFT.  The reference in Mar 16:18 seems to be to the custom of condemnation to death by means of poison (κώνειον, Plato, Lys. 219; Plutarch, Phoc. c. 36; Diog. Laert. 2, 42; Ael. V. H. 1, 16; 9:21; comp. J. Jac. Bose, De potionibus mortiferis, Lips. 1736). We read in 2Ma 10:13 of an example of suicide by poison (comp. Bose, iss. p. 25 sq.). The administration of poisons seems to have been no unusual crime in the days of the apostles (see Winer, Ad Gtlat. p. 125; comp. Philo, Op. 2. 315 sq.), and the Arabian women were especially famous for their skill in preparing them (Joseph. Ant. 17:4, 1; comp. Rein, Romr. Criminahlecht, p. 427 sq.). But in the New Testament the words φαρμακεία and φαρμακεύς do not refer to this, but to necromancy (q.v.). On poisoned arrows, see Bow. Swords were sometimes also dipped in poison (Curt. 9, 8, 20). SEE MYRRH.

## Poissi[[@Headword:Poissi]]

             SEE POISSY.

## Poisson, Nicolas Joseph[[@Headword:Poisson, Nicolas Joseph]]

             a French ecclesiastic, noted as a writer of philosophy, was born in 1637 at Paris. He entered the Congregation of the Oratory at the age of twenty- three (1660), and undertook to propagate the principles of Descartes by writing a general commentary on all the works of that philosopher; but after publishing the Traite de la Memique Canote (Par. 1668, 4to), and Remam ques sur la Methode (Vendome, 1671, 8vo), he gave up the project for fear of compromising his congregation, whom their zeal for the new philosophy exposed to the resentment of the followers of Aristotle. The same fear prevented him from complying with the solicitations of Clerselier and of queen Christina, who promised him ample materials for a Life of Descartes. In 1677 he went to Rome, and handed secretly to pope Innocent XI, in the name of the bishops of Arras and Saint-Pens, a Memoire composed by Nicolas, and thus obtained the condemnation of sixty-five propositions of lax morals which were then in vogue in the schools of theology. The real object of his journey being discovered he was recalled by order of Pere Lachaise (1679), and relegated to Nevers, where bishop Valot made him his vicar, and gave him the direction of the diocesan seminary. After the death of this prelate, Poisson retired to a house of his order at Lyons (1705), where he died, May 3, 1710. He published, besides, Acta Ecclesiae Mediolanensis stub sancto Carolo  (Lyons, 1681-83, 2 vols. fol.), valuable for the number of documents translated by the author from Italian into Latin: — Delectus actorumn Ecclesice Universalis (ibid. 1706, 2 vols. fol.). This summary of the councils is the most extensive abridgment which we have on the subject he left a number of manuscripts, among them, Vie de Charlotte de Harlay- Sancy: — a Description de Rome moderne: — a Relation of his journey to Rome, etc. See Salmon, Trait de l'etude des Conciles, p). 275 sq.; Moreri, Grand Dict. Hist. s.v. — Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Géneralé, s.v.

## Poissy, Conference of[[@Headword:Poissy, Conference of]]

             an ecclesiastical colloquy held September, 1561, is of very great importance in the reformatory history of the French Church. It has been somewhat spoken of in the article HUGUENOTS SEE HUGUENOTS (q.v.). It was called by Catharine de' Medici, and was composed of all bishops and archbishops, and the representatives of the absent prelates of France. It was intended that the conference should prepare partly for the anticipated renewal of the Tridentinum (q.v.), partly as a sort of national council, to effect the reformation of the French Church; and partly to help reduce the debt of the kingdom by the treasures of the Church. But however friendly the prelates were to the state, they did not look very favorably upon the project of reform, though all classes of society were then anxiously discussing not only reform of abuses but of doctrine. Reformed preachers were invited to participate, and even Catharine wrote in favor of the project of keeping the Huguenots within the pale of the Church, and to facilitate a reconciliation by tolerating a difference of sentiment. Pius IV, then the Roman pontiff, objected to the conference, on the ground that “if every prince were to take upon himself to hold councils in his own dominions the Church would soon become a scene of universal confuision” (Fra Paolo, Hist. du Concile de Trente, liv. 5, § 53, 72).

The colloquy was opened Sept. 9, in presence of the young king, the queen mother, the princes of the blood, the great officers of the crown, and a brilliant audience. Cardinal de Tournon presided. The Reformers were represented by twelve of their most eminent ministers, headed by Theodore Beza the favorite disciple and confidential friend of Calvin. Peter Martyr, who was reckoned the ablest theologian of the party, was likewise present. The proceedings were opened with a speech by chancellor L'Hopital in favor of this national council, and its advantages over an ecumenical synod. Beza spoke next in elaborate exposition of the doctrinal system of the  Reformers as set forth in the “Institutions” of Calvin. Beza's tone was calm, conciliatory, and impressive. In treating of the Eucharist, lie employed language which at first seemed almost tantamount to the Catholic terminology on that vital point. Butt on further explanation it appeared that the presence which he recognized was subjective only; depending not on the supernatural virtue of the sacrament, but on the power of faith; to be sought not in any change of the substance of the elements, but in the heart of the devout communicant. Beza repudiated both transubstantiation (q.v.) and consubstantiation (q.v.). Cardinal de Tournon objected to Beza's speech, and in a trembling voice prayed for its interruption on the ground that the young monarch's mind would be poisoned. Beza, however, managed to conclude, when, after a few hasty words of angry remonstrance from the cardinal, the assembly separated in a state of agitation (De Thou, Hist. Univ. liv. 28; La Place, Commentaire de l'Etat de Religion, liv. 6).

At the second meeting, several days afterwards, the cardinal of Lorraine replied to Beza in a very able discourse. The doctrine of the real presence, as held in the Church of Rome he proceeded to establish by proofs drawn with great skill from the Holy Bible and the Church fathers. (The speech is given at full length in the Collection des Poces-verbaux des Assembles generales du Cleyrg deFrance, vol. 1, “Pieces Justifications,” No. 2.) The sitting was then adjourned. The sessions which followed were not held in the royal presence, and were comparatively private. Though it was clear that there could be no successful settlement by the conference, it was resolved by all parties to make a final effort for approximation, and for this purpose a select committee of ten persons was named from the most moderate members of each party. After some days of negotiation, these divines drew up a formulary upon the doctrine of the Eucharist, in the terms of which it was hoped that all sincere friends of peace in the rival communions might be induced to concur. Its language, however, was so ambiguous that each party was at liberty to construe it in accordance with their own prepossessions. Tie following was the draft agreed upon: “We confess that Jesus Christ, in his Holy Supper, presents, gives, and exhibits to us the true substance of his body and blood by the operation of the Holy Spirit; and that we receive and eat sacramentally, spiritually, and by faith the very body which died for us, that we may be bone of his bone and flesh of his flesh; and inasmuch as faith, resting on the Word of God, makes present things which are promised, so that thereby we receive actually the  true and natural body and blood of our Lord by the power of the Holy Ghost, in that sense we acknowledge the real presence of Christ in the Holy Supper” (Beza, Histoire des Eglises Ref 1, 608; Contin. de Fleury, liv. 47, 24). Of course such evasion could not prove satisfactory. The doctors of the Sorbonne being appealed to, rejected the formulary as “captious, insufficient, and heretical;” and then the prelates put forth a counter-statement, asserting the real presence by transubstantiation of the elements, according to the authorized traditions of the Church. This they forwarded to the queen, with a request that Beza and his associates might be ordered to signify their acceptance of it without further demur, under pain of being proscribed as heretics and banished from the kingdom. This peremptory demand was equivalent to a rupture of the negotiations; and the conference of Poissy terminated without satisfactory result.

The actions of the conference were therefore of very little advantage. Several regulations relating to discipline were made. Concerning the election of bishops, it was ordered that the name of the person nominated by the king to a bishopric shall be posted at the cathedral doors, and in other public places, that all persons may have the opportunity of objecting to him if they know anything against him. The following is a summary of other important actions of this synod:

Archbishops and bishops are forbidden to absent themselves from their dioceses for more than three months; are exhorted to apply themselves to preaching and visitations, and to hold annual synods.

Archbishops are directed to summon provincial councils every three years, according to the decrees of the Council of Basle. Excommunications, save for weighty reasons, are forbidden. Curates not to be admitted to their benefices until they have been examined by the bishop: they are ordered to proceed to priest's orders within a year from their admission: to reside constantly; to explain the Gospel to their people, and to teach them to pray. Private masses are forbidden to be said while solemn mass is celebrated.

Priests are enjoined to prepare themselves carefully before approaching the holy altar; to pronounce the words distinctly; to do all with decency and gravity; not to suffer any airs, save those of hymns and canticles, to be played upon the organ; to correct the church books; to try to abolish all superstitious practices; to instruct the people that images are exposed to view in the churches for no other reason than to remind persons of Jesus  Christ and the saints. It is further directed that all images which are in any way indecent, or which merely illustrate fabulous and ridiculous tales, shall be entirely removed.

These regulations are closed by a profession of faith in which the errors of Luther and Calvin, and other sectarians, are specially rejected.

See, besides the authorities already cited, De Felice, History of French Protestantism, p. 101 sq.; Bossuet, Varuiations, vol. 1; Jervis, Church of France, 1, 137-146; Soldan, Gesch. des Protestantismus in Frankreich (1855), etc., vol. 1; Ranke, Franzosische Gesch. 1, 236 sq.; Baum. Theodor Beza (1851), vol. 2; Smedley, History of the Ref. Relgion in France, 1, 148 sq., 178; Smiles, History of the Huguenots (see Index); Hardwick, History of the Reformation, p. 138 sq. (J. H. W.)

## Poitier, Pierre Louis[[@Headword:Poitier, Pierre Louis]]

             a French religious writer, was born Dec. 26, 1745, at Havre. As soon as he had taken holy orders, he was appointed superior of the seminary of Rouen, by cardinal La Rochefoucauld, archbishop of that city. After submitting to the law which exacted the constitutional oath of clergymen, he recalled it, and retired to the seminary of St. Firmin, at Paris, where he perished, Sept. 2, 1792, with almost all his companions. He left some works of edification, which had several editions. — Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Géneralé, 40, 582.

## Poitiers[[@Headword:Poitiers]]

             (earlier POICTIERS, a corruption of the Latin Pictavium, so called by the Gallic tribe, the Pictai, who inhabited the district in Caesar's time) is one of the oldest towns in France. It is the capital of the department of Vienne, and is situated on an eminence near the rivers Clain and Boivre. Its population is now about 31,034, and it possesses many churches, chapels, and monasteries. Its cathedral, named St. Pierre, is one of the finest in France, and belongs to the 12th century. It contains the ashes of Richard Coeur de Lion, and was the seat, in its present condition, or in the older edifice that occupied its site, of twenty-three ecclesiastical councils.

## Poitiers, Councils Of[[@Headword:Poitiers, Councils Of]]

             (Concilium Pictaviense), were convened here at different times in the Middle Ages.

I. The first of these was held in 593, and was provoked by a rebellion of nuns, under the leadership of Chrodielde, a Frankish princess and nun at Poitiers, who had rebelled against Leubovera, abbess of St. Croix. She was here called to account for leaving her nunnery, and for the violence which she had committed against Gondegesile and other bishops; also for the acts of rebellion which she, in concert with Besina, another nun, had committed against their abbess. Being exhorted to ask forgiveness of the abbess, she boldly refused, and threatened to kill her. The bishops, after consulting the canons, declared her to be excommunicated, and ordered that she should remain so until she should have done penance. They then re-established the abbess, Leubovera, in the government of tile monastery. See Labbe, Concil. 5, 1593; Gregor. Turon. Hist. d. France, 9, 4; 10:16, 19; Mansi, Concil. 9, 1011; 10:455, 459; Hardouin, Concil. 3, 490, 527, 531; Hefele, Conciliengesch. 3, 51.

II. Another council was held Jan. 13, 1004, convoked by William V, count of Poitiers and duke of Aquitaine. Five bishops were present, who published three canons:

1. Pronounces those persons to be under anathema who pillage the churches, rob the poor, or strike the clergy; and further declares that if they rebel against this sentence the bishops and barons shall assemble and march against them, ravaging all around them until they submit.

The other two canons forbid bishops to take any fees for penance and confirmation; and priests and deacons to retain women in their houses. See Labbe, Concil. 9, 780.

III. The third council was held in 1073, before cardinal Gerand, the Roman legate, against Berenger. The question of the Holy Eucharist was discussed, and the minds of men were so exasperated against Berenger that he narrowly escaped with his life. See Labbe, Concil. 10, 346.

IV. The fourth was held in 1078, by the legate Hugo, bishop of Die, who, by the account which he gave of this council to pope Gregory VII, seems to have encountered much opposition to his plans. He complains that the king of France had forbidden the count of Poitiers to allow the council to be held within his states; that the archbishop of Tours and the bishop of Rennes had rendered themselves almost complete masters of the council, and that the assembly had been disturbed by the armed followers of these  prelates. Some attribute to this council, and others to the following one, ten canons, of which these are the most worthy of note:

1. Forbids to receive investitures at the hands of kings and other laymen.

2. Forbids simony and pluralities.

4. Forbids bishops to receive any present for conferring holy orders, for consecrating churches, or for giving any benediction.

6. Forbids monks and canons to purchase churches without the bishop's consent.

8. Forbids the ordination of the children of priests, and of bastards, except they be canons or regular monks.

10. Enjoins that clerks who carry arms, or who deal in usury, shall be excommunicated. See Labbe, Concil. 10, 366.

V. The last council convened at Poitiers was held Nov. 18, 1100, by order of John and Benedict, the two legates of the Holy See, who presided in the place of Pascal II. About eighty bishops and abbots were present. Norigaudus, bishop of Autun, having been found guilty of simony, was condemned to give up his stole and pastoral ring. Upon his refusal to do so, he was further deposed from his bishopric and from the priesthood, and sentence of excommunication was denounced against all who continued to obey him as their bishop. He, nevertheless, persisted in his refusal to submit to the sentence, and retained his stole and ring. In this council, moreover, Philip, king of France, who had taken back to him Bertrade, his wife, was excommunicated by the legates, in spite of the opposition of many of the bishops and of William, duke of Aquitaine. Lastly, sixteen canons were published:

1. Declares that it is lawful for bishops only to give the tonsure (coronas benedicere) to the clergy, and for abbots to do so to monks.

2. Forbids them to require any fee for performing the operation, or even the scissors and napkin employed.

4. Reserves to the bishop the benediction of the sacerdotal vestments, and of all the vessels, etc., of the altar.

7. Forbids, under excommunication, to buy or sell prebends, and to require any allowance (pastus) for having given one.

10. Gives permission to regular canons to baptize, preach, administer the sacrament of penance, and bury the dead during the bishop's pleasure.

12. Forbids to allow to preach those who carry about the relics of saints for the sake of gain.

16. Confirms all that the pope had enacted in the Council of Clermont. See Labbe, Concil. 10, 720; Hefele, Conciliengesch. vols. 4 and 5.

## Poix, Louis De[[@Headword:Poix, Louis De]]

             a French monastic, was born Oct. 18, 1714, at Croixrault (diocese of Amiens). He devoted himself for some years to the study of the Greek, Hebrew, Chaldee, and Syriac languages, and conceived the design of a Polyglot Bible, to the redaction of which several of his confraternity (the Capuchin monks) promised to lend a hand. In 1744 the abbé Villefroy, professor at the College of France, took the direction of this enterprise; but the Bible impatiently expected by the learned world, and in regard to which Benedict XIV addressed a brief of felicitation to Louis de Poix, April 9, 1755, was not published, owing to divers contrarieties which at that time befell the Capuchins. In 1768 Poix wrote A Memoir, in which he advocated the foundation of an institution which, without being a burden to the State, would be of invaluable service to the Church, useful to the learned and men of letters, and honorable to the nation. He proposed the name of “Societe Royal des Etudes Orientales,” and on the plan suggested by him was founded, April 1, 1822, the “Socieit Asiatique.” Louis de Poix died at Paris in 1782. He published, with the collaboration of several other Capuchins, the following works: Prieres que Nerses, Patriartche des Armeniens, fit a la Gloire de Dieu, pour toute Ame fidele a Jesus Christ (1770): — Principes discutes pour-faciliter l'Intelligence des Livres prophetiques (Par. 1755-64, 16 vols. 12mo), the fruit of twenty years' labor: — Nouvelle Version des Psaumes (ibid. 1762, 2 vols. 12mo): — a Translation of Ecclesiastes (1771, 12mo): — Propheties de Jeenmie (ibid. 1780, 6 vols. 12mo): Propheties de Baruch (ibid. 1788, 12mo): — Essai sur le Livre de Job (ibid. 1768, 2 vols. 12mo): — Taaite de let Paix inteirieure (1764, 1768, 12mo): — Traite de la Joie (1768, 12mo). He left  in manuscript a Dictionaire Armenien, Latin, Italien, et Francais. — Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Géneralé, 40, 585.

## Poki, Jehuda, Ben-Elieser[[@Headword:Poki, Jehuda, Ben-Elieser]]

             (Tshelebi ben-Isaak Puli), a Jewish writer of some note, who belonged to the sect of the Karaites, was born and educated at Constantinople in the first half of the 16th century. He made extensive travels through Palestine, Egypt. Irak, and Persia in order to become acquainted with the Karaite literature. But having no knowledge of the Arabic, he was unable to make use of a large portion of Karaite literature, as he himself confessed in the preface of a work of his. In the year 1571 he was at Kahira, where he found many writings of the Karaites in the house of the Nasi, or head of the Karaites, where he also resided, and was told that all congregations were in possession of such collections, which, however, were very often burned or plundered. He was told that the year before (1570) three hundred very valuable and interesting works of the Karaites had been taken from the synagogue at Kahira and destroyed. At Kahira, Poki finished his work שער יהודהabout 1573, and died in 1575 in his native place. The above- named work, which was published by his son and brother at Constantinople in 1581, treats in a very elaborate way on the laws of incest, the preface of which has been reprinted by Wolf in his Bibl. Nebr. 3, 294 sq. See Furst, Gesch. des Kariaerthums, from 900 to 1575 (Leips. 1865), 2, 322 sq.; id. Bibl. Jud. 3, 108 sq.; De Rossi, Dizionario storico degli Autori Ebrei, p. 266 (Germ. transl. by Hamberger); Wolf, Bibl. Hebr. 3, 293 sq. (B. P.)

## Pol[[@Headword:Pol]]

             SEE BEAN.

## Polak, Jacob[[@Headword:Polak, Jacob]]

             a Jewish savant, one of the greatest Talmudic authorities in his time, was born about 1460, and died about 1530 at Prague, where under his lead a great Talmudic school had flourished. Polak was a pupil of Jacob Margoles of Nuremberg, from whom he learned a new method of Talmudic casuistry, known as the “Pilpul.” In the times which were disastrous and troublesome to the Jews the study of the Talmud was left to itself, and, guided by no general scientific knowledge, it unavoidably degenerated into a method repulsive to the few who were really profound scholars, or whose minds were less distorted. The transition from the short explanation of words and  things of the older commentators of the Talmud—through the discussions and disputations of the Tosaphoth (in the narrower sense) -to the exercises of wit of the Nurembergers (Blauser, from the German “bloss,” by which the query was introduced) and Regensbergers (so called from the principal schools), and the pettifoggings of modern times, has not yet been specially investigated. There are many analogies in Christian jurisprudence and Mohammedan theology to this kind of casuistry and discussion (“Pilpull”), which devotes more attention to the mode of treatment than to the subject itself. For it is the nature of a practical science-and the Halacha must be regarded throughout as a theory of law-that over-theorizing causes it to degenerate from a practical aim to a mere play of intellect. During this unhappy time rules derived from idle speculation were enforced as rules of life belonging to the religious law, more strictly than at any former period; and subsequently the authors of the Tosaphoth and their successors, together with the great Spanish and Provengal legal authorities (particularly the authors of compendiums, judgments, etc.), were comprised under the expression “decernents” (Pesukinz, פסוקים). But it must be said in honor of Jacob Polak, though he introduced this “Pilpul method,” he was very careful not to write down nor publish the decisions achieved by this method of hair-splitting, for fear that his successors might follow him implicitly. The only work of his we have is a decision entitled ביעקב ויקם עדות, published with the approbation of Simon benBezalel (Prague, 1594), and republished together with Lowe ben-Bezalel's הֶסְפֵּד עִל פְּטַירִת חָכָם(Frankfort-on-the-Main, 1719). See Furst, Bibl. Jud. 3, 109 sq.; Wolf, Bibl. Hebr. 3, 1095; Graitz, Geschichte der Juden. 9, 63 sq.; Jost, Gesch. d. Judenth. 2. s. Sekten, 3, 240 sq.; Güdemann, in Frankel's Monatsschrift (Breslau, 1854), 13, 423 sq. (B. P.)

## Polallion, Marie De Lumague Dame De[[@Headword:Polallion, Marie De Lumague Dame De]]

             a French lady renowned for her piety, and the founder of a religious order, was born Nov. 29, 1599, at Paris. Belonging to a noble and rich family, and having enjoyed a brilliant education, she was wooed by several gentlemen of high standing, but, resisting all the seductions of the world, gave the preference to a life of monastic quiet. At the instigation of Lebrun, a Dominican who directed her conscience, she entered a monastery of the Capuchins. But as the weakness of her health did not suffer her to submit to the ascetic rules of the order, she was free to leave the monastery, and in 1617 she was married to Francois de Polallion. Her  husband died about a year after, and from this time she lived in retirement as tutor of one of the daughters of the duchess of Orleans. Madame de Polallion, in the midst of the most brilliant court of Europe, remained true to her early monastic habits, and when relieved of her duties sought again her former retreat. According to St. Vincent de Paul, she founded the “Institut des Filles de la Providence” in 1630: the members of this sisterhood undertook to educate the children of the poor in the country. She directed that they should be thirty-three in number, and distributed them in the villages of the environs of Paris. Her own means were soon exhausted by the enterprise, but private charity came to the rescue, and Anne of Austria, taking the institution under her protection, presented it in 1651 with a mansion in the suburb of Saint-Marceau. She also helped in the founding of the “Maison des Nouvelles Catholiques,” which was liberally endowed by marshal Turenne. The life of Madame de Polallion has frequently been written. She died at Paris Sept. 4, 1657. — Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Géneralé, 40, 587.

## Polanco[[@Headword:Polanco]]

             is the name of three brothers esteemed Spanish painters of the 16th century, natives of Seville. Francisco Zurbaran was their master, and they were so proficient in art that even in their own times their works were confounded with those of their master. This mistake, says Quillet, has been quite frequent with those who beheld the paintings of San-Esteban at Seville, where Zurbaran painted St. Peter and St. Stephen, but where the Martyrdom of the patron, the Nativity, which is below, St. Hermenegilde, and St. Herman, are works of Polanco. They always worked and lived together. Their great paintings adorn the monuments of Seville. At San- Paolo we find the Apparition of the Angels to Abraham; Tobias the Younger guided by an Angel; Jacob Wrestling; Joseph's Dream; and in the church of the Guardian Angels, St. Theresa in Ecstasy (1649). The last work of Carlo Polanco, who seems to have been the most celebrated of the brothers, bears the date of 1686. — Hoefer, Nouvelles Biographies Géneralé, 40, 588.

## Poland, Ecclesiastical History of[[@Headword:Poland, Ecclesiastical History of]]

             The Polish historians Naruscewicz, Friese, Lelewel, and others assert that Christianity was introduced into the Slavic countries at a very early period by some disciples of Methodius from Moravia. Lelewel, upon very unsafe  grounds, admits a bishopric of Posen anterior to the time of king Micislas I. According to Thietmar of Merseburg, the latter, under the influence of his wife Dambrouska, daughter of the Bohemian duke Boleslas, established the Christian religion in Poland in 965, prevailed upon his subjects to destroy the idols, and founded as early as 966, with the assistance of the German emperor Otho the Great, the bishopric of Posen (Poznani), over which, together with the bishoprics of Cizi, Misni, Merseburg, Brandenburg, and Havelberg, etc., jurisdiction was given to the archbishop of Magdeburg, at the Council of Ravenna, in 967. It follows that the year of foundation, 968, given by Boguphalus and the Annales Poznan., has been accepted erroneously. The diocese of the bishop of Posen extended over the dominions of duke Boleslas, the boundaries of which cannot be ascertained for want of documents. Posen was the only Polish bishopric up to the year 1000, when the emperor Otho III, at the time of a pilgrimage to the tomb of St. Adalbert at Gnesen, founded the archiepiscopal see of Gnesen (nesna), and subordinated to it the bishoprics of Colobrega (Kolberg), Cracow, and Wratislavia (Breslau), all then situated in the duchy of Polonia. Stanislas Lubienski's assertion that Cracow was the seat of the oldest Polish bishopric is thus proved to be erroneous, as it could not, as an archbishopric, have been a dependence of (Gnesen.

Early Period. — We know little about the ecclesiastical development of Poland in its first Christian century. Pope Gregory VII complained in 1075 of the small number of the bishops in proportion to the population; the dioceses were too large, and the bishops had not even fixed residences; nothing definite had been decided about the limits of the diocese of Gnesen and its dependent bishoprics, among which was then counted the bishopric of Lebus, founded by Micislas in 965; but as the city passed continually from Poland to Germany, and vice versa, its existence was a precarious one. It is believed that the papal legate AEgidius founded it a second time in 1123, and subordinated it to Gnesen; documents relating to it date only from 1133. Another episcopal see dependent upon Gnesen was the bishopric of Plock, whose foundation is referred to Boleslas the Great. It was formerly called Ep. Masovice. Callus (Chronicles Pol. ad ann. 1110) mentions a bishop Simeon: he seems to have been ordained in 1107, and to have died in 1129. A great victory of the Poles over the Prussians and Pomeranians is attributed to his intercession. And still another dependent bishopric was that of Leslau, which was founded by Micislas II, son of Boleslas the Great, and originally called Episc. Cujaviensis, because it was  intended for the province of Cujawia; extended afterwards over the largest part of Western Prussia, on the left bank of the Vistula; reached in a northerly direction the Baltic Sea; and was bounded west by the archbishopric of (Gnesen, which it also encircled on the south. Gallus (Chronicle) mentions bishop Paulas, who died in 1110.

The bishopric of Ermeland, founded in 1243, came to Poland only in 1466. After the reign of Micislas II (1023-34), general anarchy ensued, and at the same time a general apostasy from the Christian faith. Bishops and priests were without authority, some were killed, and external and civil wars robbed Poland of its wealth, and of a considerable part of its population. In 1039 the Bohemians destroyed Posen and Gnesen, and took away the body of St. Adalbert. A multitude of Poles crossed the Vistula and took refuge in Masowia; wild beasts established their lairs in the churches of St. Adalbert and St. Peter. Kasimierz (Casimir) in that great distress arrived with a body of five hundred soldiers from Germany, and by his bravery and intelligence freed the country from foreign occupation. He retained the power until his death, which occurred in 1058. He promoted the interests of Christianity by all the means in his power. He was succeeded by his son, Boleslas II, whose feats were not inferior to those of his ancestors; but his ambition and pride caused his ruin. At Christmas, 1076, he put the diadem on his head, and was anointed by the bishops of the kingdom. About the same time Gregory VII sent a legate to Poland. A few years afterwards, in 1079, the king, being put under interdict by St. Stanislas, bishop of Cracow, avenged himself by the murder of the prelate. Hereupon the nobility expelled him, and he was obliged to take refuge in Hungary, where he died. He was succeeded by his younger brother, Boleslas Wladislas Hermann, who lived in peace with his neighbors and the clergy, to whom he granted rights and privileges. Having lived many years in childless matrimony with the Bohemian princess Judith, a son was granted him, in consequence of the intercession, it was believed, of St. AEgidius.

This son was afterwards Boleslas Krzywousty. At this time Otho, afterwards the apostle of Pomerania, lived at the Polish court. He was instrumental in bringing about Wladislas Hermann's second marriage with Judith, the widowed sister of the emperor Henry IV. In 1099 the bishops of Poland dedicated the cathedral of Gnesen. On the day previous to that ceremony St. Adalbert is said to have appeared to the Poles in a battle with the Pomeranians, and given them victory. Wladislas divided his states during his lifetime between Boleslas and another illegitimate son, Zbigniew. The latter had revolted a few years before, and was pardoned at the intercession of the bishops.  Wladislas died in 1102, at Plock. The new ruler, Boleslas III (1102-1139), married a Russian princess, and undertook expeditions, considered in the light of crusades, against the pagan Pomeranians. In 1103 Walo, chosen bishop of Beauvais, and, after his return, bishop of Paris, came to Poland as the legate of pope Paschal II, and in his zeal for justice deposed two bishops—” nullo vel prece vel pretio subveniente.” In 1109 Boleslas reported such a complete victory over the Pomeranians that. of their 40,000 warriors, 10,000 only escaped; he took the stronghold of Nakel, thus preparing the way for the spiritual expedition undertaken soon afterwards by Otho, bishop of Bamberg. In 1109 the emperor Henry V was utterly defeated in his attempt to submit Poland a second time to the empire. In 1110 Boleslas fought successfully against the Bohemians: the bishops, as usual, accompanied the troops, and distributed the Eucharist to the whole army on the eve of an engagement. In 1120-1121 the Pomeranians, after a desperate struggle, were completely subdued and Stettin was taken. The conquered foe promised tribute and conversion. It was then that Boleslas besought Otho of Bamberg to instruct tile Pomeranians. SEE POMTERANIA.

The last years of the great king were less successful. In 1135 Boleslas recognized at Merseburg the emperor Lothair as his liege lord for Pomerania and Rügen; promised a tribute for twelve years, and carried the sword of the emperor as the imperial procession proceeded to church. In 1139 he divided his dominions among the four oldest of his sons, and (tied Oct. 28, 1139. In 1123 the papal legate AEgidius, bishop of Tusculum, sent by Calixtus II, had to establish more distinctly the limits between the dioceses, and this division of the temporal sovereignty in nowise affected the Church. But the Church was far from enjoying in Poland the privileges she possessed in other parts of Christian Europe. Her goods and subjects stood under the secular laws; there was no immunity from taxes, and the bishops were altogether dependent on the princes. Still at the beginning of the 13th century the princes disposed of the prebends of' the cathedrals, and took hold of the goods of the bishops at their demise, as the patrons did of the heritage of curates.

A number of priests lived in concubinage. There were churches, the charges of which had become, in some sense, the possession of certain families. The dissensions of the successors of Boleslas, as was to be expected, dismembered the empire after a century of bloodshed. Prussians, Lithuanians, Mongols, and other tribes devastated the country. The authority of the Church grew among those ruins. Papal legates appeared more frequently, synods became more frequent too, and altogether the  Church sought for herself the rights she had long attained elsewhere. The Templars, assisted by Crusaders from the West, attacked the pagans of Prussia, and the voice of the popes constantly called the Western Christians to arms against the barbarians. In 1157 the emperor Frederick I indicted a crusade of the Germans against Poland, to re-establish the tie of vassalage that once united the land with Germany. The Poles were defeated, and Boleslas appeared at Kryszkowo before the emperor barefooted, and with a naked sword tied around his neck. Wladislas died in Germany, and was succeeded by Boleslas IV, who died in 1173, leaving an only son, Leszek: but it was his brother licislas who succeeded him. The people, led by Getka (Gedcon), bishop of Cracow, revolted against Micislas, and his younger brother, Casimir Sprawied liwy (the Just), was put in his place.

In 1180 there was a synod of Polish bishops. They threatened with interdict whoever should rob the peasants of their stores, appropriate the heritage of an ecclesiastic, or refuse to restore within a given time whatever of Church property had been taken. After Casimir, who died May 4, 1194, at table, while talking with the bishops about salvation-”non sine veneni suspicione”—Fulko assembled the primates, and prevailed upon them to recognize the sons of Casimir. Helena, Casimir's widow, made arrangements with Alicislas, and, in the name of her minor sons, recognized him as archduke, and left him Cracow: her son Leeszek was to be his successor. This Micislas died in 1202 at Kalisch, and Leszek waived in favor of his son Wladislas his own rights to Cracow. In these years the endeavors of the popes for the reformation of the Polish Church were crowned with some success. Clement III sent in 1189 cardinal Giovanni Malabranca to collect contributions for a crusade, and reform the clergy of Poland; several regulations for that purpose were agreed upon at the Synod of Cracow. Cardinal Peter came in 1197; but when he published at Prague the edict against the matrimony of clergymen, the wrath of the clergy was so great that his life was put in danger. He held another synod at Cracow, where he insisted on the same views; journeyed through the bishoprics, giving his attention to a dereliction of sound morals more deplorable than the marriage of ecclesiastics, and traditional with the Poles: for he besought the laymen to seek some consecration for their wild copulations.

He made slow work of it, and it required all the energies of archbishop Henry Kentlitz to establish, little by little, a more Christian-like state of things. In 1212 bishop Peter was freely elected by the chapter of Posen. The dukes at that time promised to touch nothing of the heritage of prelates save gold, silver, etc., and waived their judiciary rights on  clergymen and their subjects. In 1231 Wladislas Odonicz became the only ruler of Great Poland. At this epoch some crusades against the Prussians took place, and the Poles, though slowly and reluctantly, had a part in them. We find the same bishoprics in the 13th and 14th centuries, but not in those firm metropolitan relations which the interest of the Church required (see Gregory VII, Epist. (ad Boleslauum, Pol. rgeqeml, 73). The first bishop of Posen, Jordan, and the duke Boleslas Chrobry distinguished themselves by their successful attempts to expand the Christian faith; Bodzanta, archbishop of Gnesen, in the 14th century, by the conversion of the barbarians of Lithuania and Samogitia. This prelate extended his diocese, augmented by a half, over Pomerellia and Neringia, and added Silesia to his spiritual dominions: in one word. the country between the Netze River, the sources of the Vistula, the grand-duchies of Moscow and Semgallen, constituted the territory of his archiepiscopal see. In consequence of these aggrandizements the new bishoprics of Whilna, in the grand-duchy of Lithuania, and of Wornie or Miedniki, in the duchy of Samogitia, were established-the first in 1387, the latter in 1417.

The Reformation Period and Since. — In order to make clear the history of the Polish Church in the Reformation period, it is necessary to retrace our steps to the 11th century. It was then that the neighboring churches of Germany acquired a great influence over the Poles, while priests and monks flocked from France and Italy, but particularly from Germany, to Poland, built everywhere convents and churches, and at the same time used the Romish ritual in opposition to the simple worship of the Polish national churches, which, however, maintained their ground till the 14th century. The Hussites (q.v.) from Bohemia found a favorable field in Poland for the propagation of their peculiar tenets, and the Romish clergy in consequence took active measures for the purpose of checking the spread of the obnoxious doctrines. With this view the parish priests were ordered to seize and bring before the bishops all who were suspected of holding Hussite sentiments. Severe enactments were passed for the punishment of the heretics. But in the face of all opposition the new doctrines were embraced by some of the most influential families in the land, and the reforming party indeed was very numerous when their leader was slain on the field of battle. But although the doctrines of Huse had found many supporters in Poland, the national feeling was still in favor of the dominant Church.

We append an account of the progress of Protestantism in Poland dependent largely on Gardner, Dictionary of Religions, p. 670 sq.  “In the commencement of the 15th century a powerful impulse was given to the cause of Polish education and literatim by the establishment of the University of Cracow, and the encouragement given in that seminary to native scholars. Already a goodly number of accomplished literary men had issued from the University of Prague, some of whom were chosen to fill the chairs at Cracow; these again were generally selected to supply the vacant episcopal sees, and thus in a short time they were found in the Polish Church not a few prelates distinguished alike for their piety and learning. The enlightened views which some of these ecclesiastical dignitaries entertained were speedily manifested in various projects started for reforming the Church. Thus Martin Tromba, the primate of Poland, ordered the liturgical books to be translated into the national language, that they might be understood by the great mass of tile people. But the boldest step in the direction of Church reform at this period was taken by Ostrotwo, palatine of Posen, who presented to the Polish diet of 1459 a proposal for introducing improvements of such a vital character that, had they been adopted, a separation of the Church of Poland from Rome would have been the immediate result. ‘In this plan,' says count Krasinski, ‘of reforming the Church of Poland he maintained that, Christ having declared that his kingdom was not of this world, the pope had no authority whatever over the king of Poland, and should not even be addressed by the latter in humble terms, unbecoming his dignity; that Rome was drawing every year from the country large sums under the pretence of religion, but, in fact, by means of superstition; and that the bishop of Rome was inventing most unjust reasons for leaving taxes, the proceeds of which were employed, not for the real wants of the Church, but for the pope's private interests; that all the ecclesiastical lawsuits should be decided in the country and not at Rome, which did not take “any sheep without wool;” that there were, indeed, among the Poles people who respected the Roman scribblings furnished with red seals and hempen strings, and suspended on the door of a church; but that it was wrong to submit to these Italian deceits.' He further says: ‘Is it not a deceit that the pope imposes upon us, in spite of the king and the senate, I don't know what, bulls called indulgences? He gets money by assuring people that he absolves their sin; but God has said by his prophet, “My son, give me thy heart, and not money.”

The pope feigns that he employs his treasures for the election of churches; but he does it, ill fact, for enriching his relations. I shall pass in silence things that are still worse. There are monks who praise still such fables. There are a great number of preachers and confessors who only think how to get the  richest harvest, and who indulge themselves, after having plundered the poor people. He complains of the great number of monks unfit for the clerical office, saying, “After having shaven his head and endowed a cowl, a man thinks himself fit to correct the whole world. He cries, and almost bellows, in the pulpit, because he sees no opponent. Learned men, and even those who possess an inferior degree of knowledge, cannot listen without horror to the nonsense, and almost blasphemy, uttered by such preaches.”

“These sentiments avowed by a Polish senator in the assembly of the states, plainly indicated that public opinion, even in the 15th century, was prepared for the great ecclesiastical reformation which commenced a century later in Germany and Switzerland. As if still further to pave the way for that important movement, treatises were at every little interval issuing from the press in Poland containing opinions which Rome has always been accustomed to brand as heresies. One work, in particular, was published at Cracow in 1515, which openly advocated the great Protestant principle that the Holy Scriptures must be believed, and all merely human ordinances may be dispensed with.

The date of the appearance of this these ways two years before Luther publicly avowed his opposition to Rome. No sooner, accordingly, did the German Reformer commence his warfare with the pope than he was joined by many Poles, more especially belonging to the towns of Polish Prussia; and so rapidly did the principles of the Reformation spread in Dantzic, the principality of that province, that, in 1524, no fewer than five churches were occupied by the disciples of the Wittenber reformer. A very large part of the inhabitants of Dantzic, however, still adhered to the old Church; and, anxious to restore the ancient order of things, they dispatched a deputation to Sigismund I, who at that time occupied the throne of Poland, imploring his interposition. The monarch, moved by the appeal made by the deputation, who appeared before him dressed in deep mourning, proceeded in person to Dantzic, restored the former state of things, and either executed or banished the principal leaders of the new movement. But while for purely political reasons Sigismund in this case acted in the most tyrannical and oppressive manner, he allowed the doctrines of Protestantism to spread in all the other parts of his dominions without persecuting those who embraced them. Even in Dantzic itself, when Lutheranism, in the course of a few years, began to be again preached within its walls, he refused to take a single step to check its progress, so  that in the subsequent reign it became the dominant creed of that city, without, however, infringing upon the religious liberty of the Roman Catholics.

“The works of Luther found many readers, and even admirers, in Poland, and a secret society, composed of both clergymen and laymen, met frequently to discuss religious subjects, including those points more especially which the rise of the Reformation brought prominently before the public mind. It was in connection with his society that Antitrinitarian opinions were first adopted as a creed by several individuals, and the foundation laid in Poland for that sect whose members were afterwards known by the name of Socinians (q.v.). The spread of this heresy, however, was limited to the upper classes of society, while among the great mass of the people the scriptural views of the Reformers found ready acceptance; a result in no small degree owing to the arrival of Bohemian Brethren, to the number of about a thousand, who had been driven from their own country, and found a home in the province of Posen. This event happened in 1548, and the public worship of the Brethren being conducted in the Bohemian language, which was intelligible to the inhabitants of Posen, attracted towards them the sympathies of multitudes. The Romish bishop of Posen, alarmed at the influence which the Brethren were exercising over the people of his diocese, applied for and obtained a royal edict for their expulsion from the country. This order they immediately obeyed, and proceeded to Prussia, where they found full religious liberty. Next year, however, some of them returned to Poland, where they had formerly received so much kindness, and continued their labors without being molested in any form. Their congregations rapidly increased, and in a short time they reached the large number of eighty in the province of Great Poland alone, while many others were formed in different parts of the country.

“A circumstance occurred about this time which was providentially overruled for the still wider diffusion of Protestant principles in Poland. The students of the University of Craucow, having taken offence at some real or imagined affront offered them by the rector, repaired to foreign universities, put particularly to the newly erected University of Königsberg, from which the great majority of them returned home imbued with Protestant principles. The Reformed doctrines now made extraordinary progress, particularly in the province of Cracow. In vain did the Romish clergy denounce the growing heresy; all their remonstrances were  unavailing, and at length they convened a general synod in 1551 to consider the whole subject. On this occasion Hosilis, bishop of Ermeland, composed his celebrated Confession, which has been acknowledged by the Church of Rome as a faithful exposition of its creed. The synod not only decreed that this creed should be signed by the whole body of the clergy, but petitioned the king that a royal mandate should be issued ordering its subscription by the laity. It was now resolved that violent persecution should be commenced against the heretics, and this determination was strengthened by an encyclical letter from Rome, recommending the extirpation of heresy. Several causes of bloody persecution occurred; but the nobles, aroused to jealousy by the high-handed measures of the clergy, openly declared their wish to restrict the authority of the bishops, and the people were unanimous in expressing a similar desire.

“Such was the state of matters in Poland when the diet of 1552 was convened; and scarcely had its deliberations been commenced, when a general hostility was evinced by the members to episcopal jurisdiction. The result was that at this diet religious liberty for all confessions was virtually established in Poland. At the diet of 1555 the king was earnestly urged to convoke a national synod over which he himself should preside, and which should reform the Church on the basis of the Holy Scriptures. It was proposed, also, to invite to this assembly the most distinguished Reformers, such as Calvin, Beza, Melancthon, and Vergerius. But the expectations of the Protestants in Poland were chiefly turned towards John a Lasco or Laski, who had been instrumental in promoting the cause of the Reformation in Germany, Switzerland, and England. For to long time he remained within the pale of the Romish Church, in the hope that it would be possible to effect a reformation without seceding from her communion.

In 1540 he declared his adherence to the Protestant Church on the principles of Zwigli. The high reputation which Lasco had already gained, both as a scholar and a Christian, attracted the marked attention of the Protestant princes in various parts of Europe, several of whom invited him to take up his residence in their dominions. The sovereign of East Friesland, anxious to complete the reformation of the Church in that country, prevailed upon Lasco to allow himself to be nominated superintendent of all its churches. To carry out the object of his appointment was matter of no small difficulty, considering the extreme reluctance which prevailed to the entire abolition of Romish rites, but by energy, per severance, and uncompromising firmness he succeeded, in the  brief space of six years, in rooting out the last remains of Romanism, and fully establishing the Protestant religion throughout the whole of the churches of East Friesland. In 1548 Lasco received an earnest invitation from Cranmer, archbishop of Canterbury, to join the distinguished Reformers who had repaired to England from all parts of the Continent, that they might complete the Reformation of the Church in that country.

Having accepted Cranmer's invitation, the Polish Reformer left Friesland and went to England, where he was appointed, on his arrival in 1550, superintendent of the foreign Protestant congregation established at London. In this important sphere he continued to labor with much comfort and success, until the demise of Edward VI and the accession of Mary arrested the progress of the Reformation in England, and compelled Lasco with his congregation to leave the country. This little band of exiles, headed by the Polish Reformer, were driven by a storm upon the coast of Denmark, where, on landing, they were received at first with hospitality and kindness, but, through the influence of the Lutheran divines, they were soon obliged to seek an asylum elsewhere. The same hatred man, the part of the Lutheran clergy was shown to the congregation of Lasco at Lubeck, Hamburg, and Rostock. At length the remnants of the congregation found in Dantzic at peaceful asylum, while Lasco himself retired to Friesland, where he was received with every mark of respect and attachment. In a short time, however, finding his position by no means so comfortable as at first, he removed to Frankfort-on-the-Mainm, where he established a church for the Belgian Protestant refugees, and made various attempts, without success, to unite the Lutheran and Protestant churches.

“Throughout all his wanderings Lasco's thoughts were habitually turned towards Poland, and he maintained a constant intercourse with his countrymen, and also with his sovereign, Sigismund Augurstus, who entertained a high regard for him lie returned to Poland in 1556, and no sooner did his arrival become known than the Romish clergy, taking the alarm, hastened to implore the king to banish from his dominions a man whom they described as an outlawed heretic, and the source of troubles and commotions wherever le went. To this representation the king paid no regard; and, to the annoyance of the bishops and the papail nunicio, Lasco was soon after entrusted with the superintendence of all the Reformed churches of Little Poland. Through his influence the tenets of the Swiss Reformers were extensively adopted by the higher classes of his countrymen. The chief objects, however, which he kept steadily in view  were the union of all Protestant sects, and the ultimate establishment of a Reformed National Church modeled on the plan of the Church of England, for which he had conceived a high admiration. But his exertions in the cause of reform were much weakened by the rise of Antitrinitarian sentiments in some of the churches which he superintended. He struggled hard, and not without success, to check the progress of these opinions. In the public affairs of the Church he took an active part, and assisted in preparing the version of the first Protestant Bible in Poland. In the midst of his unwearied labors in the cause of the Polish Reformation, Lasco was cut off in 1560, before he had an opportunity of fully maturing his great designs.

“One of the last objects on which the Polish Reformer had set his heart was the speedy convocation of a national synod. This proposal, however, met with violent opposition from Rome and its partisans. The pope, Paul IV, dispatched a legate to Poland with letters to the king, the senate, and the most influential noblemen, promising to effect all necessary reforms, and to call a general council. Lippomali, the papal legate, was an able man, and a devoted servant to the see of Rome. The Romish clergy were much encouraged by the presence of this dignitary in the country, who endeavored, but without effect, to prevail upon the king to adopt violent measures for the extirpation of heresy. The crafty emissary of the pope succeeded also by his intrigues in fomenting discord among the Protestants. He assembled a synod of the Polish clergy, which, while it lamented the dangers which threatened the Church, both from within and from without, passed many resolutions for improving its condition and coercing tile heretics. The extent to which the synod, instigated by Lippomani, pushed their jurisdiction may be seen from their proceedings in a case of alleged sacrilege recorded both by Romish and Protestant writers. Dorothy Laszecka, a poor girl, was accused of having obtained from the Dominican monks of Sochaczew a host, feigning to receive communion. It was said that she wrapped that host in her clothes, and sold it to the Jews of a neighboring village, by whom she had been instigated to, commit this act of sacrilege by the bribe of three dollars and a gown embroidered with silk.

This host was said to have been married by the Jews to the synagogue, where, being pierced with needles, it emitted a quantity of blood, which was collected into a flask The Jews tried in vain to prove the absurdity of the charge, arguing that, as their religion did not permit them to believe in the mystery of transubstantiation, they never could be supposed to try a  similar experiment on the host, which they considered as a mere Wiafer. The synod, influenced by Lippomani, condemned them, as well as the unfortunate woman, to be burned alive. The iniquitous sentence could not, however, be put into execution without the exequatur, or the confirmation of the king, which could not be expected to be obtained from the enlightened Sigismund Augustus. The bishop Przerembski, who was also vice-chancellor of Poland, made a report to the king of the above- mentioned case, which he described in expressions of pious horror, entreating the monarch not to allow such a crime committed against the Divine Majesty to go unpunished. Myszkowski, a great dignitary of the crown, who was a Protestant, became so indignant at this report that he could not restrain his anger, and was only prevented by the presence of the king from using violence against the prelate, the impiety and absurdity of whose accusation he exposed in strong language. The monarch declared that he would not believe such absurdities, and sent an order to the starost (chief magistrate or governor) of Sochaczew to release the accused parties; but the vice-chancellor forged the exequatur, by attaching the royal seal without the knowledge of the monarch, and sent an order that the sentence of the synod should he immediately carried into execution. The king, being informed of this nefarious act of the bishop, immediately dispatched a messenger to prevent its effects. It was, however, too late, and the judicial murder was perpetrated.' This atrocious affair excited, of course, a pleat sensation throughout Poland, and awakened such feelings of hatred against Lippolani that he lost no time in quitting the country, a step which was absolutely necessary, indeed, as his life was in danger.

“The Polish Reformation went steadily forward in spite of all the opposition of Rome and its emissaries. In Lithuania particularly it received a strong impulse from the influence exerted in its favor by prince Radziwill, who had been entrusted by the monarch with almost the sole government of that province. Taking, advantage of the facilities which he thus possessed for advancing the good work, he succeeded in establishing the Reformed worship both in the rural districts and in many towns. He built also a splendid church and college in Vilna, the capital of Lithuania. To this enlightened and pious nobleman, besides, is due the merit of having caused to be translated and printed, at his own expense, the first Protestant Bible in the Polish language. It was published in 1564, and is usually known by tie name of the Radziwilliain Bible. The death of Radziwill the Black as he was termed, which happened in 1565, was a severe loss to the Protestant  cause in Lithuania: but happily his counsel and successor, Radziwill the Red, was also a zealous promoter of the Reformed religion, and founded a number of Protestant churches and schools, which he endowed with landed property for their permanent support. The king of Poland was strongly urged, by a portion of the clergy, to reform the Church by means of a national synod, but he was of too irresolute a character to take a step so decided. He adopted, however, a middle course, and addressed a letter to pope Paul IV, at the Council of Trent, demanding the concession of the five following points:

(1) The performance of the mass in the national language;

(2) The dispensation of the communion in both kinds;

(3) The toleration of the marriage of priests;

(4) The abolition of the annates or first-fruits of benefices

(5) The convocation of a national council for the reform of abuses, and the union of different sects.

These demands, of course, were rejected by his holiness. But the Protestants in Poland, far from being discouraged by the conduct of the pope, became bolder every day in their opposition to the Romanists. At the diet of 1559 a proposal was made to deprive the bishops of all participation in the affairs of the government, on the ground that they were the sworn servants of a foreign potentate. This motion, though strenuously urged upon the acceptance of the diet, was not carried; but a few years later, in 1563, the diet agreed to convoke a general national synod, composed of representatives of all the religious parties in Poland-a measure which would, in all probability, have been carried into effect, had it not been prevented by the dexterity and diplomatic craft of cardinal Coinmenidoni, who succeeded in dissuading the king from assembling a national council.

“The establishment of a Reformed Polish Church was much impeded by the dissensions which divided the Protestants among themselves. At that time, in fact, no less than three parties existed in Poland, each adhering to its own separate confession. Thus the Bohemian or Waldensian Confession had its own ardent admirers chiefly in Great Poland; the Genevese or Calvinistic Confession in Lithuania and Southern Poland; and the Lutheran or Augsburg Confession in towns inhabited by burghers of German origin. Of these the Bohemian and the Genevese Confessions were so completely agreed on almost all points, that their respective supporters found no difficulty in forming a union in 1555, not indeed incorporating it into one  body, but holding spiritual fellowship together, while each Church retained its own separate hierarchy. This union being the first which took place among Protestant churches after the Reformation, caused great joy among the Reformers in different parts of Europe. The two churches thus united wished to include the Lutherans also in the alliance, but the doctrine of the Augsburg Confession on the subject of the Eucharist seemed likely to prove an insuperable obstacle in the way of any union with the Lutheran churches. An attempt, however. was made to effect so desirable an object. For this purpose a synod of the Bohemian and Genevese churches of Poland was convoked in 1557, and presided over by John a Lasco. At this synod overtures were made to the Lutherans to join the union, but to no effect, and they still continued to accuse the Bohemian Church of heresy. The obstacles thus thrown in the way of a union among the Protestants of Poland only roused the Bohemians to exert themselves still more actively for its attainment. They forwarded copies of their Confession of Faith to the Protestant princes of Germany, and to the chief Reformers, both of that country and of Switzerland, and received strong testimonials of approval- so strong, indeed, as to silence for a time the objections of the Lutherans. Shortly, however, the good understanding which had begun was interrupted by the unreasonable demands of some Polish Lutheran divines that the other Protestant denominations should subscribe the Confession of Augsburg. The Bohemians, therefore, in 1568, submitted their confession to the University of Wittenberg, and received from that learned body a strong expression of their approbation, which so operated upon the minds of the Lutherans that from that time they ceased to charge the Bohemian Church with heresy.

“The long desired union was at length effected in 1570. A synod having assembled in the town of Sandomir, in April of that year, finally concluded and signed the terms of union under the name of the Consensus of Sandomir (q.v.). This important step excited the utmost alarm among the Romanists, who endeavored to bring it into discredit. But the union itself was essentially hollow and imperfect. The confessions, between which a dogmatic union had been effected, differed on a point of vital importance the presence of Christ in the Eucharist. The union, accordingly, was rather nominal than real; and many Lutherans directed their whole efforts towards bringing about a disruption of the alliance which had been established at Sandomir. This hostility of the Lutherans to the other Protestant confessions was very injurious to the interests of Protestantism in general,  and a number of noble families, followed by thousands of the common people, disgusted with the bitter contentions which raged among the Protestants of different denominations, renounced the principles of the Reformation, and returned to the Church of Rome. Another circumstance which tended to weaken the Protestant Church of Poland was the rise and rapid spread of a party who denied the divinity of the Lord Jesus Christ. Sonme learned divines of the Reformed churches combated these Antitrinitarian doctrines, and at length, in 1565, the professors of these doctrines seceded from their brethren, forming themselves into a separate ecclesiastical organization, called by its members the Minor Reformed Church of Poland. The arrival of Faustus Socinus in Poland in 1579 led to the tenets of the Antitrinitaians being thrown into a definite form, and to the formation of Socinian congregations, chiefly composed of nobles, among whom there were manly wealthy landowners.

“When the Consensus of Sandomir was concluded in 1570, Protestantism in Poland had reached its highest state of prosperity. Many churches and schools, belonging to Protestants of various denominations, had been established; the Scriptures had been translated and printed in the national language; and religious liberty was enjoyed in Poland to a degree unknown in any other part of Europe. These favorable circumstances attracted great numbers of foreigners, who sought an asylum from religious persecution. Among these, besides many Italian and French refugees, there were also a great number of Scotch families settled in different parts of Poland, whose descendants are found there at this day.

“At the period at which we have now arrived Romanism had, to a great extent, lost its hold of the Polish nation. The most influential portion of the nobility were on the side of Protestantism, while many powerful families, and the population generally, of the eastern provinces belonged to the Greek Church. Nay, even within the national Church itself, not only was the primate favorable to Reformed principles, but many even of the inferior clergy, and a considerable proportion of the laity, would have welcomed any proposal to correct the flagrant abuses which had in course of time crept into the Church. In the senate, also, the great proportion of the members were either Protestants or belonged to the Greek Church and even the king himself showed a decided leaning towards the adherents of the Protestant faith. The Roman Catholic Church in Poland, indeed, was on the verge of utter ruin; but in this hour of its extremist danger it was mainly saved by the exertions of cardinal Hosius, one of the most remarkable men  of his age. This zealous Romish dignitary had early made himself conspicuous by his hostility to the Protestants, and now that he had been nominated a cardinal, he used every effort to check the progress of the Reformation in Poland. Finding, however, that his own Church was fast losing ground, and that Reformed principles were almost certain ere long to obtain the ascendancy, he called to his aid the newly established Order of Jesuits, several of whom arrived from Rome in 1564, and by their intrigues and agitation the whole country was made for a long period the scene of the most unseemly commotions.

“During the life of Sigismund Augustus the Protestants indulged the hope that, although naturally of a wavering and undecided character, he might possibly decide on the establishment of a Reformed National Church; but the death of that monarch without issue, in 1572, put an end to all such expectations. The Jagellonian dynasty, which had governed Poland for two centuries, was now extinct.' An earnest struggle commenced, therefore, between the Protestants and Romanists, each party being anxious that the vacant throne should be filled by a zealous supporter of their Church. The Romanists, headed by cardinal Commendoni, ‘were anxious to confer the crown upon the archduke Ernest, son of the emperor Maximilian II, and were even ready to secure their object by force. Coligiuy and the French Protestants had for some time, even before the death of Sigismund Augustus, entertained the project of placing Henry of Valois, duke of Anjou, on the Polish throne; and Catharine de' Medici, the mother of the duke, eagerly lent her approbation to the proposal.

“The diet of convocation assembled at Warsaw in January, 1573, for the purpose of taking steps for the maintenance of the peace and safety of the country during the interregnum. At this diet, notwithstanding the opposition of the Romish bishops, instigated by Commendoni, a law was passed establishing a perfect equality of rights among all the Christian confessions of Poland, guaranteeing the dignities and privileges of the Roman Catholic bishops, but abolishing the obligation of Church patrons to bestow the benetices in their gift exclusively on Roman Catholic clergymen. The election of a new monarch was arranged to take place on April 7, at Kaminietz, near Warsaw. The principal competitors for the throne of Poland were the two princes already mentioned; and although meanwhile the horrid massacre of St. Bartholomew had rendered the Polish Protestants somewhat afraid to commit their interests to a French prince,  yet, being unwilling to involve their country in a civil war, they accepted Henry, duke of Anjou, who was accordingly elected king of Poland.

“A deputation of twelve noblemen were immediately dispatched to Paris to announce to Henry his election, and on Sept. 10, 1573, the ceremony of presenting the diploma of election took place in the church of Notre Dame. The circumstances attending the presentation are interesting as manifesting the intolerant spirit of the Polish Romanists. ‘The bishop Karnkowski, a member of the Polish embassy, at the beginning of the ceremony, entered a protest against the clause for securing religious liberty inserted in the oath which the new monarch was to take on that occasion. This act produced some confusion, the Protestant Zborowski having interrupted the solemnity with the following words, addressed to Montuc: “Had you not accepted, in the name of the duke, the conditions of religious liberty, our opposition would have' prevented this duke from being elected our monarch.” Henry feigned to be astonished, as if he did not understand the subject in dispute; but Zorowski addressed him, saying, “I repeat, sire, that if your ambassadors had not accepted the condition of liberty to the contending religious persuasions, our opposition would have prevented you from being elected king; and that if you do not confirm these conditions, you shall not be our king.” After this the members of the embassy surrounded their new monarch, and Herburt, a Roman Catholic, read the formula of the oath prescribed by the electing diet, which Henry repeated without any opposition. The bishop Karnkowski, who had stood aside, approached the king after he had sworn, and protested that the religious liberty secured by the royal oath was not to injure the authority of the Church of Rome; land the king gave him a written testimony in favor of that protest.'

“Henry set out for Poland, but after what had passed the fears of the Protestants were far from being allayed, and they resolved carefully to watch the conduct of the new monarch at his coronation. Firley, the leader of the Protestant party, insisted that on that solemn occasion the oath taken at Paris should be repeated; and even in the midst of the ceremony, when the crown was about to he placed on Henry's head, Firley boldly advanced forward and interrupted the proceedings, declaring in the name of the Protestants of' Poland that, unless the Parisian oath was taken, the coloration would not be allowed to go forward. The scroll of the oath was put into the king's hand as he knelt on the steps of the altar, and Firley, taking the crown, said to Henry with a loud voice, If you will not swear, you shall not reign.” The intrepid conduct of the Protestant leader struck  the whole assembly with awe, and the king had no alternative but to repeat the oath. Thus the religious liberties of Poland were saved from utter overthrow, and the nation delivered from all impending civil war.

“The Polish Protestants were naturally suspicious of their new king, knowing that, having taken the oath by compulsion, he was not likely to respect their rights. The Rominish bishops, on the other hand, supported by the favor of the monarch, formed projects for extending their influence, and all impression rapidly spread through the country that Henry had become a ready tool in the hands of the priests. This feeling, combined with disgust at his profligacy, rendered him so unpopular, and his subjects so discontented, that the country would undoubtedly have been speedily plunged into a civil war had not the king fortunately disappeared, having secretly left Poland for France on learning that the death of his brother, Charles IX, had opened the way for his succession to the throne of France. The crown of Poland was now conferred upon Stephen Batory, prince of Transylvania, who had earned so high a reputation that, although an avowed Protestant, his election met with no opposition from the Romish clergy. The delegation which announced to Stephen his election to the throne was composed of thirteen members, only one of whom was a Romanist: but this man, Solikowski by name, succeeded in persuading the new monarch that, if he would secure himself on the throne, he must profess the Roman Catholic religion. Next day, accordingly, to the dismay of the Protestant delegates, Stephen was seen devoutly kneeling at mass. During, his reign, which lasted tell years, he maintained inviolate the fights of the Anti-Romanist confessions, while at the same time, through the influence of his queen, who was a bigoted Romanist, he openly engaged and patronized the Jesuits, by founding and endowing various educational institutions in connection with their order.

“Stephen Batory died in 1556, and was succeeded by Sigismund III, in whose reign the Romish party acquired much strength, while many of the Protestants had become dissatisfied with the general confession, and sought to, renew the former controversies which had so much weakened their influence in the country. Poland was unhappily subjected to the rule of this infatuated monarch from 1557 to 1632, and throughout the whole of that long period his policy was uniformly directed towards the promotion of the supremacy of Rome. The Jesuits exercised an unlimited influence over the government; and all the offices of state land posts of honor were exclusively bestowed upon Romanists, and more especially upon  proselytes, who, from motives of interest, had renounced the principles of the Reformation. The whole country was covered with Jesuit. colleges and schools, thus enabling the disciples of Loyola most effectually to exercise dominion over all classes of the people. ‘The melancholy effects of their education,' says count Krasinski, soon became manifest.

the close of Sigismund III's reigns, when the Jesuits had become almost exclusive masters of public schools, national literature had declined as rapidly as it had advanced during the preceding century. It is remarkable, indeed, that Poland, which, from the middle of the 16th century to the end of the reign of Sigismund III (1632), had produced many splendid works on different branches of human knowledge, in the national as well as in the Latin language, call boast of but very few works of merit from that epoch to the second part of the 18th century, the period of the unlimited sway of the Jesuits over the national education. The Polish language, which had obtained a high degree of perfection during the 16th century, was soon corrupted by an absurd admixture of Latin; and a barbarous style, called Macaronic, disfigured Polish literature for more than a century. As t he chief object of the Jesuits was to combat the Anti-Romanists, the principal subject of their instruction was polemical divinity; and the most talented of their students, instead of acquiring sound knowledge, by which they might become useful members of society, wasted their time in dialectic subtleties and quibbles. The disciples of Loyola knew well that, of all the weaknesses to which human nature is subject, vanity is the most accessible; and they were as prodigal of praise to partisans as they were of abuse to antagonists.

Thus the benefactors of their order became the objects of the most fulsome adulation, which nothing but the corrupted taste acquired in their schools could have rendered palatable. Their bombastic panegyrics, lavished upon the most unimportant persons, became, towards the end of the 17th century, almost the only literature of the country-proof sufficient of the degraded state of the public to which such productions could be acceptable. An additional proof of the retrocession of the national intellect and the corruption of taste under the withering influence of the Jesuits is that the most classical productions of the 16th century-the Augustan era of the Polish literature— were not reprinted for more than a century, although after the revival of learning in Poland in the second half of the 18th century they went through many editions, and still continue to he reprinted. It is almost superfluous to add that this deplorable condition of the national intellect produced the most pernicious effects on the political as well as social state of the country. The enlightened statesmen who had appeared  during the reign of Sigismund III— the Zanoyskis, the Sapiehas, the Zalkiewskis, whose efforts counterbalanced for a time the baneful effects of that fatal design, as well as some excellent authors who wrote during the same period — were educated under another system; for that of the Jesuits could not produce any political or literary character with enlarged views. Some exceptions there were to this general rule; but the views of enlightened men could not be but utterly lost on a public which, instead of advancing in the paths of knowledge, were trained to forget the science and wisdom of its ancestors. It was therefore no wonder that sound notions of law and right became obscured, and gave way to absurd prejudices of privilege and caste, by which liberty degenerated into licentiousness; while the state of the peasantry was degraded into that of predial servitude.'

“Not contended with secretly imbuing the minds of the people with Romanist principles, the Jesuits connived at the ill-treatment to which many Protestants were subjected, and the courts of justice being wholly under Jesuit influence, it was vain for the injured to look for legal redress. Riotous mobs with complete impunity destroyed the Protestant churches in Cracow, Posen, Wiltna, and other places. The natural result of the adverse circumstances in which Protestants were placed inner this long but disastrous reign was that their numbers were daily diminished, and what was, perhaps, more melancholy still, those who held fast to Reformed principles were divided into contending factions; and although the Consensus of Sandomir maintained an apparent union for all time, that covenant even was finally dissolved by the Lutherans. An attempt was made without effect to manage a union between the Protestants land the Greek Church at a meeting convened at Wilna in 1599, and although a confederation for mutual defense was concluded, it led to no practical results.

“At the close of the long reign of Sigismund III the cause of Protestantism was in a state of tile deepest depression. But his son mad successor, Wadisla IV, was a person of many different character, and so opposed to the Jesuits that he could not allow a single member of that order to be near his court. He distributed offices and rewards solely according to merit, and, being naturally of a mild disposition, he discountenanced all persecution on account of religion. He endeavored in vain to effect a general reconciliation, or at least a mutual understanding, between the contending parties, by means of a religious discussion held at Thorn in 1644. But the  early death of this benevolent monarch changed the whole aspect of affairs. His brother, John Casimir, who succeeded him, had been a Jesuit, and a cardinal; but the pope had relieved him from his vows on his election to the throne. From a monarch who had formerly been a Romish ecclesiastic the Protestants had everything to fear and little to expect. The consequence was that the utmost discontent begin to prevail among all classes, and the country having been invaded by Charles Gustavus, king of Sweden, the people were disposed to place him upon the throne of Poland. Elated, however, by the success of his arms, that haughty monarch declined to accept the sovereignty in any other mode than by conquest, whereupon the Poles, rising as one man, drove him from the country. Peace was restored by the treaty of Oliva in 1660 but not until the Protestants had suffered much during the war. The king had taken refuge in Silesia during the Swedish invasion, and on his return to Poland he committed himself to the special care of the Virgin Mary, vowing that he would convert the heretics by force if necessary. A considerable number of Protestants still remained after all the persecutions to which they had been exposed, and among them were several influential families, who besides were supported by the interest of the Protestant princes throughout Europe. The king, therefore, judged it best to direct the whole force of his persecution against the Socinianus, whom he banished from the kingdom, declaring it to be henceforth a capital crime to propagate or even profess Socinlianism in Poland.

“The ranks of the Protestants were now completely broken, and the Roman clergy acquired and exercised nearly uncontrolled power. John Soblieski, during his short reign, endeavored to put an end to religious persecution; but he found himself unable to maintain the laws which still acknowledged a perfect equality of religious confessions. Augustus II, also, who succeeded to the throne in 1696, confirmed, in the usual manner, the rights and libel ties of the Protestants, but with the addition of a new condition, that he should never grant them senatorial or any other important dignities and offices. This monarch had renounced Lutheranism in order to obtain the crown of Poland, and now that he had secured his object, he allowed the Romish bishops to treat the heretics as they chose. Augustus having been expelled by Charles XII of Sweden, Stanislaus Leszczynski was elected in 1704, and the accession of this enlightened monarch revived the hopes of the Protestants. The treaty of alliance concluded between Stanislaus and the Swedish sovereign usually guaranteed to the Protestants  of Poland the rights and liberties secured to them by the laws of their country, abolishing all the restrictions imposed in later times. But such favorable circumstances were of short continuance. Stanislauis was driven from his throne by Peter, the czar of Russia, and Augustus II again restored to his kingdom. Civil commotions now arose, which were only terminated by the mediation of Peter the Great, who concluded a treaty at Warsaw in 1716, into-which the Romanists had sufficient influence to get a clause inserted to the following effect: ‘That all the Protestant churches which had been built since 1632 should be demolished, and that the Protestants should not be permitted, except in places where they had churches previously to the above-mentioned time, to have any public or private meetings for the purpose of preaching or singing. A breach of this regulation was to be punished, for the first time by a tine, for the second by imprisonment, for the third by banishment. Foreign ministers were allowed to have divine service in their dwellings, but the natives who should assist as it were to be subjected to the above-mentioned penalties.'

“The terms of this treaty excited feelings of discontent and alarm, not only in the minds of the Protestants, but also of the more enlightened portion of tile Roman Catholics. Protests poured in from all quarters against the measure. But all remonstrance was vain; the Romanists continued to prosecute the Protestants with inveterate rancor, in some cases even to blood. The Protestant powers of Europe from time to time made representations in favor of the Polish Protestants; but instead of alleviating their persecutions, these remonstrances only increased their severity. In 1733 in an act was passed excluding them from the general diet, and from all public offices, but declaring at the same time their peace, their persons, and their property inviolable, and that they might hold military rank and occupy the crown-lands.

“During the reign of Augustus III, which lasted from 1733 to 1764, the condition of the Polish Protestants was melancholy in the extreme; and, despairing of relief from every other quarter, they threw themselves under the protection of foreign powers, by whose interference they were admitted, in I767, to equal rights with the Roman Catholics. This was followed by the abolition of the Order of Jesuits in 1773. Augustus had throughout his reign kept Poland in a state of subserviency to Russia, and that power placed his successor Poniatowski on the throne. Wlieu Catharine II, empress of Russia, obtained possession of the Polish Ralmu provinces, part of the people became members of the United Greek  Church, and part joined the Russian Church. Even the most bigoted Romanists were gained over in course of time, u-, that at the Synod of Polotsk, in 1839, the higher clergy of Lithuania and White Russia declared the readiness of their people to join the Russo-Greek Church, and, accordingly, these Uniates, or United u Greeks, to the number of 2,000,000, were received back into the Muscovite branch of the Eastern Church on their solemn disavowal of the pope's supremacy, and declaration of their belief in the sole Headship of Christ over his Church.”

The unfortunate determination of pope Pius IX to force the infallibility dogma on the Church of Rome has had its damaging consequences to papal Christianity in Russia. After the encyclical of 1874 the czar's government saw itself forced to urge the union with the Russian Church of all Polish Christians not Protestant. Several popes had confirmed to the United Greeks the privileges of the use of the vernacular tongue and the marriage of the clergy. Ritualistic movements, however, had been introduced by some of the clergy, tending to assimilation to Rome, and the disputes engendered by the changes had infrequently been referred to the Vatican. When the encyclical came to the laity, only two ways seemed to lie upon either to submit to the new orders or openly defy them. In Sedletz the decision was prompt, and one sixth of the whole population of the government determined to ask the “White Czar” to admit them into his Church. Though the parish priests in no case commenced the movement, when it had once taken root they joined their flocks. The government took no notice of the first petition sent in till convinced that the movement was perfectly spontaneous, when the emperor authorized the governor-general of Warsaw to admit them into the Russian Church; and on Sunday, Jan. 24, the public ceremony was performed before an immense crowd in the town of Sedletz. Of the 50,000 people admitted, 26 were priests. The first parish entered was that of Bielsk, to which the archbishop of Warsaw proceeded, with all the convert priests and delegates from the forty-five parishes, and where a solemn service of consecration was performed in the parish church.

The Berlin correspondent of the London Times, under date of June, 1S75, writes: “The orthodox movement is steadily progressing in Poland, and will very shortly lead to the extinction of the United Greeks. Nearly 250,000 persons in the provinces of Siedice, Lublin, Suvalki, and Lomsa have already embraced the established faith of the empire. The Uniad remnant left is estimated at only 30,000, and as the priests who ale adverse to the  movement are running away to Galicia, the last trace of the sect will soon disappear. The political advantage accruing t to the Russian government from this wholesale conversion of a religions community, half Roman Catholic and half Greek, cannot ‘well be overrated. Not only are all their subjects of Russian blood brought within the pale of the national Church, but a number of Poles being likewise included in the sweeping change of creed, a way is paved to a further and even more comprehensive conquest in the same field.” In 1876 the Russian government, feeling that the Papists were intriguing against the union movement, occasionally interfered by force for the transition of whole congregations from Rome. In consequence several of the bishops and priests were brought into rebellious conditions to the czar's government. More recently a concordat has been signed between the czar and the pope, which restores full diocesan authority to the bishops, together with the right to direct correspondence with Rome. The ukase of 1868 is abolished, and appeals of the bishops will henceforth be transmitted to Rome through the metropolitan of Warsaw, instead of being sent to the synod at St. Petersburg. On the other hand, the pope acknowledges the legal status of the St. Petersburg Synod, which is to form the council of a Catholic primate residing in the Russian capital.

It is computed that the Protestant Poles amount in round numbers to 442,000, the great majority of whom mare found in the Prussian portion. There is a considerable number of Protestants in Poland itself but these are chiefly German settlers. In that part of Poland which was annexed to Russia by the treaty of Vienna, it was calculated in 1845 that, in a population of 4,857,250 souls, there were 252,000 Lutherans, 3790 Reformed, and 546 Moravians. In Prussian Poland, according to the census of 1846, there were in the provinces of ancient Polish Prussia, in a population of 1,019,105 souls, 502,148 Protestants; and in that of Posen, in a population of 1,364,399 souls, there were 416,648 Protestants. As the Russian government is determined to make the Poles adopt its nationality, the Russian language only is tolerated in the churches where a popular tongue is used, and all hymn and prayer books, as well as schoolbooks, must be in the Russian tongue. The Prussian government, too, anxious to use all means of Germanizing its Slavonic subjects, caused the worship in almost all the churches of Prussian Poland to be conducted in the German language, and the service in Polish is discouraged as much as possible.

On the modern ecclesiastical history of the former kingdom of Poland, SEE PRUSSIA and SEE RUSSIA. See also Ripell, Gesch. Polens (Hamb. 1840);  Lengich, Diss. de Religion. Christ. in Polonia initiis (1734); and Friese, Gesch. Polens (Breslau, 1786). On the Reformation: Stanislaus Lubieniecius, Hist. Reformationis Polonicea (Freistadii, 1685); Krasinski, fistoricul Sketch of the Reformation in Poland (Lond. 1838, 2 vols. 8vo), part 1 treating of the introduction and progress of Christianity in that country; Maclear, ist,. of Christian Missions in the Middle Ages; Gieseler, Eccles. Hist. (see Index in vol. 3); Brit. and For. Ev. Rev. 1843, p. 502 sq.

## Poland, Mission Among The Jews In[[@Headword:Poland, Mission Among The Jews In]]

             The Polish mission was commenced by the London Society for promoting Christianity among the Jews in the year 1821. The first missionaries there were the late Dr. A. M'Caul (q.v.), at that time a simple graduate of the University of Dublin, and the Rev. W. F. Becker. The center of their operation was made in Warsaw. For a while all seemed promising, but the missionaries were compelled for a time to quit Warsaw. Early in the year 1822 the missionaries were summoned to appear before the “Commission of the Religious Confessions,” and had to sign a protocol as to what was their object, of which it was said that it would be sent to St. Petersburg. Learning, however, that the answer which would be given them would be that foreign missionaries were not wanted in the country, and that if the Jews wished to be converted there were priests enough for that purpose, the missionaries— in order to avoid being sent out of the country, and hoping to get permission from the emperor Alexander-left Warsaw and went to Posen. The permission was obtained not only for Poland, but also for Russia. The first two missionaries were now joined by two others, Messrs. Wendt and Hoff, and in the winter of 1822 missionary operations were fairly commenced at Warsaw. In the year 1823 a service according to the ritual of the Church of England was established in the Reformed Church, Mr. M'Caul having received ordination in England; and this, in 1824, was followed up by the commencement of a German service in the same place in the afternoon. As the labor increased two more missionaries were sent, Messrs. Reichardt and Wermelskirch. Visits were paid to various towns, and for a time Lublin was made the scene of missionary labor. The chief work of the winter of 1825 was the preparation of a translation of the Word of God, for the use of Hebrew women more especially. It was completed by M'Caul, with the assistance of the other missionaries, as far as the end of the Pentateuch, by the spring of 1826, and has proved a work of considerable value.  The death of the emperor Alexander rendered it necessary to apply to his successor for a confirmation of the permission which had been accorded to them. The answer to their application was of a modified character: it gave them liberty to labor among the Jews of Poland, but was silent concerning Russia itself, and as was afterwards stated by the grand-duke Constantine, that, as far as Russia was concerned, the permission was withdrawn. All efforts to reobtain it were without success.

In 1829 Lublin was permanently occupied as a missionary station, and proved a success, for no less than forty-four Israelites were there admitted into the visible Church. The year 1830 was marked by some events materially affecting the state of the mission and the position of the missionaries: by an order from St. Petersburg the missionaries were placed under the General Protestant Consistory, and their correspondence with the committee was required to be laid before it, the Commission of the Interior, and the police. On Nov. 29 in the same year the Polish revolution broke out, without affecting materially the missionary labors. This year may be regarded as marking the close of the second period in the history of the Polish mission, lasting from the year 1823 to 1830.

The event of most consequence that marked the following years was the occupation of a new station, in 1834, in the south of Poland. Kielce was the place selected, a place equidistant from Warsaw and Lublin. The main features of the work that now present themselves are the missionary journeys to Suvaltri, Calvary, and other places. We have now arrived at the year 1841, and up to that period, in connection with the mission, there had been baptized at Warsaw 115, at Lublin 33, and at Kalisch-selected in 1838 as the station and other stations, occupied only for a short time, 5, making altogether a total of 153. During the year 1842 the missionaries made several journeys, and in spite of the “Cherem,” or Jewish excommunication, pronounced against those who should have any intercourse with the missionaries, the work went on with great blessings, and in the year 1851 the number of those who were baptized through the mission in Poland was 326, some of the converts occupying the highest stations in life. We have now brought the history of the Polish mission down to that period when the door was closed against it. The war of England with Russia effected this change, for it could not reasonably be expected, while that war was carried on with the greatest vigor, that an English mission, however peaceful its object, would be tolerated in the very heart of the Russian empire, and indications were not wanting that soon its  work was to cease. Various tracts about to be printed, which had already received the sanction of the Consistory, were unaccountably detained at the censor's office; and in the month of May, 1854, “the missionaries in Warsaw were summoned before the Russian authorities to receive various injunctions and restrictive orders on pain of being expelled from the country. One of these was to submit all their official correspondence with the committee to the Russian government, who promised to forward it to London; and to circulate no books, not even the Bible, among Christians. The letters and journals were from that time submitted as prescribed, but never reached London. This state of things continued from the end of May till Dec. 28, when the missionaries were again summoned to appear before the Russian authorities to hear an imperial order read, which imposed upon them and their brethren in the country the discontinuance of all missionary work from that day, and to be prepared to leave the country in three weeks, viz. on Jan. 13, 1855, the New-year's day of the Russian Church.”

Thus closed the Polish mission, just three weeks before the death of the Russian emperor, a mission which had not been in vain, for, besides the 361 members of the house of Israel who were admitted by baptism into the Christian Church, more than 10,000 Bibles, in different languages, and upwards of 10,000 New Testaments have been circulated, of which many had come into the hands of Jews.

The missionary work which had thus been suspended for over twenty years was again resumed in the year 1877, permission having been granted by the present emperor. To the Rev. J. C. Hartmann, one of the oldest missionaries of the society, was intrusted the temporary charge of the mission-field at Warsaw, where about 100,000 Jews reside, divided into Talmudists, Chasidim, and Reformers. According to the latest report of 1877, the Warsaw station is now occupied by the Revs. O. J. Ellis and H. H. F. Hartmann, son of the above, N. D. Rappoport, A.E. Ifland, and a colporteur. Comp. the Jewish Intelligencer and the Annual Reports of the London Society. (B.P.)

## Polanus, Amandus[[@Headword:Polanus, Amandus]]

             a Swiss theologian, was born at Oppeln, Silesia, in 1561, and died at Basle in 1610, professor of theology and Old-Test. exegesis. Polanus was one of the ornanents of the Basle University, and wrote, Analysis l'Malachiae (Basle, 1597): — Commentarius in Danielem (1593): — Analysis Hoseae (1601): — Commentarius in Ezechielem (1607): — Exegesis Aliquot Vaticiniorum Veteris Testamenti de Christi Nativitate, Passione et Morte,  Resurrectione et Adscensu in Celo (1608): — De AEterna Dei Praedestinatione (1600): — Symphonia Catholica (1607): — Theses Bellarminio potissimum Oppositae (published after Polanus's death by J.G. Grosse, 1613): — Institutiones de Concionum Sacrarum Methodo (1604): — Syntagma Theologiae Christianae (1612). See Lichtenberger, Encyclop. des Sciences Religieuses, s.v.; Jocher, Allgemeines Gelehrten- Lexikon, s.v. (B.P.)

## Pole[[@Headword:Pole]]

             (נֵס, nes, a flagstaff, Num 21:8-9; hence the flag or standard itself, “sign,” “banner,” etc., as elsewhere).

## Pole, Reginald[[@Headword:Pole, Reginald]]

             a famous English cardinal, who figures so prominently in the English Reformation period, upon whose character rests the stigma of duplicity and selfishness, and against whom both Protestants and Romanists have written in censure or praise, was descended from royal blood, being a younger son of Sir Richard Pole. lord Montague, cousin-German of king Henry VII, and Margaret, daughter of George, the duke of Clarence, and younger brother to king Edward IV. Pole was born at Stourton Castle, Staffordshire, in March, 1500. When seven years old he was sent to the Carthusian monks at Sheen for instruction. At twelve he became a student at Magdalen College, Oxford, where the famous Linacre and Will. Latimer, two great masters of Latin and Greek, were his teachers. At fifteen he took the B.A. and entered into deacon's orders, and in 1517, the year that Luther began to preach against indulgences, Pole was made prebendary of Salisbury, to which preferment the deanery of Exeter and others were soon after added by king Henry VIII, who greatly admired Pole, and desired his elevation to the highest ecclesiastical dignity. At the age of nineteen Pole went to Italy, there to continue his studies, and was by the king afforded support suitable to his rank. He visited different universities, and finally rested at Padua, where he entered a distinguished group of scholars, among whom were Leonicus, a great philosopher and philologist, Longolius, Bembo, and Lupset, a learned Englishman. These masters were his constant companions, and they have told us how he became the delight of that part of the world for his learning, politeness, and piety. From Padua he went to Venice, where he continued for some time, and then visited other parts of Italy. Having spent five years abroad, he was recalled home; but being desirous to see the jubilee, which was celebrated this year at Rome, he went to that city: whence, passing by Florence, he returned to England, where he arrived about the end of 1525. He was received by the king, queen, court, and all the nobility with great affection and honor, and was highly esteemed, not only on account of his learning, but for the sweetness of his nature and politeness of his manners.

Devotion and study, however, being what he solely delighted in, he retired to his old habitation among the Carthusians at Sheen, where he spent two years in the free enjoyment of them. In 1529 when king Harry determined upon his divorce from Catharine of Aragon, Pole, foreseeing the troubles consequent upon this, and how he must needs be involved in them, resolved to withdraw, and obtained leave of his majesty to go to Paris. Here he continued in quiet till  the king, prosecuting the affair of the divorce and sending to the most noted universities in Europe for their opinion upon the illegitimacy of his marriage, commanded him to concur with his agents in procuring the approval for his contemplated step from the faculty of the University of Paris. Pole left the affair to the commissioners, excusing himself to the king as unfit for the employ, since his studies had lain another way. Henry was angry, upon which Pole returned to England in order to pacify him; but failing in this, and unwilling to make a tool of himself to the king in his questionable designs, Pole returned to Sheen, where he continued two years. It has been asserted that scruples of conscience and of religion were not his only motive: that, though a priest, he was not without hope of marrying the princess Mary Tudor, and that it was not without such views that Catharine of Aragon had committed the education of her daughter to his mother, the countess of Salisbury. Henry at length perceiving that the court of Rome resolved to oppose the affair of the divorce, conceived a resolution to shake off their authority, and to rely upon his own subjects. Pole was again pressed, but as steadfastly refused as before, even under the temptation of being made archbishop of York if he should comply with the king's demands.

The king having dismissed Pole in anger, he consulted his safety by leaving the kingdom, and rejoined the company of the distinguished men he had known abroad. ‘he first year he spent at Avignon; but as his health declined there he went to Padua, making now and then excursions to his friends at Venice. The literary circle in which he moved was formed by Caraffa (Paul IV), Sadoleto, Gilberto, Fregoso, archbishop of Salerno, Bembo, and Contarini. These men even embraced the doctrine of justification, and in their social meetings discussed the means of reforming the papacy-their great principle being to preserve the unity of the Church under the papal government. In Italy, during the reign of Henry VIII, Reginald Pole rose to great distinction, and on the accession of Paul III in 1534 was raised to the cardinalate, as were his friends just mentioned. Thus the days passed very agreeably in Italy, while fresh troubles were rising in England. Henry had not only divorced Catharine, but married Anne Boleyn, and resolved to throw off the papal yoke and assert his right to the supremacy, with the title of Supreme Head of the Church. To this end he procured a book to be written in defense of that title by Sampson, bishop of Chichester, which he immediately sent to Pole for his confirmation. Pole, taking courage from the security of the pope's protection, not only disapproved the king's divorce and separation from the apostolic see, but shortly after drew up a treatise, entitled De unitate  ecclesiasticat, in which he controverted the pretensions of Henry to the headship of the Church, and compared him to Nebuchadnezzar. He forwarded a copy of it to the king, who, displeased with Pole, under pretence of wanting some passage to be explained, sent for him to England; but Pole, aware that to deny the king's supremacy was high- treason there, and considering the fate of More and Fisher, refused to obey the call. The king therefore resolved to keep measures with him no longer, and accordingly his pension was withdrawn, he was stripped of all his dignities in England, and an act of attainder passed against him.

Pole was abundantly compensated for these losses and sufferings by the bounty of the pope and emperor. At the same time Paul III, having in view a general council for the reform of the Church, called to Rome several persons renowned for their learning, and among them Pole, to represent England. In vain his mother, brothers, and friends tried to dissuade him from going to Rome. After some wavering, the exhortations of his friend Contarini prevailed over the fears of his family, and lie went to Rome in 1536. There he was, against his earnest wish, created cardinal, Dec. 22, 1536. Two months afterwards (February, 1537) Paul appointed him his legate on the other side of the Alps, and sent him on a most delicate and dangerous errand. The rebellion of the northern Catholics against Henry VIII seemed to the pope a favorable occasion to attempt the reconciliation of England with the Roman see. The legate's instructions were to promote a good understanding between the emperor and the king of France, to establish himself in the Netherlands, and if circumstances allowed of such a course to pass over to England. Scarcely had he put his foot on the French territory when Cromwell, his personal foe, claimed him in virtue of an article of a treaty concluded between Francis and Henry; but, secretly put on his guard by the king himself, he pursued his journey with the utmost speed, and stopped only at Cambrai. The regent here refused to allow him to enter the Netherlands; and, after a short stay with the prince-bishop of Liege, he was obliged to make his way back to Rome (August, 1537).

At the same time Henry VIII set a price of fifty thousand crowns on his head, and promised to the emperor a subsidy of four thousand men in his war against Francis for his extradition. If the pope had up to that time shrunk from extreme measures against the schism of England, it was because lie felt powerless to put them into execution. Having succeeded in restoring peace between the two great rulers of the Continent, he at last published his bull of excommunication. Pole was sent in secret mission to the courts  of Spain and France; but forestalled by the English agents, lie could only get evasive answers. Charles, at Toledo, declared that he had more urgent business to attend to, but that he was ready to fulfill the promises made by him to the pope if Francis assisted him without afterthought. Francis, in his turn, protested his good will, but besought the legate not to enter his states if he did not bring some positive proof of the emperor's sincerity. After carrying on negotiations for several months, Pole came to the conclusion that he was being deluded on both sides, and advised the pope to wait patiently for a better opportunity to turn up in the course of political events. His share in these negotiations proved fatal to his relations. Henry wreaked his savage vengeance on him by sending to execution his brother, lord Montague, and his aged mother, lady Salisbury, who was dragged to the scaffold May 17, 1541. The second brother of the cardinal, Sir Geoffrey, saved his life by revealing the secrets of his relations and friends. In 1539 cardinal Pole was sent to Viterbo, where, in the exercise of his functions, until 1542, he distinguished himself by his piety, the encouragement he gave to letters, and his tolerance towards the Protestants. In 1545 he repaired to Trent, under strong escort, to superintend the works preparatory to the council. After the death of Henry (1547), he wrote to the Privy Council in favor of the Catholic communion, and to Edward VI in justification of his acts; but his letters were left unopened. Pole's book, De unitate ecclesiastica. was published in Rome in 1536; and though, as Burnet, says, “it was more esteemed for the high quality of the author than for any sound reasoning in it,” it yet gave the most certain proof of his invincible attachment and zeal for the see of Rome, and was therefore sufficient to build the strongest confidence upon. Accordingly Pole was employed in negotiations and transactions of high concern, was consulted by the pope in all affairs relating to kings and sovereign princes, was made one of his legates at the Council of Trent, and, lastly, his penman when occasion required. Thus, for instance, when the pope's power to remove that council was contested by the emperor's ambassador, Pole drew up a vindication of that proceeding; and when the emperor set forth the interim, was employed to answer it. This was in 1548, and pope Paul III dying the next year, our cardinal was twice elected to succeed him, but refused both the election: one as being too hasty and without due deliberation, and the other because it was done in the nighttime. This unexampled delicacy disgusted several of his friends in the conclave, who thereupon concurred in choosing Julius III, March 30, 1550. The tranquility of Rome being soon after disturbed by the wars in  France and on the borders of Italy, Pole retired to a monastery in the territory of Verona, where lie lived agreeably to his natural humor till the death of king Edward VI in July, 1553.

On the accession of queen Mary, Pole was appointed legate for England, as the fittest instrument to reduce that kingdom to an obedience to the pope; but he did not think it safe to venture his person thither till he knew the queen's intentions with regard to the reestablishment of the Romish religion, and also whether the act of attainder which had passed against him under Henry, and confirmed by Edward, was repealed. It was not long before he received satisfaction upon both these points; and he set out for England, by way of Germany, in October 1553. The emperor, suspecting a design in queen Mary to marry Pole, contrived means to stop his progress; nor did he arrive in England till November, 1554, when her marriage with Philip of Spain was completed. (The English ecclesiastical historian Soames thinks that Pole was delayed by bishop Gardiner, who himself desired this distinguished post.) On his arrival Pole was conducted to the archbishop's palace at Lambeth, Cranmer being then attainted and imprisoned; and on the 28th went to the Parliament and made a long and grave speech, inviting them to a reconciliation with the apostolic see, for which purpose, he said, he was sent by the common pastor of Christendom. This speech of Pole occasioned some motion in the queen, which she vainly thought was a child quickened within her womb: so that the joy of the times was redoubled, some not scrupling to say that as John the Baptist leaped in his mother's womb at the salutation of the Virgin, so here the like happiness attended the salutation of Christ's vicar. The Parliament being absolved by Pole, all went to the royal chapel, where the Te Deum was sung on the occasion; and thus, the pope's authority being now restored, the cardinal, two days afterwards, made his public entry into London, with all the solemnities of a legate, and presently set about reforming the Church and freeing it from heresy. In conformity with a pontifical bull, he published a decree by which, 1, churches, hospitals, and schools founded during the schisms should be preserved; 2, persons who had married at unlawful degrees without dispensation should be considered as legitimately united; 3, buyers of ecclesiastical property should not be disturbed in their possession. But such a triumph did not satisfy the fanatics. Encouraged by the chancellor, Gardiner, they filled England during four years with those horrors which left forever a bloody stain on Mary's memory. Pole had formerly been suspected of favoring the  Reformation, because he had advocated in the Council of Trent (q.v.) and at Ratisbon (q.v.) the adoption by the Church of Rome of the doctrine of justification as held by the Protestants, and being now anxious to satisfy the Papists, altered in his actions, and became the severe opponent of all Protestants. In the cruel measures which were adopted it is sometimes claimed for Pole that he had no direct part, as he was by nature humane and of good temper, and had ever previously proved most lenient to Protestants; but it would appear as if Pole, in his desire to please the pope and the queen, did adopt sterner measures than heretofore. The poet Tennyson has recently taken the favorable view of Pole's conduct, and thus makes him speak of his decision how to reconcile the heretics:

“For ourselves, we do protest That our commission is to heal, not harm; We come not to condemn, but reconcile; We come not to compel, but call again; We come not to destroy, but edify; Nor yet to question things already done: These are forgiven-matters of the past And range with jetsam and with offal thrown Into the blind sea of forgetfulness” (Queen Mary, Acts 3, scene 3).

In a later scene he makes bishop Gardiner (q.v.) the persecutor, and Pole the advocate and friend of the heretic:

“Indeed, I cannot follow with your grace; Rather would say-the shepherd doth not kill The sheep that wander from his flock, but sends His careful dog to bring them to the fold” (Acts 3, scene 4).

There is somewhat to favor this interpretation of Pole's acts. After the death of pope Julius, and his successor Marcellus, who rapidly followed him to the grave, the queen recommended Pole to the popedom; but Peter Caraffa, who took the name of Paul IV, was elected before her dispatches arrived. This pope, who had never liked our cardinal, was pleased with Gardiner, bishop of Winchester, whose temper exactly tallied with his own; and therefore favored his views upon the see of Canterbury in opposition to Pole, whose nomination to that dignity was not confirmed by him till the death of his rival, which happened Nov. 13, 1555. After Pole's decease,  pope Paul IV himself acknowledged that if the cardinal's humane policy had been accepted, England might not have been lost again to Rome.

After his elevation to the legateship of England, Pole had the sole management and regulation of ecclesiastical affairs in that country. His concurrence in the butcheries of Protestants did not, however, secure him against the attacks of his old enemy Paul IV, who upon various pretences accused him as a suspected heretic, summoned him to Rome to answer the charge, and, depriving him of his legantine powers, conferred them upon Peyto, a Franciscan friar, whom he had made a cardinal for that purpose. The new legate was upon the road for England when queen Mary, apprised of his business, assumed some of her father's spirit, and forbade him at his peril to set foot upon English ground. Pole, however, was no sooner informed of the pontiffs pleasure, or rather displeasure, than, out of that implicit veneration which he constantly and unalterably preserved for the apostolic see, he voluntarily laid down the legate's ensigns and forbore the exercise of its power, dispatching his trusty minister Ornameto to Rome with letters clearing him in such submissive terms as melted even the obdurate heart of Paul. The cardinal was restored to his legantine powers soon after, but did not live to enjoy them a full twelvemonth, being seized with a double quartanague, which carried him off, Nov. 17, 1558. During his illness he often inquired after her majesty, and his death is said to have been hastened by that of his royal mistress, which, as if one star had governed both their nativities, happened about sixteen hours before. After lying forty days in state at Lambeth, Pole's remains were carried to Canterbury, and there interred. He was a learned, eloquent, modest, humble, and good-natured man, of exemplary piety and charity, as well as generosity becoming his birth. Though by nature he was more inclined to study and contemplation than to active life yet he was prudent and dexterous in business, so that he would have been a finished character had not his superstitious devotion to the see of Rome led him from the path his own convictions marked out to him. Burnet, who has drawn Pole in very favorable colors, acknowledges this fault in the great cardinal. Froude's delineation of Pole as a narrow-minded and fanatical bigot is precisely the reverse of the fact. Pole, like his friend Contarini, was a leading member of that moderate party of Romanists who, though they dreaded the disruption of Christendom, desired a reform not only in the discipline but also in the doctrine of the Church. From this position he was only scared by fear of losing his mitre. This betrays a weakness, it is true, but rather of ambition  than of fanaticism or narrow-mindedness. It is, besides, unjust to make Pole the sole responsible party for the persecutions which were inaugurated; for Fox (8, 308) has furnished clear evidence against such an insinuation. He even gives two instances where Pole personally interfered to save Protestants from execution. All that Pole did, even at the worst, was to suffer the law to take its course, and not preventing what he knew should not have been done. But, of course, this is bad enough; we only desire that it be made no worse. Hook has taken a view very much dependent on Froude. In the instructions which Pole was putting out at the time of his decease for the clergy, and in the devotional books which he was putting together for his people, it is hard to find anything but good- sense, deep piety, and hearty benevolence.

Pole wrote various controversial and theological tracts, besides the work above referred to. Among these publications are, Liber de Concilio (Venet. 1562, 8vo, and elsewhere): — Refoirmatio Anglica ex Decretis ipsius Sedis Apostolicae Legati anno MDLVI (Rome, 1562, 4to); one of the most elegant pieces of composition in the Latin language, and which, for perspicuity, good-sense, and solid reasoning, is equal to the importance of the occasion on which it was written (Phillips, Sacred Literature): — De Summo Pontifices Christi in Terris Viecario et de ejus Officis et Potestate; a Treatise of Justification (Lovanii, 1569, 4to); this work is reported to have been “found among the writings of cardinal Pole.” See Hume, Hist. of England, ch. 37 (very favorable); Froude, Hist. of England, 6:369 sq.; Collier, Eccles. Hist. of England (see Index in vol. 7); Schröckh, Kirchengesch. seit der Ref. 2, 575 sq.; Soames, Hist. of the Ref. 1, 251 sq.; 2, 185 sq., 229 sq., 327 sq., 357 sq.; 4. 66 sq., 77, 238, 495, 545 sq., 577 sq., 595; Ffoulkes, Divisions in Christendom, 1, § 63; Hook, Lives of the Archbishops of Canterbury (Lond. 1869), vol. 3; Hardwick, Hist. of the Reformation, p. 64, et al.; Seebohm, Hist. of the Prot. Religion, p. 194, 206, 212; North H'Bit. Rev. Jan. 1870, p. 283; Westminster Rev. April 1871, p. 266; and especially the references in Allibone, — Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors, s.v.

## Pole-axes[[@Headword:Pole-axes]]

             were the ensigns of legates a latere, carried with silver pillars (Gal 2:9) before cardinals Wolsey and Pole.

## Polehampton, Henry Stedman[[@Headword:Polehampton, Henry Stedman]]

             an English divine, was born in 1824, and educated at Pembroke College, Oxford. He took holy orders, and was ordained deacon in 1848; in the year following became assistant curate of St. Chad's, Shrewsbury; in 1855 chaplain in the Bengal Presidency. During the great Sepoy rebellion he was shot through the body in the insurrection at Lucknow and died July 20, 1857. He was a good man, and his loss was greatly deplored in all England, as well as among the English of India. See Memoir, Letters, and Diary o' the late Rev. Henry Polehampton, and the Rev. Thomas Stedman Polehampton (Lond. 1858, 8vo, and often); London Athenaeum, 1858, pt. 2, 451 sq., 487.

## Polehampton, Thomas Stedman[[@Headword:Polehampton, Thomas Stedman]]

             brother of the preceding, of lesser note, died at Lucknow. SEE POLEHAMPTON, HENRY S.

## Polemics[[@Headword:Polemics]]

             (from πολεμικός, warlike) is the controversial branch of scientific theology. It is also sometimes called by German theologians elenchtics and differs from apologetics (q.v.) in that it is not simply intended to defend Christianity in general, but aims to attack a rival or disputed system in particular, and is the direct opposite of irenics (q.v.), which aims to establish peace within the Christian fold. This distinction has not always been observed in Christian theology, but is of rather recent (late. As a rule, the theologians of the Church mixed the polemical and apologetical elements in all theological controversy. In our own century, however, and especially since the days of Schleiermacher, theological encyclopaedists have insisted upon a strict severance of polemics from apologetics and symbolics (q.v.), and have dealt with it in an independent manner. In theory nothing can be more accurately defined and distinguished than apologetics and polemics; they bear the same relation to each other as in physical conflict the offensive and the defensive operations. In practice, however, it is impossible always to separate the apologetic and the polemical elements. See the art. SEE APOLOGY.

In the ages of the Church fathers no great difficulty was encountered, because their object was to combat the Jewish or the heathen systems of religion, and their writings therefore bear a predominant polemical coloring. But it is one thing to combat a single religious system like paganism, and it is quite another to attack heresy  within the Church, or to make war on religious systems claiming a like foundation. Polemics, then, narrowed down to its proper sphere, is the controversy within the Christian fold regarding the essentials of the Church faith. In the early Church the polemical activity was confined to heresies and schismatics. Indeed, from the death of Origen to John of Damascus (A.D. 254-730)— the time which elapsed between the Sabellian and the Monothelite controversies— the polemics of the Church were developed much more prominently than either the apologetic tendency, as in the preceding period, or the systematic tendency, as in the next period. The heresies which called out polemical activity from 730 till the outbreak of the Reformation differed in tendency from those of the preceding period in their opposition to the whole ecclesiastical system rather than to any particular doctrines, But with the establishment of Protestantism the polemical activity began in real earnest, and from that time to this has continued to develop and expand in strength both among Romanists and Protestants. Among the former it has been specially cultivated by the Jesuits, who, on account of the many methods which they have proposed for attack of Protestants, have been given the appellation “Methodists” (comp. Pelt, Theol. Encyklopädie, § 63, p. 386 sq.). They even published large works containing the modus operandi for controversies of a confessional nature, under the title Theologia Polemica (Vitus Pichler, 1753; Gazzaniga, 1778 sq.). The Protestants were not far behind, and provided material under the more appropriate title of a Synopsis Controversiarum (Abraham Calow, 1685; Musaeus, 1701), to which may be added Walch, Einleitung in die polemische Gottesgelahrtheit (Jena, 1752, 8vo), and his other writings; Schubert, Institutiones Theologies Polemical (1756-58); Baumgarten, Untersuchung theologischer Streitigkeiten (1762-64); Mosheim, Streittheologie (1763 sq.); Bock, Lehrb. fur die neueste Polemik (1782). No work of importance on the science of polemics appeared until Schleiermacher treated of it in his Dearstelluny des theol. Studiums (Berl. 1811); and his ideas found further and fuller elucidation by his disciples Sack in his Christliche Polemik (Bonn, 1838), and by Pelt in his Theol. Encyklopädie (1843); Hagenbach, Theol. Encyklop. (1864, and since); Hill, System of Divinity (N. Y. 1847, 8vo); McClintock, Encyclop. and Method of Theol. Science (N. Y. 1873). The literature of polemics is divided properly into:

I. Treatises on the Controversy between Protestants and Romanists.

1. General Treatises by writers of the Church of Rome.

2. General Treatises against Popery by Protestant Divines.

II. Treatises on the Arian Controversy.

III. Treatises on the Socinian Controversy.

IV. Treatises occasioned by the Controversies between the Church of England, and between them and Dissenters.

1. The Bangoriani Controversy.

2. Subscription to the 39 Articles.

3. Baptismal Regeneration Controversy.

4. Controversial Treatises on Dissent.

V. Treatises on Heresies.

The various publications on these divisions must be sought for under their respective headings. We will refer the reader here for general treatises to the works cited by Werner, Gesch. der apologet. u. polemischen Literatur, and to Spanheim, Controversiarum de Religione cums Dissidentibus Hodie Christianis Prolixe et cuan Judeis Elenchus Historico Theologicus, and Horneck, Summa Controversiarum; Clarisse, Encyklopèdie Theologicae Epitome (Lugd. 1835, 8vo). § 91. p. 499 sq. See, also, Mohler's Symbolik; Piper, Monumental- Theologie, § 135 sq.

The principles which should govern the Christian theological polemic are those of an honest offensive warfare. They may be condensed into the following points:

(1) The question is not about persons, but about things. Only when both stand and fall together may personalities be allowed.

(2) The attack must be directed to the point where the strength of the enemy is most formidable: as soon as the principles of the adversary have been refuted the hostility must cease.

(3) We must not impute to the adversary more wrong than he is really guilty of; or else the attack itself assumes the appearance of a wrong, and will be considered in that light by every third party, even if successful. Polemics, then, must take the cause of the adversary just as it is; they must not attribute to him any opinions which can only be made his own by  exaggerating his expressions, or even by putting false constructions upon them.

(4) It is imprudent to think too little of an adversary. The reasons given by him must be recognized in all their force, and on the basis of full acknowledgment the proof must be given that they are not convincing.

(5) A struggle with unequal arms is not honorable. The polemic, then, will have to prove either that the weapons of his adversary are illegal, or, if this cannot be done, to inquire into his standpoint and his reasons and to prove in error the cause in its very principles.

(6) If the polemic thus succeeds in reducing his adversary ad abstordcum, i.e. to an illogical condition, which, by reason of its untenability, forces him hors de conmbat, the vanquished is turned into a friend and convert and the truth has indeed triumphed, as God would have it.

## Polemics, Jewish[[@Headword:Polemics, Jewish]]

             The friendly relation which existed at first between the Church and the Synagogue could not always last, and a separation became a matter of necessity. The result was that the non-identification of Christianity with Judaism gave rise to bitterness and enmity, and some of the fiercest persecutions were instigated and encouraged by the Jews. The Christians were no more called so, but “Minim,” or heretics. So great became at last the enmity, that a celebrated Jewish sage (Tarphon) declared that, although the Gospels and the other writings of the “Minim” contained the sacred names of the Deity, they ought to be burned; that heathenism was less dangerous than Christianity; that heathens offended from ignorance, while Christians did so with full knowledge; and that he would prefer seeking shelter in a heathen temple rather than in a meeting-place of the “Minim” (Tarph. Sabb. 116 a). Another and more moderate rabbi (Ishmael) also recommended the burning of every copy of the Gospels, as in his opinion inciting to rebellion against God, and to hatred against the commonwealth of Israel (Aboda Sara, 43). By and by all friendly relations between the two parties entirely ceased, and the mutual estrangement was such that the ordinary civilities of life were not to be exchanged, and the bread. wine, oil, and meat used by Christians were declared polluted.

One of the earliest polemics against Christianity is that of R. Simlai, of the 3d century, who became famous for his virulent opposition to Christianity.  His polemics were especially directed against the doctrine of the Trinity (comp. Genesis Rubba, c. 8; Jerus. Berach. 9, 11 d, 12 a). It has been suggested. and with apparent probability, that he had been chiefly engaged in controversy with Origen. Another polemic was R. Abbahu, of the 4th century, who likewise attacked the Trinity and the ascension of Christ (Jerus. Taanith, 2, 65 b; Genesis Rabba, c. 29; Exodus Rabba, c. 29). Of this R. Abbahu, we also read (Abodah Sarah, fol. 4 a) that he recommended a certain R. Saphra to a noble Christian. At this recommendation the Christian permitted R. Saphra an exemption for thirteen years. When the Christian asked R. Saphra about the meaning of the passage in Amo 3:2, and perceived his ignorance, he asked R. Abbahu about its meaning. Having received a satisfactory answer, the Christian asked, “Why is R. Saphra, whom you recommended to me as a great man, so ignorant in the Scriptures, which thou didst explain right away?” To this R. Abbahu answered, “We, who come in contact with you Christians. are obliged, for our self-preservation, to study the Scriptures, because you dispute so often with us from the Scriptures, and because we know that you study the Scriptures: but the other Jews, who live among Gentiles, have no need of that, since they do not dispute with them concerning the Scriptures.” What a gloomy picture! The Jews read the Bible, not because they are concerned about the “one thing needful,” but only for the sake of controversy! Next in order are those passages of the Talmud which speak of Jesus, and have been expurgated in the earliest editions. Eisenmenger has collected a great many of these passages in his Neuentdecktes Judenthuim, and also Meelführer, in his Jesus in Talmude (Altorf, 1699, 2 vols.).

We now give an alphabetical list of such as wrote against Christianity, and who, for the most part, have been treated upon in this Cyclopedia, to which reference is made:

Abendana, Jacob (q.v.), carried on a controversy with Hulsius (1699), and translated the Cusari into Spanish.

Abrabanel, Isaac (q.v.), whose commentaries contain the strongest invectives against Christianity; and so likewise his משמוע ושועהand ישועות משיחו.

Albo, Joseph, who died in 1444, took part in the conference held with Jerome de Santa Fe, which took place at Tortosa in 1413-14 under the  presidency of Peter de Luna, afterwards Benedict XIII. He is the author of the Sepher lkkarim, ספר עקרים, i.e. “the Book of Principles.” “This book,” says R. Wise, “was the first, and for a long time the only one which attacked the dogmas of the Roman Catholic Church. His opponents spoke, wrote, and argued so much against him that he became quite popular in Christian circles, and thus also a forerunner of the Reformation.” This effusion of the Cincinnati rabbi is of course only to be taken cum grano salis, for a personal acquaintance with the work would have told him that only the last division contains what can be called antichristian.

Arama, Isaac, one of the Spanish exiles, impugns Christianity in his חזות קשה, i.e. “‘the Heavy Vision.”

Bechai ben-Ashel's attacks upon Christianity can only be found in the earliest editions of his commentary on the Pentateuch.

Farrissol, Abraham (q.v.), is the author of אברהם מגן, i.e. “the Shield of Abraham,” written against Christianity.

Isaac-Jacob ben-Saul, of the 18th century, wrote his Buch der Verzeichnung. Fine Unterweisung wie man seine Religion gegen die Angrife des Christenthums, und wie man überhaupt den Einwüfen der Polemik antworten soil (Amsterdam, 1693).

Jechiel ben-Joseph (q.v.), author of וכוח, was a member of the conference held at Paris between Nicolaus Donin and some Jewish savans. Jechiel would not admit that the Jesus mentioned in the Talmud is Jesus of Nazareth, but another, a discovery which was copied by later writers. But Jews themselves acknowledge the failure of such an assertion; for, says Dr. Levin, in his prize essay, Die Religions disputation des R. Jechiel von Paris, etc. (published in Gratz's Monatsschrift, 1869, p. 193), “We must regard the attempt of R. Jechiel to ascertain that there were two by the name of Jesus as unfortunate, original as the idea may be.” Jehudah ha-Levi ben-Samuel (q.v.) is the author of the famous Cusari. Joseph ben-Shemtob (q.v.), the commentator on Profiat Duran's (q.v.) Epistle.

Joseph bu-Jachm (q.v.) attacks Christianity in his commentary on the Hagiographa.  Kimchi, David and Joseph (q.v.), made their commentaries the arena of attacks. Lipmaumm, Yonmtob (q.v.), is the author of the well known Nizzachon. Luppercio, Isaac, defended Judaism against a monk of Seville in his Apolojia. (Basle, 1658).

Machir of Toledo is the author of an eschatology of Judaism in three sections; the first Hulsius translated into Latin, with a refutation.

Monalto, Elias (q.v.), wrote an apology of Judaism in his Livro FIato.t

Mortera, Saul (q.v.), the teacher of Spinoza, was so virulent in his תורת משהthat it could not be printed.

Nachmanides, Moses (q.v.), speaks against Christianity in more than one of his works.

Ofenlhausen, Smrl. Zewi (q.v.), wrote his Jewish Theriaca against Brenz.

Olquenira, Isaac (q.v.), is the pretended editor of an antichristian work written by Joseph Nasi of Naxos.

Orobio, Isaac (q.v.), wrote his Israel Venye and Scripta adversus Christianam Religionem.

Profiat Duran (q.v.) is the author of the well-known satirical epistle entitled אל תהי כאבותי,ִ “Be not like thy Fathers,” which R. Isaac Wise, of Cincinnati, published in English for the readers of his paper, under the pompous heading, “A Relic of Great Significance,” respectfully inscribed “to religion peddlers.” This last expression puts R. Wise on the side of these Jewish polemics, but with the difference that “quod licet Jovi, non licet bovi.”

Roman, Abraham, showed his animosity by publishing antichristian works (Constantinople, 1710).

Saadia, Gaon (q.v.), devotes the second and eighth chapters of his philosophical work to attack Christianity.

Toki, Isaac ben-Abraham- (q.v.), is the author of the famous חזוק אמונה, which has been made use of by critical writers upon the New Testament from Voltaire to Strauss. Some years ago it was published, with a German  translation by R. David Deutsch (2d ed. 1875), under the patronage of M. Rothschild (!).of Paris. In English some chapters were published by a New York rabbi.

In the same year in which the second German edition of Toki's work appeared, a similar work in five volumes was published at Warsaw, under the title Zerubbabel, written by Lebensohn, under the patronage of Sir Moses Montefiore, of London; a work which, as reviewer says, by far surpasses the author of the Chizuk l'Emrunath. It is characterized by coarse vituperation.

The literature on this subject is very meager. For the older literature, we would refer to De Rossi, Bibliotheca Judaica Antichristiana (Parmse, 1800); Steinschneider, Jewish Literature, p. 122 sq., 211 sq. (B. P.)

## Polemioi[[@Headword:Polemioi]]

             SEE SYNSTUSISTAE.

## Polemius (or Salvius or Sylvius)[[@Headword:Polemius (or Salvius or Sylvius)]]

             a Gallican ecclesiastic of the 5th century, flourished as bishop of Martigny, in the Valais. He is the author of a sacred calendar, drawn up A.D. 448, which is entitled Laterculus s. Index Dierums Festorum, and which includes heathen as well as Christian festivals. A portion of this Laterculus was published by Bollanduls, in the general preface to the Actae Sanctorom (1, 44, 45), and the whole will be found, but in a mutilated state, in the seventh volume of the same work (p. 178). See Mansi, Ad Fabric. Bibl. Med. et Inufin. Lt. vol. 6; Schonemann, Bibl. Patrum Lat. vol. 2, § 50. — Smith, Dict. of Gr. and Rom. Biog. and Mythol. s.v.

## Polemo Of Athens[[@Headword:Polemo Of Athens]]

             (1) an eminent Platonic philosopher, and for some time the head of the Academy, was the son of Philostratus, a man of wealth and political  distinction. In his youth Polemo was extremely profligate; but one day, when he was about thirty, he broke into the school of Xenocrates at the head of a band of revelers. His attention was so arrested by the discourse, which the master continued calmly in spite of the interruption, and which chanced to be upon temperance, that he tore off his garland and remained an attentive listener, and from that day lie adopted an abstemious course of life, and continued to frequent the school, of which, on the death of Xenocrates, he became the head, in 01, 116, B.C. 315. According to Eusebius (Chronicles) he died in 01, 126, 4, B.C. 273. Diogenes also says that he died at a great age, and of natural decay. He was a close follower of Xenocrates in all things, and an intimate friend of Crates and Crantor, who were his disciples, as well as Zeno and Arcesilas; Crates was his successor in the Academy. Polemo gave his attention mainly to ethics, and esteemed tie object of philosophy to be to exercise men in things and deeds, not in dialectic speculations. His character was grave and severe, and he took pride in displaying the mastery which he had acquired over emotions of every sort. In literature he most admired Homer and Sophocles, and he is said to have been the author of the remark that Homer is an epic Sophocles, and Sophocles a tragic Homer. He left, according to Diogenes, several treatises, none of which were extant in tile time of Suidas.

There is, however, a quotation made by Clemens Alexandrinus, either from him or from another philosopher of the same name, ἐν τοῖς περὶ τοῦ κατὰ φύσιν βίου (Strom. 7, 117), and another passage (Strom. 2, 410) upon happiness, which agrees precisely with the statement of Cicero (De Fin. 4:6), that Polemo placed the summum bonum in living according to the laws of nature. Cicero gives (Acal. Pt. 2, 43) the following as Polemo's ethical principles: “Holeste vivere, fruentem rebus iis, quas primas homini natura conciliat.” See Diog. Laert. 4:16-20; Suid. s.v.; Plut. De Adul. et Amic. 32, p. 71 e; Lucian, Bis Accusat. 16 (2, 811); Athen. 2, 44 e; Cic. Acad. 1, 9; 2, 35, 42; De Olltt. 3, 18; De Fin. 2, 6, 11; 4:2, 6, 16, 18; 5, 1, 5, 7, et al.; Horat. Sernu. 2, 3, 253 fol.; Val. Max. 6:9; Menag. Ad Diog. Laert. 1. c.; Fabricius, Bibl. Grcec. 3, 183; comp. p. 323, note hhh; Smith, Dict. of Gr. and Roms. Biog. and Mythol. s.v.; Ueberweg, Hist. of Philos. 1, 133-135; Butler, Hist. of Anc. Philos. (see Index).

(2.) Another Platonic philosopher was the disciple of Plotinus; but very little is known of him (Porphyr. Plot. Vit.; Fabricius, 1. c.; Clinton, F. II. sub ann. B.C. 315, vol. 2, 3d ed.).

(3.) OF ATHENS by citizenship, but by birth either of Ilium or Samos or Sicyon, a Stoic philosopher and an eminent geographer, surnamed ὁ περιηγήτης, was the son of Euegetes, and a contemporary of Aristophanes of Byzantium, in the time of Ptolemy Epiphanes, at the beginning of the 2d century B.C. (Suid. s.v.; Athen. 6:234; Clinton, F. H. vol. 3, sub ann. B.C. 199). In philosophy he was a disciple of Panetius. He made extensive journeys through Greece, to collect materials for his geographical works, in the course of which he paid particular attention to the inscriptions on votive offerings and on columns, whence he obtained the surname of Στηλοκόπας (Ath. 1. c.; Casaub. ad loc.). As the collector of these inscriptions, he was one of the earliest contributors to the Greek Anthology, and he wrote a work expressly, Περὶ τῶν κατὰ πόλεις ἐπιγραμμάτων (Athen. 10:436 d, 442 e); besides which, other works of his are mentioned upon the votive offerings and monuments in the Acropolis of Athens, at Lacedamon, at Delphi, and elsewhere, which no doubt contained copies of numerous epigrams. Hence Jacobs infers that in all probability his works formed a chief source of the Garland of Meleager (Animardv. in Anth. Graec. vol. 1, Procem. p. 34, 35). Athenemus and other writers make very numerous quotations from his works, the titles of which it is unnecessary to give at length. They are chiefly descriptions of different parts of Greece; some are on the paintings preserved in various places, and several are controversial, among which is one against Eratosthenes. See Fabricius, Bibl. Graec. 3, 184; Vossils, De list. Graec. p. 159 fol. ed. Westermann; Clifton, F. II. 3, 524, where a list of his works is given.

## Polemo, Antonius[[@Headword:Polemo, Antonius]]

             a highly celebrated sophist and rhetorician, who flourished under Trajan, Hadrian, and the first Antoninus, and was in high favor with the two former emperors (Suid. s.v.; Philostr. Vit. Sophist. p. 532). He is placed at the sixteenth year of Hadrian, A.D. 133, by Eusebius (Chronicles). His life is related at considerable length by Philostratus ( Vit. Sophist. 2, 25, p. 530-544). He was born of a consular family at Laodicea, but spent the greater part of his life at Smyrna, the people of which city conferred upon him at a very early age the highest honors, in return for which he did much to promote their prosperity, especially by his influence with the emperors.  Nor, in performing these services, did he. neglect his native city Laodicea. An interesting account of his relations with the emperors Hadrian and Antoninus is given by Philostratus (p. 533, 534).

Among the sophists and rhetoricians whom he heard were Timocrates, Scopelianus, Dion Chrysostom, and Apollophanes. His most celebrated disciple was Aristides. His chief contemporaries were Herodes Atticus, Marcus Byzantinus, Dionysius Milesius, and Favorinus, who was his chief rival. Among his imitators in subsequent times was St. Gregory Nazianzen. His style of oratory was imposing rather than pleasing, and his character was haughty and reserved. During the latter part of his life he was so tortured by the gout that he resolved to put an end to his existence he had himself shut up in the tomb of his ancestors at Laodicea, where he died of hunger, at the age of sixty-five. The exact time of his death is not known; but it must have been some time after A.D. 143, as he was heard in that year by Verus. The only extant work of Polemo is the funeral orations for Cynlegeimus and Callimachus, the generals who fell at Marathon, which are supposed to be pronounced by their fathers, each extolling his own son above the other. Philostratus mentions several others of his rhetorical compositions, the subjects of which are chiefly taken from Athenian history, and an oration which he pronounced, by command of Hadrian. at the dedication of the temple of Zeus Olympius at Athens, in A.D. 135. His Λόγοι ἐπιτάφιοι were first printed by H. Stephanus, in his collection of the declamations of Polemo, Himerius, and other rhetoricians (Paris, 1547, 4to; afterwards by themselves in Greek, Paris, 1586, 4to; and in Greek and Latin, Tolosae, 1637, 8vo). The latest and best edition is that of Caspar and Conrad Orelli (Leips. 1819, 8vo). See Fabricius, Bibl. Graec. 6, 2-4; Clinton, Fasti Rogmani, s. a. 133, 135, 143. There is a coin of Itadrian, bearing the inscription ΠΟΛΕΜΩΝ. ΑΝΕΘΗΚΕ. CΜΥΡΝΑΙΟΙC. (Rasche, Lexic. Rei Vm. s.v. Polemo; Eckhel, Doctr. Nume. Vet. 2, 562). This coin belongs to a class which Eckhel has explained in a dissertation (vol. 4. c. 19, p. 368- 374). There is a question respecting the identity of this sophist with Polemo, the author of a short Greek work on Physiognomy, who, it is supposed, was a Christian, and must have lived in or before the 3d century. See the discussion on this question by Passow, Ueber Ptolemio's Zeitalter, in the Archiv für Philologie und Pädigogik (1, 7— 9), 1825.

## Polenz, John[[@Headword:Polenz, John]]

             a Polish prelate of some note, flourished in the first half of the 16th century. He was of noble parentage, and having decided to give himself to the service of the Church. studied theology in the University of Cracow, and in Germany and other Continental high schools. He also visited Rome. After filling various minor ecclesiastical offices, he was made bishop of Saalland, a province at that time paying fealty to Poland, but under the secular rule of prince Albrecht of Brandenburg. In 1522 this prince, who had refused homage to the new king Sigismund, went to Germany, in company with bishop Jacob Dobeneck and bishop Polenz, to secure the independence of Poland and to accept the Protestant doctrines at the Diet of Nuremberg, which they finally did in 1524. Bishop Polenz died shortly after this event. See Krasinlski, Sketch of the Rise and Progress of the  Reformation in Poland, vol. 2; Alzog, Kirchengesch. 2, 327, 328; Theiner, Herzog Albrecht von Preussen, etc. (Augsb. 1846). SEE PRUSSIA. (J.H.W.)

## Poles, Ancient Mythology Of The[[@Headword:Poles, Ancient Mythology Of The]]

             The Poles, a Slavic people, had a religious system agreeing with that of other Slavonic mythologies, and it is an error to call them fire-worshippers, or to say they worshipped Roman gods, as some affirm. Gnesen, the capital of Poland, the seat of prince Primas, contained a row of great temples, of which now only a few traces may be found. There stood the temple of Nija, the god of the soul; of Perun, the god of thunder, etc. There the principal gods of Slavonic heathendom were worshipped with bloody sacrifices. This warlike nation had many gods of war, but some superintended also domestic concerns.

## Polhemus, Abraham, D.D[[@Headword:Polhemus, Abraham, D.D]]

             a minister of the (Dutch) Reformed Church in America, was a lineal descendant of the Rev. Johannes T. Polhemus the first minister of the Dutch Church of Brooklyn, Long Island, who had previously been a missionary of the Reformed Church of Holland at Itamarca, Brazil. He came to this country in 1654, and died in 1676. But little more is known of him than these few dates and facts of his ministry. The subject of this notice was born at Astoria, L. I., in 1812; graduated at Rutgers College in 1831, and at the theological seminary in New Brunswick in 1835. Immediately after his licensure by the Classis of New York, in 1835, he settled at Hopewell, Dutchess Co., N. Y., and remained there until 1857, when he removed to Newark, N. J., and took charge of the newly organized North Reformed Church in May of that year. In October following he died at Newburgh, N. Y., of fever, after an illness of several weeks. He was a man of majestic physical proportions, tall, broad shouldered, handsome, of amiable instincts and attractive manners. The attachment of his parishioners and friends to him was almost unbounded. He was modest, and yet energetic; frank and cordial, but always dignified and commanding respect. His pastoral qualifications were finely developed. As a preacher, he was easy, graceful, impressive in manner, solid and instructive in matter, evangelical and catholic ill spirit, and full of “an unction from the Holy One” which gave him great acceptance with the people. He was a leading man in the councils of the Church and in her benevolent and educational institutions, and, had he lived, would have been eagerly sought for other high positions. His piety partook of the characteristics to which it gave its own burnished splendor. His death was a scene of glorious Christian triumph, which reminds one of Payson's experiences. A few hours before he died he exclaimed aloud, “I see Jesus! Now that I have seen him, I never can come back again. I see Jesus! Did I not tell you I should see Jesus? My soul is ravished with the sight.” After a while he added, “I have perfect assurance; not a doubt, not a fear.” His last sermon was on the death of Stephen, and the subject made a deep impression on his own heart. From the beginning of his sickness he felt that he would never recover, though with occasional encouragements to the contrary, and he prayed that, like Stephen, he might see Jesus. The answer  came on his dying bed. A handsome memorial volume has been published, containing his biography and a selection of his sermons. His memory has been an inspiration to the church whose foundations he laid with faith and prayer, and which, after only three short months of earthly labors, he was destined to lead in person to heaven. (W. J. B. T.)

## Polhemus, Johannes T[[@Headword:Polhemus, Johannes T]]

             SEE POLIIEIUS, ABRAHAM.

## Polhill, EDWARD[[@Headword:Polhill, EDWARD]]

             a learned English Calvinistic layman, flourished in the second half of the 17th century as justice of the peace at Burwast, Sussex. He wrote, The Divine Will considered in its Eternal Decrees, etc. (1673, 8vo): — Answer to Dr. Sherlock's Discourse (1675, 8vo): — Precious Faith, considered in its Nature, Working, and Growth (1675, 12mo): — Speculum Theologicae in Christo, or a View of some Divine Truths (1678, 4to) Christus in Corde, or Mystical Union between Christ and Believers considered (1680. sm. 8vo, and often): — Armatura Dei, or a Preparation for Suffering in an Evil Day (1682, 8vo): — Discourse on Schism (1824, 12mo). Several of his works were published in Ward's Library of Standard Divinity. “Everything of Polhill is evangelical and valuable,” was the testimony of Cotton Mather; and Williams says: “All the works of this learned layman contain many excellent representations of Gospel truths, intermixed with a strain of sublime devotion.” Of course Arminians fail to see the consistency of his Bible interpretations, but they nevertheless admire his unction and experience, and regard his writings as precious practical religious works. See Eclectic Revelation 4 th series, 18:202. (J. II. W.)

## Poliander, Johann (Originally Granmann)[[@Headword:Poliander, Johann (Originally Granmann)]]

             a German theologian of the Reformation period, was born at Neustadt in 1487. He studied at Leipsic, where in 1516 he became magister, and in 1520 baccalaureate of theology. When the famous disputation between Dr. Eck and Luther and Carlstadt took place, he was Eck's amanuensis. The disputation convinced him of the truth of the evangelical doctrine, and in 1520 he commenced to preach in accordance with it. The consequence was that he had to leave Leipsic, and in 1522 went to Wittenberg. At the recommendation of Luther, the duke Albrecht of Prussia called Poliander to Koinigsberg, as pastor of the Altstadtkirche, where he remained until his  death in 1541. Poliander is the author of the well-known hymn Nun lob' mein' Seel' den Herrn (Engl. transl. by Mills, 1iorce Germanicae, No. 75, p. 139, “Now to the Lord sing praises”). See Koch, Gesch. des deutschen Kirchenliedes, 1, 355 sq,; Theologisches Universal-Lexikon, s.v.; Herzog, Real-Encyklop. 12, 18-20. (B. P.)

## Polias[[@Headword:Polias]]

             (Πολιάς), a surname given by the Athenians to Minerva, or Athene, as being the goddess- who protected the city.

## Polidoro, Caldara[[@Headword:Polidoro, Caldara]]

             called Caravaegio, from his birthplace, was an eminent Italian painter of the Pre-Raffaelites. He was born in 1495, near Milan. He went to Rome at the time when Leo X was raising some new edifices in the Vatican, and not knowing how to get his bread otherwise, for Polidoro was very young, he hired out as a day-laborer to carry stones and mortar for the masons there at work. He drudged this way till he was eighteen, when he was led to think of devoting his life to painting. It happened thus: Several young painters were employed by Raffaelle in the same place to execute his designs. Polidoro, who often carried them mortar to make their fresco, was touched with the sight of the paintings, and the pleasure he took to see the painters work stirred up the talent which he had for painting. In this disposition, he was very officious and complaisant to the young painters, pushed himself into their acquaintance, and opened to them his intention; whereupon they gave him lessons, which emboldened him to proceed. He applied himself with all his might to designing, and advanced so rapidly that Raffaelle was astonished, and set him to work with the other young painters; and Polidoro distinguished himself so much from all the rest, that, as he had the greatest share in executing his master's designs in the Vatican, so he had the greatest glory. The care he had seen Raffaelle take in designing the antique sculptures showed him the way to do the like. He spent whole days and nights in designing those beautiful things, and studied antiquity to the nicest exactness. The works with which he enriched the frontispieces of several buildings at Rome are proofs of the pains he took in studying the antique.

He did very few easel pieces, most of his productions being in fresco, and of the same color, in imitation of the bass- reliefs. In this way he made use of the manner called scratching, consisting in the preparation of a black ground, on which is placed a white plaster,  and where, taking off this white with an iron bodkin, we discover through the holes the black, which serves for shadows. Scratched work lasts longest, but being very rough, is unpleasant to the sight. He associated himself at first with Maturino, and their friendship lasted till the death of the latter, who died of the plague in 1526. After this, Polidoro, having by Raffaelle's assistance filled Rome with his pieces, thought to have enjoyed his ease and the fruits of his labors; when the Spaniards in 1527 besieging that city, all the men of art were forced to fly, or else were ruined by the miseries of the war. In this exigency Polidiro retired to Naples, where he was obliged to work for ordinary painters, and had no opportunity of making himself noted; for the Neapolitan nobility in those days were more solicitous to get good horses than good pictures. Seeing himself therefore without business, and forced to spend what he had got at Rome, he went to Sicily; and, understanding architecture as well as painting, the citizens of Messina employed him to make the triumphal arches for the reception of Charles V coming from Tunis. This being finished, and finding nothing further, he set out for Rome but, scarcely out of the place, was murdered by his servant for his money. This happened in 1543. Polidoro's principal work was done at Messina, and represented Christ bearing his Cross. This, with several small pictures of sacred subjects, is now in the Studj Gallery at Naples. His works have power, life, and passion, and he may be said to have originated the style which in later time formed the basis of the Neapolitan school. See Spooner, Biog. Hist. of the Fine Arts, s.v.; Mrs. Clement, Handbook of Painters, etc. p 171, 172. (J. H. W.)

## Polieia[[@Headword:Polieia]]

             (Πολίεια), a festival anciently observed at Thebes, in Greece, in honor of Apollo, when a bull was wont to be sacrificed,

## Polieus[[@Headword:Polieus]]

             (Πολιεύς). a surname of Zeus, or Jupiter, under which he was worshipped at Athens, as the protector of the city. The god had an altar on the Acropolis, on which a bull was sacrificed.

## Polignac, Melchior De, Cardinal[[@Headword:Polignac, Melchior De, Cardinal]]

             was one of the most illustrious scholars and courtiers of France in the latter years of Louis XIV, and in the early reign of Louis XV; an ecclesiastic and high dignitary of the Roman Catholic Church; a distinguished diplomatist,  archaeologist, philosopher, and poet. It is in the last of these characters that his reputation has survived, and is likely to survive, though with continually fading luster. The elegant Latinist, whose name was for half a century in the mouths of the fashionable ladies of the court, and of the learned in their studious retreats; whose verses passed current in the gay world for years before they were committed to the press, and continued in circulation for half a century after the death of their author and the oblivion of their source; furnishing to America an inscription in honor of Franklin “Eripuit fulmenque Jovi Phoeboque sagittas;” whose poem was anxiously and frequently desired by Leibnitz, but who died without seeing it, thirty years before it saw the light-this elegant Latinist is now remembered only by a few, and the work which gave him his renown is known to still fewer, being almost as inaccessible as it is unsought. Yet Polignac can never be entirely forgotten, for he linked himself by his poetic labors with Lucretius; and' so long as the profound but dreamy philosophy, and the exquisite but melancholy graces of the greatest of Roman poets are admired, so long will Polignac shine in the radiance reflected from the great luminary with which he is in opposition.

Life. — Melchior de Polignac, the descendant of one of the oldest houses of Auvergne, was born Oct. 11, 1661, at Puly-en-Velay, now Le Puy, the capital of the present department of Haute-Loire, in France. Puy is in the heart of the mountainous region of Middle France, the region of which Puy-de-Dome is the center. It lies at the foot of Mount Anis, in a rugged valley between the great arms of the Cevennes. It is on the left bank of the Upper Loire, and is watered also by its two small tributaries, the Borne and Dolaison. The situation is wild and romantic, and is consecrated by romantic associations. The ground on which the city stands is so ragged and broken that the streets in the higher town are unfit for wheels, and are often mere stairs, like those of Valetta. The cathedral is escalated by an approach of 118 steep steps.

Within is a miraculous image of the Virgin Mary, carved by resident Christians (f Lebanon from the cedars of that mountain, though skeptically suspected to have been an idol of the Egyptian Isis. In the suburb of L'Aiguille, the church of St. Michel crowns a basaltic rock 285 feet in height, and is gained by a flight of 216 steps hewn out of the rock. In the Dominican church of St. Laurent are the tomb and part of the remains of Bertrand Duguesclin, the great constable of France. Near by, and close to the village of Expailly, are the ruins of the ancient castle of Polignac, supposed to have been erected on the site of the  temple of the Celtic Apollo. From this circumstance-the Templum Apollinim cum— the family of Poliglac claimed to have derived its appellation. The tremendous forces of volcanic action are manifest in the country round about, and the streets of Le Puv are partly paved with the volcanic breccia. The race and the birthplace of the future cardinal were thus encompassed with the evidences on which were founded legends and traditions, pagan and Christian-antiquarian, classical, ecclesiastical, chivalrous, and poetic-which might well inspire the quick fancy of the descendant of an ancient family in that marvelous land; and they were enclosed in scenes of natural beauty or sublimity which might feed his imagination in those years of youth which are susceptible to all external influences. Who shall tell to what extent and in what modes the young mind is molded by the circumstances in which infancy and boyhood are passed-in that impressible period of exulting life when it is facile to all impressions? There are no interesting recollect-ions of Polignac's boyhood. As the cadet of a noble house, he was destined for the Church, and was educated at Paris in the colleges of Clermont and Harcourt. He completed his courses by the study of theology at the Sorbonne, and was early provided with a living through the intervention of his family.

The young abbé soon attracted attention by the extent of his acquirements, the vivacity of his disposition, the polish of his conversation, and the elegance of his manners. He is said to have added to ‘a distinguished address and personal appearance a sweet and winning eloquence, which became masculine and powerful in the close of his harangues.” Madame de Sevignt described him in her Letters as “a man of the world, of fascinating sprightliness, knowing all things and meditating all things; yet with all the gentleness, brilliancy, and complaisance which could be desired in the intercourse of life” (March 18, 1690). Equally flattering commendations were bestowed on him about the same time by Louis XIV and pope Alexander VIII. This pope was ‘elected in a conclave attended by the cardinal de Bourbon, who had carried with him to Rome the young abbé, fresh from his theological studies. On this visit Polignac was charged with the discussion of the four articles of 1682 which asserted the liberties of the Gallican Church. He returned to France to report to Louis XIV the favorable results of the effort at conciliation between the French and Roman courts. In 1691 he accompanied the cardinal de Bourbon a second time to Rome, on the occasion of the election of Innocent XII to the pontificate. On his return to France, he shut himself up in the monastery of “Bons Enfants” to continue his studies. He was not suffered to remain long in this learned seclusion.  The previous experience of his adroitness recommended him as a suitable person to conduct the delicate negotiations in support of the candidature of the prince de Conti for the crown of Poland. He was accordingly sent to Warsaw as ambassador extraordinary. This was his first diplomatic employment. On his journey he was wrecked on the Prussian coast; and, to add to the misfortunes of the sea, he was plundered and his life imperiled by marauders of Dantzic. He managed, however, to reach the court to which he was accredited, and was cordially welcomed by the heroic king, John Sobieski. In his confidential mission at Warsaw he displayed great dexterity and capacity for intrigue, which were, however, frustrated of their expected fruit by the listlessness and delays of the French prince. But the sentiment of Poland was expressed in an epigram cited by Leibnitz (Lett. 6 a Burnet):

“Per vivum Deum Nolumus Condaeum.”

The election resulted in placing the Polish crown on the head of Augustus, elector of Saxony, the first king of the Saxon line. Louis XIV manifested his disappointment by replacing Polignac at the court of Warsaw by the abbé de Chateaunay, and ordered the discredited ambassador to return to his abbey of Bon Port (or Fair Haven). The rusticated diplomatist accepted his banishment with apparent gratification, and declared it altogether conformable to his wishes and fortunes. Here he remained during four years, closely occupied with those studies and labors which enabled him to merit the high but pedantic compliment of Voltaire:

“Le cardinal, oracle de la France, Reunissant Viroile avec Platon, Vengeur du ciel et vainqneur de Lucrce.”

To these years of tranquil application must be assigned the conception and commencement of the poem by which his renown was mainly acquired, and by which it has been preserved. On his return from Poland, Polignac visited the celebrated skeptic Bayile with whom he had many and earnest conferences. Bayle, in replying to the theological arguments of his clerical opponent, assumed to be a Protestant, and justified the genuineness of his Protestantism on the score of protesting against everything usually said or done against “tout ce qui se dit et tout ce qui se fait.” The French abbé could make no serious impression upon his astute and witty antagonist, but was much struck with the frequency and point of his citations from  Lucretius. He determined in consequence to re-read the great Roman poet, and to refute his infidel and materialistic arguments. To this task he addressed himself at once in his retreat at Bon Port, and occasional passages of the incipient poem were communicated to his friends, were circulated from mouth to mouth, and excited general expectation among scholars.

Notwithstanding these diligent literary avocations and his professed enjoyment of the charms of contemplative repose, Polignac was too much of a Frenchman and courtier not to sigh and scheme for a renewal of the delights of Paris and of royal favor. On the proclamation of the duke of Anjou as king of Spain, he wrote to Louis XIV: “If your majesty's prosperity does not put an end to my misfortunes, at least it makes me forget them.” The compliment was graciously accepted. He was recalled from his rural banishment, and was -welcomed with the utmost cordiality. The king presented him with two additional abbacies. He seems to have recited at this time long passages from his growing poem to the king, the princes, and the learned. He was sent to Romes auditor of the Rota; and was nominated to the English cardinalate by the Pretender, with whose interests he was entrusted. In 1706 he was joined with the cardinal De la Tremouille in the conduct of the French negotiations. He was recalled from Rome in 1710, and was commissioned, along with the marechal D'Uxelles, as plenipotentiary to the conferences of Gertruydenburg, being already cardinal in petto. The recent victories of Marlborough had rendered the plenipotentiaries of the Dutch provinces arrogant exacting, and impracticable. He rebuked their domineering tone by remarking, “It is very evident, gentlemen, that you are unused to victory.” Nothing was effected at this time towards the restoration of peace, but two years later he was sent to the Congress of Utrecht, where he appeared in the habit of a layman, and under the name of the Comte de Polignac. The Dutch negotiators, suspecting the existence of secret articles between France and England, threatened to expel the French ambassadors from their territory. Hereupon Polignac retorted, “We will not depart: we will treat of you, among you, and without you.” He refused, however, to sign the treaty, as it excluded from the English throne the Stuart family, to whose head he was indebted for his nomination to the cardinalate. Before the negotiations at Utrecht were closed, the promotion of Polignac was promulgated, and he received the cardinal's hat at Antwerp, Feb. 10, 1713. In the summer of the same year the beretta was delivered to him at Versailles by Louis XIV  himself. He did not neglect his poetic defense of Christianity even in the perplexity of diplomatic cares. He added new passages to his poem during his sojourn at Utrecht, and read his poetic labors to the eminent and aged scholar Le Clerc. Soon after his return to Paris he received the appointment of master of the Royal Chapel, an office which he resigned after three years' tenure. His influence and acceptability at court declined after the death of the great monarch. His stately manners belonged to the old regime, and were uncongenial to the license of the regency. He was involved in the conspiracy of Cellamare through his attachment to the duke and duchess of Maine, and his opposition to the regent Orleans. He was exiled to his abbey of Anchin, in Flanders; and though his arrival was distasteful to the simile and uncultivated Flemish monks, he won their regard by his gentleness and consideration, by the integrity of his government, and by the decoration of their church. He employed himself here with the continuation of his poem; but after three years returned to Paris on the death of the cardinal Dubois and of the regent. In 1724 he attended the conclave in Rome which resulted in the election of Benedict XIII, and rendered himself singularly acceptable to him and to his successor, Clement XII. He was appointed shortly after his arrival in Rome ambassador of France at the papal court, and at length brought to a happy termination the long controversy of the Gallican Church on the subject of the bull Unigenitus. He returned to his native land in 1730, “laden with the spoils of Rome” both the tributes paid to his dexterity, with eloquence, and fascination of manner, and the antique treasures brought from the capital of the ancient world. During his absence he had been appointed, in 1726, archbishop of Auch. and in 1728 Comnmandeur des Ordres du Roi.

During this long political and diplomatic career there had been many intervals of literary retirement, as we have seen, which had been sedulously employed in the acquisition and application of various knowledge. His poetic taste and his learned labors he never entirely laid aside, but rendered them profitable to himself and attractive to statesmen and courtiers wherever his wanderings led him. His public avocations were thus far from filling up the measure of his distinction. In 1704 he succeeded the illustrious Bossuet as a member of the Royal Academy of France. His inaugural address on this occasion was greatly admired. More than twenty years after its delivery the marquis D'Argenson deemed it superior to any discourse delivered during the century in which the Academy had existed, and declared it to be “the most perfect model for those who have a like  task to fulfill.” In 1715 he was elected an honorary member of the Academy of Sciences, and in 1717 of the Academy of Belles-Lettres. These honors were fairly merited. He had through life been a diligent explorer and collector of antiquities. He gathered a large and valuable cabinet of coins and medals. He brought together at great expense a splendid assemblage of archaic remains, due in great measure to his frequent and prolonged residences at Rome. He instituted explorations in its neighborhood, between Frascati and Grotta Ferrata, and discovered the villa of Marius his conjectures being confirmed by the exhumation of a fragment of an inscription recording the fifth consulship of the conqueror of the Teutones and Cimbri. From these diggings he obtained six statues representing the detection of Achilles at the court of Lycomedes by Ulysses. The palace of the Caesars, in the Farnese vineyard on the Palatine, was opened and examined in his presence. The duke of Parma, who had ordered the excavations, presented Polignac with a bass-relief containing fourteen figures, embodying the legend of Bacchus and Ariadne. It had formed the highest step of the state platform constructed for the imperial audiences. From the Columbarium of the Libertines of Livia he obtained several beautiful urns. He expressed the wish that he could be master of Rome, in order that he might turn the course of the Tiber for a fortnight, and rifle its bed of the precious relics supposed to be concealed beneath its yellow stream. He had surveys executed with the view to the gratification of such a desire. Could it have been satisfied, the project of Garibaldi would have been anticipated by one hundred and fifty years; but recent discussions have indicated the hopelessness of obtaining any considerable treasures by such a laborious procedure. ‘The numerous relics which Polignac acquired by these and other opportunities were arranged as a grand museum of antiquities at his hotel in Paris. They ultimately met with a sorrowful fate. The cardinal had hoped to increase them by the examination of the ruins of the Templum Pacis, burned in A.D. 191, in the reign of Commodus. He expected to find amid the ashes and debris the sacred vessels carried off from Jerusalem by Titus. The hope and the expectation both remained ungratified.

Polignac's liberal studies were by no means restricted to poetry and classical archaeology. A portion of his time was always devoted to philosophy, mathematics, and physics. He thus gained that diversified and extensive knowledge which is strikingly but not convincingly displayed in his Anti-Lucretius. The last decade of his life seems to have been chiefly  consecrated to this graceful and remarkable poem; but it was also occupied with the arrangement and study of his ample gallery of instructive curiosities, and enlivened by pleasant intercourse with his friends, and with the distinguished strangers who were attracted to his hotel by his wide and long-established reputation. For half a century he was one of the notabilities of Europe. He died at Paris Nov. 20, 1741, and his collection was scattered at his death. His habits had been elegant and courtly-his living generous-his public employments and his private pursuits expensive- his ample means consumed in costly accumulations. He was embarrassed with debt, and after his decease his books, his gems, his medals, his sculptures, and his numerous articles of virtu were offered for sale. His statues were purchased by Frederick the Great, and were transported to Berlin, where they were destroyed on the capture of that city in the Seven- Years' War. All that remains as a memorial of Polignac is his confutation of Lucretius.

Even that great work-for it merits the epithet of great both by its design and by its execution-the great Latin poem which preserves his reputation, was left in as incomplete and fragmentary a condition as the ancient ruins from which he had recovered the shattered monuments of ancient art. He never finished it— he never put its finished parts together (“varias partes variis temporibus perpoliendo, dissolutas, ac dissipatas in unum corpus revocare numquam curaverat”). A few days before his death he consigned his unarranged manuscripts to his long-tried companion and friend the abbé de Rothelin, appointing him his literary executor, to revise, arrange, connect, complete the scattered leaves, or to suppress them, according to his discretion. The provision for the performance of these duties seems to have been early made. The marquis D'Argenson reports it in his Memoires, published fifteen years before Polignac's death: “A poem against Lucretius, of equal length with the original, and divided into nine books, requires the life of a man to carry it to perfection. The cardinal began too late, and cannot flatter himself with the hope of living to finish it. It is said that he means to charge the abbé de Rothelin with the task. who, from vanity, will not refuse it, and will think it an honor to put the work of his respectable friend in a state to appear before the public. But to this end the aid of some able professor of the university will be necessary: the abbé will never accomplish it of himself… But who, at present, will read a Latin poem entirely philosophical, of five or six thousand lines? Greek is entirely forgotten; it is to be feared that Latin will soon be so, and that the cardinal  de Polignac, the abbé de Kothelin, and a certain M. Le Beau, coming up in the university, will be called the last of the Romans.” From vanity, from affection, from love of learning, from zeal for philosophy, or from all these motives combined, the pious task intrusted to him was faithfully and creditably discharged by the abbé de Rothelin. With the counsel and assistance of the abbate Cerati, rector of the University of Pisa, he prepared the work for the press, and wrote the dedication to pope Benedict XIV. He, too, died without seeing the fruit of his labors; and the long- expected work, which for forty years it had been a mark of polite culture to know (Anti-Lucretium nosse pars urbanitaltis), appeared at Paris under the supervision of Prof. Le Beau, to whom the charge of editing it had been consigned by Rothelin. It was reproduced at London in 1748. D'Argenson thought that translations would be left unread; but translations soon diffused the fame of tile work among those who were ignorant of the classic tongues. At the commencement of the century, while the poem was in its crude infancy, a translation was begun by the dukes of Maine and Bourbon. The French version of Bougainville was issued in 1759, and the Italian of Ricci was produced in splendid form at Verona in 1767 (3 vols. 4to).

The Anti-Lucretiuts. — The philosophical poem of cardinal Polignac, as published by Le Beau, and, apparently, as originally designed by its author, consists of nine books; but it closes without epilogue, peroration, or envoy. Notwithstanding its length, its protracted gestation, and its elaborate execution, it ends like that canto of Butler's Ludibras which celebrates the Bear and Fiddle, but “breaks off in the middle.” It wants alike completeness and completion. It is fragmentary and desultory, deficient and redundant. Its arguments are ingenious without being convincing, and its polemics are more dazzling than satisfactory. The blind and fanatical Cartesianism of the poet confines him in a labyrinth of bewildering errors, and conceals from him at once the vagaries and weaknesses of his master, and the strength and profundity of those who had risen up to confute his philosophic hallucinations. He is dizzied by the vortices in which he has involved himself. He forgets his specific function as the antagonist of Epicurean ethics and physics, and devotes himself with more earnest energy to the refutation of all anti-Cartesians, whom he assimilates to and often identifies with the Epicurean herd. He is in consequence both undiscerning and unjust in the treatment of his brilliant predecessors and contemporaries. The statement and confutation of the doctrines of Spinoza  might have been very acceptable to the Cartesians and theologians of his own day, when Spinoza was so little understood and so harshly appreciated (3, 803-872; 4:1295-1307). It may be highly approved even now by those who still retain the old fanatical delusions and the old animosities in regard to Spinoza, and who cannot recognise in him Coleridge's “God-intoxicated sage.” SEE SPINOZA But surely the language in which the cardinal assails the Newtonian system, and proceeds to confute Newton himself, does equal discredit to his good-sense and to his scientific perspicacity (2, 865- 1006; 4:933-1124). He does, it is true, allow a faint echo of the universal admiration for Newton to escape him:

“Dicam Tanti pace viri, quo non solertior alter Naturam rerunm ad leges componere motus, Ac Mundi partes justa perpendere libra, Et radium solis transverso prismate fractum Septemn in primigenos perimansurosque colores Solvere” (2, 874-880).

Yet how different is this deprecatory commendation from the enthusiastic eulogy bestowed on Des Cartes!

“Quo nonline dicam Natlurme genium, Patrime decus, ac decus aevi Cartesiurm nostri, quo se jactabit alumno' Gallia foeta viris, ac duplicis arte Minervme” (8:55-59).

This is the manifest reflection of the tribute of Lucretius to the “Grains homo,” Epicurus. We may endure with patience Polignac's contempt for the materialistic tendencies of Locke's philosophy, and his omission of his contemporaries, Malebranche and the much greater Leibnitz (an omission which may be satisfactorily explained), but we cannot fail to observe his utter inability to discern the scientific acumen, and the wonderful faculty of logical co-ordination and development, which characterized his chosen antagonist Lucretius. One of the most admired, and probably the most brilliant passage in the Anti-Lucretius, is the opening, in which he announces his subject and its difficulties, and does earnest homage to the exquisite graces of the Roman poet. But this inauguration of his thesis does not prevent him from speaking of the spirit and doctrines of Lucretius in terms which reveal rather the controversialist eager to display his own powers in the best light than the sincere inquirer anxious to discover and to  promulgate only the truth. With all our regard for the courtly and clerical poet, we must confess him to be more of a dilettante than a philosopher or adept in science.

But, while thus taking exception to the substance and argumentation of the poem, and to the narrowness and fanaticism inseparable from the advocacy of fantastic and erroneous theories, attention may be justly called to the general execution of the difficult task, and to many episodical disquisitions, which assail by anticipation the speculations of Darwin and the evolutionists, and present many topics and many suggestions which merit careful examination in connection with the scientific controversies that distract our own day by the revival of ancient hallucinations.

Whatever deductions may be properly made from the Anti-Lucretius on the score of scientific superficiality and philosophic aberration, the work merits high praise on account of its design and execution; and still deserves consideration as a memorable and singularly graceful production of the modern Latin muse.

The versification and expression of Polignac have been unfavorably compared with the excellences of some of the earlier Latinists. In making the comparison with Vida, one of the chief of those elders, some advantage may be derived from a direct, though unequal, counterpart to one of his poems. The description of the game of chess in the Anti-Lucretius may be fairly considered in connection with the Scacchia, Ludus, of the Cremonese poet. The same ingenuity in rendering the stiffness of classic Latinity plastic, for the purpose of describing things and processes entirely unknown to the classical vocabulary, may be admired in both. In the one instance chess is employed only as an illustration, and the description occupies only fifteen lines (Anti-Lucr. 3, 892-906); in the other it constitutes the thesis of a descriptive poem. In a few lines, and in a mere illustration, there is, of course, no opportunity for detail. Nor is there room for such elaborate intricacy of narration-such subtle twisting in and twisting out of facile diction-nor for such surprising felicity of adaptation of old forms to new and undesigned uses, in the later episode as in the earlier poem. There is nothing possible within the narrower field which, for curious dexterity, admits of being adduced as a parallel for Vila's marvellous explanation of the diverse movements of the pieces at chess (Scacch. 85-168), or for his explanation of the maneuvers and fortunes of the game. But it may be permitted to act upon the artist's maxim, ‘ex pede  Herculem;' and we may discern in the episode of Polignac (notwithstanding the deficiency of materials for an accurate and minute comparison) a command over the resources of the Latin tongue which is not unworthy of Vida, even in such fantastic sports of fancy and erudition. If the larger faculties of the poet are considered, Vida's epic, the Christiad, fails to exhibit such compass of expression, such grace and dignity, and even melody of utterance, or such vigor of imagination, as the Anti- Lucretius. Both Vida and Polignac, it is true, fall into the unclassical frailty of terminating their hexameters too frequently with monosyllables and enclitics. They are careless of their caesuras, and repeat too often certain easy forms and mannerisms. There may be more liquidity and smoothness in Vida, but there is more elevation and a more masculine gravity in Polignac. If the former adheres with unconscious imitation to the transparent fluency of Virgil, the latter with equal success, but with deliberate endeavor, reproduces the peculiarities, and not rarely the splendors, of Lucretius, in the very diction of the greater Roman poet. But, whatever judgment may be passed on either the absolute or the relative merit of the Anti-Lucretius, it remains a very remarkable poem, which deserves to be reclaimed from the oblivion in which it has been suffered to remain so long. It was a praiseworthy and noble effort to repel the advances of skepticism in the day of Spinoza and Locke and Bayle; “to justify the ways of God to man,” by explaining the wonder of the universe in consonance with a lively and intelligent faith in a wise, beneficent, and sustaining Creator. Despite of its imperfections, its disconnections, its disorder and incompleteness, the study of the poem may be advantageously renewed after the lapse of a century, though other weapons may be required for the renovated conflict between faith and science than can thence be drawn, in consequence of the vast changes which have since been made in all the implements of intellectual warfare.

Literature. — It results from the long neglect into which the Anti-Lucretius had fallen that the bibliography of the subject is exceedingly scant and unsatisfactory. The histories of philosophy pass it by with little or no notice; the editors of Lucretius, and the commentators on the De Natura Rerum, have scarcely bestowed more attention upon it. There is very little to assist investigation which is not due to the contemporaries of Polignac. Under these circumstances, the only references which it seems expedient to make are, Biographie Universelle, s.v. Polignac; De Boze, Eloge de M. le Cardinal de Polignac, prononae dans l'Acacernie Royle des Inscriptions  et des Belles-Lettres; De Mairan, Eloge de M. le Cardinal de Polignac, prononce dans l'Academie Royale des Sciences; Fancher, Hist. du Carcdinal de Polignac (Paris, 1772, 2 vols.); St. Simon, Memoires; D'Argenson, Memoirs; Anti-Lucretius, sive de Deo et Natura Libri Novem (Lond. 1748, 2 vols. 12mo). The recent History of French Literature by Van Laun. though extending over three octavo volumes, has not a word on Polignac, so much has his memory fallen into neglect. For the relation of Polignac to the important ecclesiastical events of his time, see Jervis, Hist. of the Church of France, 2, 181, 224, and the art.SEE NOAILLES in this Cyclopedia. (G. F. H.)

## Polish Brethren[[@Headword:Polish Brethren]]

             SEE SOCINIANS.

## Polish Version Of The Scriptures[[@Headword:Polish Version Of The Scriptures]]

             The revision of the New Test. from the Greek, undertaken for the British and Foreign Bible Society in 1878, by Messrs. Manitius, Diehl, Poplososki, and Fecht, of Warsaw, was completed in 1881, and an edition of five thousand copies was published at Vienna under the care of the Bible society's agent, Mr. E. Millard. SEE SLAVONIC VERSION. (B.P.)

## Politeness[[@Headword:Politeness]]

             SEE COURTESY.

## Politi, Adriano[[@Headword:Politi, Adriano]]

             an Italian writer. was born at Siena at the close of the 16th century. He chose the ecclesiastical career, and was attached as secretary to the cardinals Capisucchi, San Giorgio, and Serbelloni. He died about the middle of the 17th century. Politi edited Opere di C. Tacito (Rome, 1611, 4to), and another and more satisfactory edition (Venice, 1644, 4to): — Dizionario Toscano (ibid. 1615, 8vo): this work, an abridgment of the Dizionario della Crusca, caused him some tribulations: he was accused of having wittingly introduced into it some errors and falsehoods, and was thrown into jail: — Ordo Romance historiae legendae (ibid. 1627, 4to, and in vol. 3 of Roberti's Miscellanea). — Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Géneralé, 40, 616.

## Politi, Alessandro[[@Headword:Politi, Alessandro]]

             an Italian writer, was born July 10, 1679, at Florence. After studying under the Jesuits, he entered at the age of fifteen the Congregation of the Regular Clerks of the Pious Schools, and was conspicuous among its members by his rare erudition. He was called upon to teach rhetoric and peripatetic philosophy at Florence in 1700. Barring a period of about three years, during which he was a professor of theology at Genoa (1716-18), he spent the greatest part of his life in his native city, availing himself of the  manifold resources he could find there to improve his knowledge of Greek literature, his favorite study. In 1733 he was called to the chair of eloquence vacant in the University of Pisa. Accustomed to live among his books aloof from the world, Politi was of an irritable disposition, and sensitive in the extreme to the lightest criticism. He was fond of displaying his erudition, and his useless digressions make the reading of his works a most harassing job. He died July 25,1752. He left, Philosophia Peripatetica, ex mente sancti Thontae (Florence. 1708, 12mo): — De puatria in testamentis condendis potestate, lib. 4 (ibid. 1712, 8vo): — Etmstathii Commentarii in Homeri Iliadem, with notes and Latin version (ibid. 1730-35, 3 vols. fol.): — Eustuthii Commentarii in Dionysium Perietem, Greek and Latin (Cologne, 1742, 8vo): — Orationes XII ad Academiuam Pisanuam (Lucca, 1746, 8vo): — Martyrologyim Romanum castigatuum (vol. 1, Florence, 1751, 8vo); and many unpublished works. All his orations Lave been collected (Pisa, 1774, 8vo). See Fabroni. Vitae Itatioarum, vol. 8; Tipaldo, Biogs. degli Ital. illustri, vol. 4. — Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Géneralé, 40, 616.

## Politi, Giovanni[[@Headword:Politi, Giovanni]]

             an Italian canonist, was born June 8,1738, at Pinzano (Frioul). He studied at Padua, obtained in 1763 the diploma as a doctor of civil and canon law, and was a professor of literature at the Seminary of Portogruaro, and also of ecclesiastical jurisprudence, in which he was remarkably proficient. In 1800 he repaired to Concordia, where the bishop provided him with a canonicate. He published one considerable work, Jurisor udeotice ecclesiasticae universae, libri 9 (Venice, 1787, 9 vols. 4to), which was approved by a brief of Pius VI. — Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Géneralé, 40, 617.

## Politian or Poliziano, Angelo[[@Headword:Politian or Poliziano, Angelo]]

             a noted scholar of the Renaissance period, flourished in France and Italy, and was the favorite of the Medici at Florence. He was born at Montepulciano, in Tuscany, in 1454, and was the son of Benedetto Ambrogini, a doctor of law. In after-life he dropped his paternal name, and assumed that of Poliziano, from his native town Mons Politianus. Lorenzo de Medici took care of his education, placed him under good preceptors, and provided for all his wants. He afterwards entered into clerical orders, took his degree of doctor of law, and was made by Lorenzo a canon of the cathedral of Florence. He was also entrusted with the education of the  ducal children, as well as with the care of the duke's library and collection of antiquities, and he was his guest and companion for the remainder of his life. Poliziano had studied Latin under Cristofiro Landino, Greek under Andronicus of Thessalonica, and philosophy under Ficino and Argyropultus of Constantinople. He was afterwards appointed professor of Latin and Greek at Florence. a chair which he filled with great reputation. He wrote scholia and notes on many ancient authors-Ovid, Catullus, Statius, Suetonius, Pliny the Younger, and the Scriptores Historiae Augustae; he translated into Latin the history of Herodian, the manual of Epictetus, the aphorisms of Hippocrates, some dialogues of Plato, and other works from the Greek.

The Miscellanea of Poliziano, published at Florence in 1489, consist chiefly of observations he had made on the ancient authors, which he arranged for the press at the request of Lorenzo. Merula made an attempt to depreciate this work, which led to an angry controversy between the two scholars, in the midst of which Merula died. Poliziano had also a violent controversy with Bartolomeo Scala. Poliziano was conceited and vain, and very irritable, and his temper led him into an unbecoming altercation with Madonna Clarice, Lorenzo's wife, because she interfered in the education of her children, a thing which Poliziano seemed to think preposterous in a woman; and at last his behavior to her was so impertinent that she turned him out of her house in the country, and wrote to her husband at Florence to inform him of what she had done. Lorenzo perceiving that a reconciliation between the offended woman and the irascible scholar was impracticable, gave Poliziano apartments in one of his houses at Fiesole, where he wrote his Latin poem Rusticus. During Lorenzo's last illness, Poliziano attended the deathbed of his patron, who gave him tokens of his lasting affection. Poliziano wrote an affecting monody on Lorenzo's death, and not long after died himself; in September, 1494, and was buried in the church of San Marco, agreeably to his request. — English Cyclop. s.v. See Möller, de Polifiano (Altorf, 1698); Wenmer, Politimus (Magdeb. 1718); Mencken, Historie A. Politaai (Leips. 1736, 4to); Bonafous, De Politani Vita et Operibas (Paris, 1845, 8vo); Greswell, Memoirs of Politiano; Roscoe, Lives of ,Lorenzo de Medici and of Leo X; Tiraboschi, Storia della Letterat. Itrl.; Christian Schools and Scholars (Lond. 1867, 2 vols. 8vo), 2, 321 sq, 329; Lawrence, Historical Studies (N. Y. 1877, 8vo), p. 66.

## Polity[[@Headword:Polity]]

             (Gr. πολετεία) is the term generally used to signify government or forms of government a an administration in the Christian Church. Church polity may be considered in reference to its historical development during successive centuries, and also in reference to the various systems of government heretofore and now recognized in different branches of the Church.

Historical Development. — Nothing is more obvious from the New- Testament record than the simplicity which characterized the primary organization of the Church. In this particular Christianity was in marked contrast with Judaism. Without temple, tabernacle, or altars, without priests or Levites, and almost without ceremonies, it made known at once its character and purposes as spiritual and not carnal, as, in fact, a kingdom of God “not of this world.” The first form of Church organization was that in which the Lord Jesus Christ was present as the visible Head of a body of believers. At this stage the ordinances were established by direct appointment of the Savior himself, who also gave the great command to his disciples to “Go teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Ghost, teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you.”

Following the crucifixion, the resurrection, and ascension of the Lord Jesus, the Church had for a short period a second form of organization, in which the apostles were the only officers to teach and guide the followers of the Savior. It was at this period that the promised gift of the Holy Ghost was miraculously imparted and signalized by a great awakening at Jerusalem, in which “the Lord added to the Church daily such as were saved.” This period of increase was followed by the appointment of deacons or officers of help, who were especially chosen to relieve the apostles of their minor duties of a semi-secular kind, that they might give themselves “to prayer and the ministry of the Word.” Notwithstanding their primary duties, some if not all of the deacons also devoted themselves to the preaching of the Word, as may be seen from the examples of Stephen and Philip. For a few years following there appear to have been no other officers in the Church besides the apostles and deacons. The next phase of Church administration is that in which elders were appointed. As no specific account is given of the mode of their first appointment, we are left to infer that it may have occurred as a natural designation of respect for  seniority either among the deacons or the influential members of the Church, somewhat after the analogy of eldership among the Jews. Certain it is that as churches multiplied, the apostles recognized, possibly appointed, and actually ordained elders who from the first had greater or less functions of government, and were also active agents of evangelization. Elders were known at Jerusalem about A.D. 41, or eight years after the Pentecost. A few years later they were ordained generally in all the churches (Act 14:23). In the council at Jerusalem they were associated with the apostles and brethren (Act 15:4; Act 15:6; Act 15:23). The elders of the New Testament appear to have been evangelists, teachers, and pastors, and in a collective capacity to have ordained ministers of different grades.

Near the close of the New-Testament period the term bishop is used a few times by the inspired writers Luke and Paul, indicating an additional office growing up out of the presbyterate, somewhat as the latter had done from the diaconate. On questions that have arisen respecting the office of bishop in the New-Testament Church modern controversies in reference to Church polity have largely centered. One theory is that the apostles appointed bishops to be their direct and only official successors having the prerogative of ordaining future ministers by divine right. An opposite theory is that the ἐπίσκοποι and πρεσβύτεροι of the New Testament were absolutely identical in office and order and, consequently, that every elder was a bishop. The more probable theory lies between these extremes. It is that the episcopate was a natural sequence of the presbyterate, not specially appointed, but, in fact, recognized by the apostles. Whereas for the work of evangelization not only an elder but elders were ordained in the principal churches, there would exist in every body of elders the necessity of a presidency or primacy for the purpose of general superintendence and direction. Thus one of the number would be designated, either by seniority or formal choice, as a primus inter pares, who should serve as overseer (ἐπίσκοπος) of the body and the flock under them. According to this theory, the episcopate was an office of superintendency rather than a distinct clerical order; and in this respect it was analogous if not identical in its functions with that of such apostolical legates as were Timothy and Titus. Nevertheless, it was an office of such importance in the administration of the affairs of the Church and so well adapted to the necessities of the times that it soon became general. Nothing in its original character would prevent its being held in rotation by several  elders in the same church or diocese, yet a successful administration of it would tend to its perpetuation in the same individual. Hence it soon became an office for life.

The episcopacy of the primitive Church was diocesan, and in many cases dioceses embraced only single churches. But as Christian influences radiated from those churches, and contiguous churches were established, the dioceses expanded, and the bishoprics grew in importance. At this early period an error crept into the Church which had a great influence upon its polity in after-ages. It was that of attributing priestly functions to the Christian ministry. Soon after the custom became current of calling presbyters priests, it also became customary to call bishops high-priests, and deacons Levites, and thus a full hierarchical system was initiated in the Church. After the conversion of Constantine this system became gradually expanded, until it exceeded in pomp and detail of ceremony the whole ritual of Judaism, and threw the pontifical rites of Greek and Roman paganism far in the shade. From the diocesan bishop as the primitive center, episcopal offices expanded upwards into archbishops, metropolitans, exarchs, and patriarchs; downwards into chorepiscopi, or country bishops, suffragans, titular bishops, and in the African churches intercessors or episcopal advocates. Corresponding to this expansion, the lower ranks of the clergy were similarly increased by the addition of archpresbyters, archdeacons, and subdeacons, together with acolothists, exorcists, lectors, ostiarii, psalmistae, copiatae, parabolani, catechists, syndics, notaries, and still other officers in large churches. In the upward expansion of the episcopate, the Greek Church stopped at the patriarchate, but the Roman Church was content with nothing short of a universal patriarchate or papacy (q.v.).

To state somewhat more fully the organization of the Church in the 4th and 5th centuries, it may be said that the Church of that period consisted of several orders of men. Eusebius reckons three, viz. the ῾Ηγούμενοι, Πιστοί, and Κατηχούμενοι, i.e. rulers, believers, and catechumens. Origen reckons five orders; but then he divides the clergy into three orders, to make up the number. Both these accounts, when compared together, come to the same thing. Under the ῾Ηγούμενοι, or rulers, were comprehended the clergy, bishops, priests, and deacons; under the Πιστοί, or believers, the baptized laity; and under the Κατηχούμενοι, or catechumens, the candidates for baptism. The believers were called perfect Christians; the catechumens imperfect. The former, having received  baptism, were allowed to partake of the Eucharist, to join in all the prayers of the Church, and to hear discourses upon the most profound mysteries of religion: more particularly the use of the Lord's Prayer was the sole prerogative of the believers, whence it was called Εὐχὴ πιστῶν, the prayer of believers. From all these privileges the catechumens were excluded. SEE CATECHUMENS. The distinction between the laity and the clergy is by churchmen deduced from the very beginnings of the Christian Church; yet Rigaltius, Salmasius, and Salden insist that there was originally no distinction, but that it is an innovation, and was called forth by the ambition of the clergy of the 3d century, in which Cyprian and Tertullian lived. SEE CLERGY.

The various orders of the clergy were appointed to their several offices in the Church by solemn forms of consecration or ordination, and had their respective privileges, immunities, and revenues. The unity and worship of the Church were secured by laws both ecclesiastical and civil. The ecclesiastical laws were either rules and orders made by each bishop for the better regulation of his particular diocese, or laws made in provincial synods for the government of all the dioceses of a province; or, lastly, laws respecting the whole Christian Church, made in general councils or assemblies of bishops from all parts of the Christian world. SEE SYNOD. The civil laws of the Church were those decrees and edicts made from time to time by the emperors, either restraining the power of the Church, or granting it new privileges, or confirming the old. The breach of these laws was severally punished both by the Church and State. The ecclesiastical censures respecting offenders among the clergy were chiefly suspension from the office and deprivation of the rights and privileges of the order. Those respecting the laity consisted chiefly in excommunication, or rejection from the communion of the Church, and penance both public and private. SEE ECCLESIASTICAL POLITY.

The idea of the papacy or spiritual supremacy of Rome was not fully developed before the middle of the 7th century, when Theodore of Rome, not content with the title of Ecumenical patriarch, assumed that of sovereign pontiff. From that period the successive claims of the papacy — viz. temporal sovereignty, the vicariate of Peter and Paul, of Christ and of God, the janitorship of the kingdom of heaven, and the theocratic monarchy of the world-went on progressively, until in 1870 they apparently culminated in the official assumption of infallibility (q.v.). Meantime, as a system of ecclesiasticism, the papacy has retained most of  the offices of the ancient Church, and added to them that of cardinal (q.v.), nuncio, chancellor, chamberlain, prefect, referendary, auditor, inquisitor, and numerous others of a political and ceremonial character. Within the sphere of papal authority no serious controversy ever arose on the subject of Church polity. Ceremonial expansion, unchecked by any idea of scriptural example or restraint, was for centuries the order of progress. It was not till the Reformation was so far inaugurated as to feel the necessity of organizing churches after the type of the New Testament that any important discussions took place respecting the principles of Church government. The Reformed churches on the Continent generally rejected episcopacy and adopted Presbyterianism. The Lutherans practically retained the episcopal office under the title of superintendent. But scarcely any two of the principal Reformed churches agreed in detail as to their plan of organization, nor were these minor differences regarded as of any serious importance.

Systems of Church Government. — England is the country that has given birth to the chief controversies concerning Church polity which have prevailed in modern times. As the Reformation in England was largely political in its character, it not only resulted in the transfer of the cathedrals, churches, colleges, etc., built under Roman supremacy, to the Reformed Church of England, but also many Roman Catholic ceremonies and usages. Hence from the first that Church was divided into two parties in reference to Church polity. Had they been content with temperate discussion, and with the peaceful separation of those who could not harmonize their views, the result might have been very different. But unfortunately both parties had inherited the principle of intolerance, either from the Roman Church or from preceding times, and also the theory of state rule in matters of religious faith and practice. To these false principles may be charged some of the most pitiable and disgraceful facts in the history of Great Britain. The oppugnant legislation, the strifes, the persecutions, and the martyrdoms which took place in the successive reigns of Henry VIII, of Bloody Mary, of queen Elizabeth, of James I, of Charles I and II, and even under the protectorate of Cromwell, are sufficient to impress any mind with the extent of human misery, and of reproach to the Christian name caused by the errors alluded to. In all history there is not a more significant comment upon the sin of constraining men's consciences by the arbitrary standards of human authority. It was not till after more than a hundred and fifty years of party strife and bloodshed that in 1689 the  Toleration Act was passed, by which dissent from the faith and polity of the Established Church was legalized. Even after that it was a long time before many could see, and even yet it does not seem possible for all to understand, that details of Church polity were never appointed by divine authority, but designedly left by the Head of the Church to be adjusted on the basis of great principles rather than to be governed by fixed and uniform precepts. Scotland had adopted Presbyterianism from the Reformed churches of the Continent as early as 1550, but even after toleration was secured that form of Church government failed to become popular in England. Independency in various forms seemed to be preferred by the English Nonconformists and Dissenters. Between them and Presbyterians on the one hand, and the advocates of prelacy or episcopacy by divine right on the other, controversy has never ceased. But since the controversy has been limited to words it has been an innocent, though often an exciting one, owing to the many phases it has assumed from time to time.

While the Church of England has continually antagonized the Church of Rome on the ground of papal supremacy, it has itself been in ceaseless agitation as between the High and Low Church parties within its own pale, and more especially since the period of the Oxford Tracts (q.v.) and the more recent ritualistic discussions. All the English controversies respecting Church polity have found their way to this country, but with greatly altered conditions of the various parties. Independency having escaped from persecution by way of Holland, itself established a species of theocracy and became a persecutor in New England. But its period of intolerance was brief; and, on the whole, the Christian churches of the United States have been remarkably free from the spirit and practice of intolerance. The free institutions of the country and the absolute separation of the State from all the churches have tended to place all on a common level, and to make all alike dependent upon good arguments and good practice as means of securing public respect and increasing strength.

Controversies on Church polity in America have chiefly prevailed in the rivalry of denominations. For the most part, different churches, while commending their own forms of polity, have respected that of others. Discussions conducted after that manner have greatly extended the feeling of Christian fraternity, and at the same time made almost universal the opinion that particular forms of Church government are of quite inferior importance as compared with the essential elements of Christian faith and  practice. On the other hand, pretentious claims and intolerant practice have tended to defeat their own aims and to secure public disapprobation. Notwithstanding numberless varieties in unimportant particulars, the distinctive systems of Church government are few. Designated by the highest authority recognized in each, they may be enumerated as the Congregational, the Presbyterian, the Episcopal, the Patriarchal, and the Papal. The details of these systems may be seen by reference to articles on the churches adhering to them severally.

Literature. — The controversial literature of the subject of Church polity is very nearly identical with that of the subject of ordination (q.v.). The general, historical, and didactic literature of Church polity is also quite extensive. The following list of books will at least fairly represent it in its different branches and phases: Migne, Dictionnaire des Ceremonies et des Rites sacres (Par. 3 vols. 8vo); also Dictionnaire de Discipline Ecclesiastique (2 vols. 8vo); Amyrald, Du Gouvernement de l'Eglise; Marsden, Churchmanship of the New Test.; Brokesby, Government of the Church for the first Three Centuries; Kay, External Government of the Church in the first Three Centuries; Parker, Church Government of the first Six Hundred Years; Thorndike, The Forms of Church Government; Cartwright, Directory of Church Government; Canons of the Church of England; Wilberforce, Church Courts and Discipline; Clergyman's Assistant; Clay, Essays on Church Policy; Birk, Church and State; Baptist Noel, Church and State; Thompson, Church and State; Clergyman's Instructor; Bannerman, The Church of Christ; Cunningham, Discussions on Church Principles; Canons of the Prot. Episc. Church; Vinton, Manual Commentary on the Canon Law and Constitution of the Prot. Episc. Church; Dobney, Three Churches; Uhden, New England Theocracy; Upham, Ratio Disciplinae; Punchard, Congregationalism; Sawyer, Organic Christianity; Smyth, Ecclesiastical Republicanism; Miller, On Presbyterianism; also Ruling Elders; Engles, Ruling Elders; Form of Government; Cambridge Platform of Church Discipline; Bacon. Church Manual; Cummings, Congregational Dictionary; Lutheran Liturgy; Kurtz, Why are you a Lutheran? King, Presbyterian Church Government; also On the Eldership; Hiscox, Baptist Church Directory; Wayland, Principles and Practices of the Baptists; Ripley, Church Polity; Schmucker, Lutheran Manual; Grindrod, Compendium of the Laws and Regulations of Wesleyan Methodism; Barrett, Ministry and Polity of the Christian Church; Discipline of the Methodist Episcopal Church; Baker,  On the Discipline; Emory, Hist. of the Discipline; Sherman, Hist. of the Discipline; Porter, Compendium of Methodism; also Helps to Official Members; Bond, Economy of Methodism; Stevens, Ch. Polity; Hodgson, Polity of Methodism; Morris, Church Polity; Crane, Methodism and its Methods. (D. P. K.)

## Polity, Civil, of the Jews[[@Headword:Polity, Civil, of the Jews]]

             SEE GOVERNMENT.

## Poliuichos[[@Headword:Poliuichos]]

             (πολιοῦχος), a surname of several deities among the ancient Greeks, who were believed to be the guardians of cities.

## Poliziano[[@Headword:Poliziano]]

             SEE POLITIAN.

## Polk, Leonidas[[@Headword:Polk, Leonidas]]

             a noted American prelate of the Protestant Episcopal Church, and a general in the late war between the Northern and Southern States, was born at Raleigh, N. C., in 1806. He was educated for the army in the United States military academy at West Point, N. Y., but had served only a few months as lieutenant when he determined to take orders in the Protestant Episcopal Church. He was ordained deacon in 1830, and in 1831 took a rectorate. In 1838 he was made the missionary bishop of Arkansas and the Indian Territory, south of 36° 30', and in 1841 bishop of Louisiana. He then took up his residence at Lafourche parish, where he had extensive plantations. Being a man of wealth and enjoying a life of ease, he never paid very much attention to ecclesiastical labors, and did but little to strengthen the work of the Church within the range of his diocese. At the outbreak of hostilities against the North he was on the side of the planters, and did all in his power to further the secession movement. Not only did he speak in public and contribute from his purse, but he offered his services to the Southern Confederacy as soon as established, and was made a general in their army. He early urged upon Jefferson Davis and the other Confederate authorities the importance of fortifying and holding the strategical points of the Mississippi Valley, and in other ways proved himself a far-seeing and skilful adviser of their cause. He took part in several battles, and though not always very prominent in action, was ever indispensable in council, and contributed greatly to whatever success the Confederate cause achieved in his days and surroundings. During a reconnaissance near Marietta, Ga., he was killed by a cannon-shot, June 14,1864. tie had never resigned his  episcopal dignity, but was buried with military honors. Though bishop Polk gave his life in what we consider an unworthy cause, we must revere his memory for his sterling qualities as a man who was not afraid to do what he believed to be his duty. He was noted for his kindness of heart and the most devout Christian life, such as he understood it to be. See Men of the Times, s.v.; American Annual Cyclop. 1868, p. 679; Drake, Dict. of American Biography, s.v.